

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

1 **Prohibiting Babel - A call for professional remote interpreting**
2 **services in pre-operation anaesthesia information**

3

4

5 Gernot Gerger^{1*}, Nikolaus Graf^{2*}, Elisabeth Klager¹, Klara Doppler^{1,3}, Armin Langauer²,
6 Verena Albrecht³, Aylin Bilir², Harald Willschke^{1,2}, David M. Baron², Maria Kletecka-Pulker^{1,3}

7

8 ¹Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Digital Health and Patient Safety, Ludwig Boltzmann
9 Gesellschaft, Vienna, Austria

10 ²Department of Anesthesia, General Intensive Care and Pain Management, Medical
11 University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

12 ³Institute for Ethics and Law in Medicine (IERM), University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

13

14 *contributed equally

15 Corresponding author

16 Email: gernot.gerger@dhps.lbg.ac.at (GG)

17

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

18 **Abstract**

19 *Introduction:* Language barriers within clinical settings pose a threat to patient safety. As a
20 potential impediment to understanding, they hinder the process of obtaining informed
21 consent. This study investigates the impact of the current use of interpreters, with a
22 particular focus on the efficacy of engaging laypersons as interpreters, rather than
23 professional interpreters. A further objective is to explore the validity and reliability of
24 phone-based telemedicine.

25 *Methods:* In three groups (N per group = 30), we compared how using lay or professional
26 interpreters affected non-German speaking patients' subjectively perceived understanding
27 (understood vs. not understood) and recollection (recollected vs. not recollected) of
28 information about general anaesthesia. Fluent German speaking patients served as the
29 control group. Statistical analyses (χ^2 tests and binomial) were calculated to show
30 differences between and within the groups.

31 *Results:* All three groups indicated similar, high self-reported levels of having understood the
32 medical information provided. This was in stark contrast to the assessed objective
33 recollection data. In the lay interpreter group, recollection of anaesthesia facts was low; only
34 around half of participants recalled specific facts. For patients supported by professional
35 interpreters, their recollection of facts about anaesthesia was significantly enhanced and
36 elevated to the same level of the control group (fluent in German). Moreover, for these
37 patients, providing information by means of phone-based telemedicine before anaesthesia
38 yielded high levels of understanding and recollection of anaesthesia facts.

39 *Conclusion:* Phone-based telemedicine is a safe and reliable method of communication in the
40 professional interpreter group and German speaking control group, but not in the lay
41 interpreter group. Compared to lay interpreters, professional interpreters significantly
42 improve patients' uptake of critical information about general anaesthesia, thus highlighting
43 the importance of professional interpreters for patient safety and informed consent.

44

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

45 Introduction

46 Increasingly multicultural societies and migration in many European countries is creating
47 linguistically more diverse patient populations. Consequently, language barriers are becoming
48 a more pressing issue for healthcare professionals and institutions. In the DACH region
49 (Germany, Austria, Switzerland), reports show that language barriers affect the routines of
50 healthcare professionals from multiple times a week to daily (1-3). Challenges in
51 communicating and understanding are inevitably linked to problems in establishing informed
52 consent and treatment compliance and negatively affect healthcare routines and health
53 outcomes (4-8). With patient safety in focus, the importance and advantage of effective and
54 professional interpretation services should therefore be apparent to healthcare professionals,
55 clinical operators, and governmental legislators. This study aims to demonstrate how the
56 current status quo of utilising interpreters in an Austrian hospital affects patients'
57 understanding of medical procedures and consequently their patient safety.

58 From a legal and ethical perspective, the ability to understand a medical consultation is
59 fundamental to self-determined decision making and thus a basis for informed consent. This
60 right is established in Article 3 of the World Health Organization Declaration on the Promotion
61 of Patients' Rights in Europe (9), as well as in Article 8 of the European Convention of Human
62 Rights (10), and Article 3 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (11). In
63 contrast to countries such as Sweden where anyone who cannot speak Swedish has the formal
64 right to an interpreter in the healthcare setting (3, 12), in Austria there is no explicit legislation
65 giving patients the right to medical consultations in their native language. Nonetheless,
66 patients must be able to make informed and self-determined decisions based on the
67 information provided by physicians. It is the legal responsibility of the physician and/or the
68 hospital to demonstrate that patients have understood the medical information provided (1).
69 Very often this is achieved by asking the patients directly (e.g., Did you understand everything?
70 Do you have any questions?), or even indirectly inferring understanding through further verbal
71 or non-verbal cues, e.g., nodding behaviour (4). If as a result of language barriers informed
72 consent cannot be obtained, healthcare professionals are not obliged to conduct medical
73 procedures (except for medical emergencies). In fact, this could even result in liability issues
74 and legal consequences (13).

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

75 Importantly, in addition to the legal ramifications, it is well-established that language barriers
76 are associated with several negative outcomes. Patient safety, healthcare routines, patient
77 and healthcare professional satisfaction, patient compliance, and access to health care are all
78 negatively affected when communication and understanding cannot be properly established
79 (14-19). Additionally, problems in understanding can be linked to higher costs as language
80 barriers result in the use of more expensive tertiary health services rather than primary
81 services, multiple visits to physicians, and longer hospital stays (5, 20-22). Therefore, for legal,
82 ethical, economic, and especially patient safety issues, it is of paramount importance that
83 patients understand the planned medical procedures. This necessitates effective and reliable
84 interpretation services.

85 With respect to interpretation services, the current situation in Austria's healthcare sector is
86 often as follows: The demand for interpretation is undoubtedly high and will likely increase
87 due to demographic developments. This is supported by a recent Austrian study
88 demonstrating that 71% of healthcare professionals interviewed reported encountering
89 language barriers 2 to 3 times a week. In some departments, physicians sometimes treated
90 patients with insufficient command of German to communicate effectively on a daily basis. In
91 only about 37% of these cases are professional interpreters consulted (1). These rather low
92 levels of professional interpreter use in Austria are in line with international observations (19).
93 Interestingly, although professional interpreters are often theoretically available at clinics (1),
94 most interpretations are (still) conducted with the help of lay interpreters. These are persons
95 available on an ad hoc basis, either family members such as siblings, (underaged) children or
96 parents, or other non-professional interpreters including friends, non-medical hospital staff
97 or even other patients (1, 19, 21).

98 It is interesting to note that public health guidelines often endorse the use of lay interpreters.
99 The Austrian Ministry of Health, for example, explicitly approves the use of laypersons as
100 interpreters to provide pre-operation diagnostic information and obtain informed consent for
101 operations (23). This fact is critical to note, as using lay interpreters creates challenges in
102 clinical contexts for all parties involved. For example, there are serious implications on the
103 interpreter side: Using non-medical professionals or other available persons (such as other
104 patients or family members) on an ad hoc basis can put severe emotional strain on these
105 interpreters. This factor is considerably aggravated when underaged children function as

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

106 interpreters (1, 24). Ultimately, this can increase the caregiver burden and diminish their
107 psychological and physical health (25, 26). Additionally, using lay interpreters raises serious
108 confidentiality concerns (1). When physicians or other healthcare professionals use their
109 second (or third) language, a further set of problems may often arise: cultural beliefs and
110 traditions of which they are often unaware can compromise the (medical) information
111 provided (27, 28). Non-proficient speakers, in particular, often overestimate their linguistic
112 abilities, assuming they can sufficiently master a language to “get by” without engaging a
113 professional interpreter (29).

114 The points above raise concerns about the quality of interpretations provided by lay
115 interpreters, and indeed, more negative health outcomes are reported when lay interpreters
116 are used compared to professional interpreters (5, 22, 29-31). Lay interpreter services are
117 linked to more interpretation errors (31, 32), more emergency room and physician visits (14,
118 33), a higher risk of readmission, and an increased length of stay (34). This gravely impacts
119 patient safety. Although professional interpretation services require more time, greater
120 organisation, and higher costs (35) in the short run, over the long run they can result in shorter
121 hospital stays, reduced medication, more appropriate treatments, and better clinical
122 outcomes (5). Thus, although empirical evidence strongly points towards better clinical as well
123 as economic outcomes, the reasons for often not using theoretically available interpretation
124 services deserves further scrutiny.

125 To further investigate how the type of interpreter impacts understanding of medical
126 information, this study considers a typical clinical scenario for which informed consent is
127 required: pre-anaesthetic information for general anaesthesia in elective surgery. We tested
128 how lay and professional interpreters affect patients’ information uptake and recollection of
129 critical clinical facts about anaesthesia. The information provided about anaesthetic
130 procedures is well suited for testing the effects of language barriers as this information is
131 usually presented in a highly standardised manner following best practice guidelines (36-38).
132 This allows for a common comparison standard across different operations and patients with
133 different language backgrounds. We developed a questionnaire to evaluate the patients’ self-
134 reported level of understanding, and included a knowledge assessment with respect to critical
135 facts about anaesthesia. We hypothesised that the level of understanding and recollection will
136 be lower in the patient group which uses lay interpreters. In contrast, the patient group using

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

137 professional interpreters, or fluent German speaking patients, should show similar levels of
138 understanding and recollection.

139 This study also considered another important aspect, namely whether telemedical solutions
140 – in this case providing pre-anaesthesia information via phone – are a reliable basis for
141 establishing informed consent (39). This is important to demonstrate, as several national,
142 European, and global agendas (40, 41) promote the use of telemedical consultations in clinical
143 contexts. For example, the restrictions during the COVID-19 pandemic clearly demonstrated
144 the need for telemedical solutions. Consequently, these tools will become a more common
145 form of healthcare provision in the near future. In fact, the motto of Austria’s recent health
146 strategy is “Digital before ambulatory before stationary” (42). Although the feasibility of
147 obtaining consent via telephone in anaesthesia settings has been demonstrated in previous
148 studies in Austria (43) and other countries (44), it needs to be shown that remote
149 consultations result in valid and reliable information transfer that allows patients with and
150 without language barriers to establish informed consent. Low levels of subjectively reported
151 understanding and/or low levels of recollection would indicate problems with this method of
152 providing medical information.

153 Material and Methods

154 Ethical approval according to the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki (45) was provided
155 by the Medical University of Vienna Ethics Committee (2138/2017). The manuscript is drafted
156 according to the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology
157 standards (STROBE) (46).

158 Participants

159 The study was undertaken from June 2021 to December 2021 at the General Hospital of the
160 Medical University of Vienna, Austria, during COVID-19 pandemic restrictions. Pre-
161 anaesthesia information was provided by phone to avoid personal contact and the risk of
162 infection. This was the first use of telemedical services for the provision of pre-anaesthesia
163 information. Participants were patients scheduled for elective surgery with little or no
164 expected complications (ASA PS \leq 2; 47, 48).

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

165 To enable a critical comparison of utilising lay vs. professional interpreters in medical
166 translations, the study included patients who lacked German language proficiency. It is the
167 responsibility of the physician to assess whether informed consent can be obtained from such
168 patients, or whether the language barrier represents an impediment and therefore
169 constitutes a liability risk (13). Consequently, when checking language skills in the context of
170 telemedical consultations (as in our study setting), it is the duty of the physician to determine
171 whether the patient's language skills are sufficient to understand the consultation to the
172 extent required, as is the case with face-to-face consultations. Interpreters were used for
173 study participants for whom the physician could assume, based on previous medical
174 experience, that informed consent could not be obtained by providing information in the
175 language of treatment. The non-German speaking patients were randomly assigned to two
176 groups using the randomizer tool (<https://www.randomizer.at/>). One group was supported by
177 professional interpreters while being given pre-anaesthesia information by the physician. For
178 the other group, laypersons (e.g., family members, friends, etc.; see Sup. B for complete list)
179 served as the interpreters. Both groups were supported by professional interpreters when
180 answering the follow up study questionnaire. All professional interpretation services were
181 provided by SAVD, an agency that provides on-site and remote interpreting services (SAVD,
182 www.savd.at). A third group of German speaking patients served as control.

183 Questionnaire

184 Providing medical information in a way which allows patients to make informed decisions and
185 follow medical instructions requires patients to understand and remember important medical
186 details. The questionnaire was designed to capture these aspects by organising 20 questions
187 into three thematic groups. One set of questions (*Subjective level of understanding*: three
188 questions) surveyed the subjective level of understanding (Do you understand everything?
189 Are you missing information? Do you have any open questions?). These types of questions are
190 typically asked by physicians as a proxy to infer understanding in their patients (4).

191 The next set of questions tested how well participants had memorised specific facts about
192 general anaesthesia (*Remembering facts about anaesthesia*: Nine questions). Four questions
193 asked for a single fact (Spontaneous breathing during anaesthesia? Food intake before
194 anaesthesia? Drinking before anaesthesia? Food intake after anaesthesia?) and four questions
195 for multiple facts (Please provide reasons not to eat after anaesthesia; What are the side

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

196 effects of breathing tubes? What are the side effects of anaesthesia? Which physiological
197 signals are monitored?). Additionally, as a control question, participants indicated whether
198 they had educated themselves about anaesthesia (yes, no), as this could influence recollection
199 of facts about anaesthesia.

200 The third group included questions designed to evaluate whether physicians had provided
201 specific explanations or asked about certain patient conditions (*Did the physician explain/
202 ask...?*) Seven questions: Type of anaesthesia; possible side effects; current diseases; allergies;
203 previous operations; current medications; chronic pain.

204 Procedure

205 The study was divided into two parts. Firstly, participants received standardised information
206 (36) about general anaesthesia from an anaesthesiologist in the study team via phone.
207 Physicians were free to adapt interviews according to the patient's specific surgery, concerns,
208 and information needs. This is in line with the daily pre-anaesthesia information procedure at
209 the study hospital and thus constitutes an ecologically highly valid setting. All participants
210 were called during standard opening hours (weekdays 7:30 – 14:30) at the anaesthesia
211 outpatient clinic at the Department of Anaesthesia, Intensive Care Medicine, and Pain
212 Medicine. Where participants were unavailable, a fixed time slot was scheduled. Depending
213 on random group assignment, a layperson or a professional interpreter was brought in to
214 communicate the medical information in the language of the respective patient.

215 Secondly, after physicians had finished providing medical information, the call was transferred
216 to a researcher (Albrecht). The researcher explained the study procedure and asked for
217 informed consent for the study (with the help of professional interpreters when speaking to
218 non-German speaking patients), documented consent in a separate form, which was followed
219 by a structured questionnaire (as outlined above). As this study was conducted during COVID
220 19 peak times oral consent (in accordance with the IRB) was the most feasible and safest way
221 to obtain consent. Answers to the questions were directly transmitted to an answer sheet by
222 the researcher. After completing the questionnaire, participants were thanked and debriefed.

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

223 **Statistical analysis strategy**

224 All statistical analyses were conducted in R and R-Studio (49, 50). All answers were
225 transformed into a binary answer format. For the questions concerning “*Subjective level of*
226 *understanding*”, “*Did the physician explain/ ask...?*”, and “*Remembering single facts about*
227 *general anaesthesia*”, binary outcomes were given (yes vs. no; recollected vs. not or
228 incorrectly recollected). In the section “*Remembering facts about anaesthesia*”, multiple
229 correct answers could be provided for four questions. Initially, it was planned to use the total
230 score of correct/incorrect answers per participant for analysis. However, answering patterns
231 showed that participants recalled between 1 to 4 facts which were all correct, or did not recall
232 any facts at all. Thus, these questions were also transformed into a binary format –
233 participants recalling at least one correct fact (recalled) vs. participants not providing any
234 correct answer (not recalled).

235 As answers were coded in binary format; proportions, frequencies, percentages, and cross-
236 tables are reported. In testing for significant differences between and within groups, Pearson
237 χ^2 tests and binomial tests are reported respectively. We used the ggstatsplot package (51)
238 which allows us to show raw data combined with visualisations of data centrality, dispersion,
239 and directly including outcomes of statistical tests. Results are provided according to the
240 sequence of thematic clusters in the questionnaire: *Subjective level of understanding* – Results
241 1; *Remembering facts about anaesthesia* – Results 2; *Questions/explanations provided by*
242 *physicians* – Results 3. Questionnaire data are available in Sup. C.

243 **Results**

244 **Participants**

245 Thirty participants were included in each group, totalling 90 participants (Age: mean = 49.2,
246 SD = 16.8, Range 18 to 82 years, Sex: 49 female). A priori power calculations using G*Power
247 (52) for the planned χ^2 -Square tests showed that medium effects ($w \geq 0.34$) can be detected
248 assuming a power of 0.8 and an α of .05 ($df = 2$; $N = 90$).

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

249 **Results 1: Subjective level of understanding**

250 Nearly all participants ($\geq 97\%$) reported a good understanding of the anaesthesia information
251 provided, had no open questions, and reported not missing any information – See Fig. 1:

252 **Fig 1: Subjective level of understanding (three questions)**

253 Following these high levels of understanding, similarly high levels of recall of the provided
254 anaesthesia facts would be expected – see Results 2.

255 **Results 2: Remembering facts about anaesthesia**

256 Fig 2 and Fig 3 show group comparison results (lay vs. professional interpreter vs. German
257 speaker) and statistical tests for the questions concerning anaesthesia facts.

258 **Fig 2: Remembering facts about anaesthesia: Single fact**

259 **Fig 3: Remembering facts about anaesthesia: Multiple facts**

260 As can be seen in Fig 2 and Fig 3, the χ^2 tests show significant group differences. Critically,
261 within the lay interpreter group, the pattern of answers indicated little recall of facts about
262 anaesthesia (rate of recall 27% to maximum 67%). Strikingly, the fluent German and
263 professional interpreter group clearly recalled anaesthesia facts well, and here rates of recall
264 were very similar (rate of recall: 73% to 100%). These outcomes provide a clear indication:
265 Patients using lay interpreters had great difficulties recalling important aspects of the general
266 anaesthesia information provided by their physicians. Patients using professional interpreters
267 performed as well as patients who speak German fluently.

268 In a side analysis, we tested outcomes in participants who had indicated having educated
269 themselves about anaesthesia prior to the consultation (e.g., via internet, books, TV, other
270 individuals, previous surgeries, etc.), as this could influence the level of recollection. Overall,
271 the rate of self-education differed significantly between groups ($\chi^2(2) = 6.02, p = .04, Cramers-$
272 $V = .26$). In particular, patients who speak German fluently reported higher rates of self-
273 education compared to the other groups (rate of self-education 53%, *standardized residuals*
274 > 2). Within the lay and professional interpreter groups, levels of self-education were similar
275 (lay interpreter: 23%, professional interpreter: 33%). Consequently, the observed differences

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

276 in these two groups cannot be attributed to differences in the rate of self-education. For a
277 more detailed analysis of the relation between self-information to memory between groups,
278 please see Sup B.

279 Results 3. Questions/explanations provided by physicians

280 With respect to the final set of questions (*Which questions/explanations were provided by*
281 *physicians?*), both the fluent German speaking and the professional interpreter groups
282 reported very high rates of received information. Only 3% of the participants in these two
283 groups missed some information – see Table 1. For the lay interpreter group, however, missing
284 information was reported more frequently (23% no explanation about type of anaesthesia;
285 30% no explanation about possible side effects; 7% no questions about current diseases).

286 One question resulted in an exception to this general pattern: With regard to chronic pain, all
287 groups reported higher rates of not being asked about this aspect (10% professional
288 interpreter group, 36% fluent German speaking group, and 50% in the lay interpreter group).
289 In sum, while German speaking patients and patients with professional interpreters reported
290 high levels of having received and been asked about clinical information, patients with lay
291 interpreters appeared to have missed some information.

292 **Table 1: Did the physician explain/ask for ...?**

		Layperson	Interpreter	German
... the type of anaesthesia?	yes	77%	97%	97%
	no	23%	3%	3%
... possible side effects?	yes	70%	97%	97%
	no	30%	3%	3%
... current disease?	yes	93%	97%	100%
	no	7%	3%	0%
... allergies?	yes	97%	97%	100%
	no	3%	3%	0%
... previous operations?	yes	97%	100%	100%
	no	3%	0%	0%

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

... current medications?	yes	97%	100%	100%
	no	3%	0%	0%

... chronic pain?	yes	50%	90%	64%
	no	50%	10%	36%

293

294 Discussion

295 The primary aim of this study was to demonstrate the implications of engaging lay
296 interpreters, currently the predominant method used to address language barriers in hospitals
297 in Austria (1). The main results are explicit and direct: Patients using lay interpreters were
298 barely able to reproduce critical facts about anaesthesia immediately after having received
299 them (see Results 2). A lot of critical information is literally lost in interpretation. Support from
300 professional interpreters, however, significantly improved patient comprehension and
301 understanding. In fact, using professional interpreters elevated recollection and
302 understanding of medical anaesthesia information to the same level as in the fluent German
303 speaking control group.

304 In detail, we identified critical differences between the three groups examined. Those utilising
305 lay interpreters encountered substantial challenges in recalling crucial details (such as side
306 effects and safety information). Both fluent German speaking patients and patients aided by
307 professional interpreters demonstrated high proficiency in recalling information, and
308 performed equally well. Notably, these objective memory assessments sharply contrasted
309 with the subjective self-reported level of understanding (see Results 1 and 2). In this aspect,
310 nearly all participants from the three groups expressed confidence in having understood the
311 information provided, not having missed any information, nor having any open questions.
312 Such a disparity between subjective perception of knowing vs. objectively knowing is a widely
313 examined psychological phenomenon (53). Multiple, not mutually exclusive, theories can be
314 proposed to explain this discrepancy, particularly within the lay interpreter group. Factors
315 such as cognitive bias and distortions (e.g., being overconfident or lacking confidence about
316 one's own memory abilities), hierarchical and social structures, as well as cultural norms (e.g.,
317 reluctance or embarrassment about admitting a lack of understanding, norms within the
318 physician-patient interaction) might all contribute to the observed discrepancy (53-56).

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

319 Irrespective of the reasons, the implications of this finding are profound for procedures and
320 workflows in clinical contexts. Frequently, subjective patient self-reports are the sole basis for
321 confirming understanding and comprehension of medical explanations. Our study
322 unequivocally shows that such subjective reports are not a reliable predictor of
323 comprehension and insight. From a patient safety perspective, verbally (or even non-verbally)
324 signalling understanding might not be sufficient proof of the high level of comprehension
325 which is the fundamental basis for informed medical consent. From a legal perspective, in
326 Austria the burden of proof that medical explanations have been understood lies with the
327 physician or care provider (1). Therefore, in legal terms, the conventional procedure of asking
328 a patient if they have understood might not be adequate as an assumed basis for informed
329 consent. Consequently, when there is doubt about having established understanding during a
330 physician-patient interaction – especially where the risk of incomprehension is high (e.g., due
331 to using lay interpreters) – subjective patient reports should be supplemented by explicitly
332 verifiable questions. Although this approach might require extra time and resources (44,45),
333 only through this procedure can high levels of patient comprehension and understanding be
334 ensured. Ultimately, this contributes to improved patient safety and reduces the clinical,
335 ethical, legal, and economic ramifications associated with language barriers (22, 30, 31).

336 Reliably providing information about clinical procedures is a prerequisite for ensuring patient
337 safety. Physicians often use guidelines to achieve this goal (e.g., Thieme-Compliance, &
338 Diomed; AN01E, see 33). However, in daily clinical procedures, physicians sometimes tend to
339 deviate from guidelines as they adopt the information they provide according to medical and
340 patient needs and the current situation. Deviating from guidelines could result in some
341 information being missed. Nonetheless, our study showed that physicians provided
342 information reliably. The groups of fluent German speakers and patients with professional
343 interpreters reported that physicians had informed / asked about critical anaesthesia-related
344 conditions well (see Results 3) and showed high recollection levels (Results 2). However,
345 patients supported by lay interpreters more often indicated that they had not been informed
346 about or not asked about certain facts. Whether this was due to constraints in using lay
347 interpreters, general problems of understanding, memory problems in patients, or whether
348 physicians did not or only incompletely explain procedures due to language barriers or other
349 organisational or time constraints (interpretations often afford more time especially with lay

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

350 interpreters), cannot be directly answered by this study. Patient-physician interaction was not
351 monitored due to confidentiality, privacy, and ethical factors.

352 The second main finding of this study is that, where language is not a barrier, physicians using
353 telemedical tools (in our case via phone) to provide pre-anaesthesia information to patients
354 is a safe and reliable form of information transfer. At the time of the study, external
355 circumstances made telemedical information provision a necessity as the study was
356 conducted during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic. Personal contacts would have posed
357 significant risks to patients and healthcare professionals. Not only did the telemedical
358 consultation to provide pre-anaesthesia information mitigate this risk, more importantly it
359 showed that patients reported high levels of understanding and recollection of critical
360 anaesthesia facts. This suggests that consulting patients via phone is a suitable method for
361 informing and educating patients about full anaesthesia in a highly reliable fashion.
362 Consequently, this telemedical method can serve as basis for informed consent for
363 anaesthesia (40).

364 Outlook and Limitations

365 The implementation of telemedical call services revealed additional advantages of remote
366 pre-anaesthesia information provision. The provision of information (at home, via phone) was
367 temporally separate from the time at which informed consent was given (in the hospital, prior
368 to the operation). In standard clinical procedures, information and consent is tightly paired in
369 a very strict clinical schedule. Therefore, patients might sometimes feel pressured to provide
370 consent. Temporal separation allows patients to consider the information and risks
371 beforehand (57). Indeed, anecdotally, some patients reported greatly valuing this possibility.
372 Another advantage is that travel times for patients and/or physicians are reduced (58, 59).

373 There is one important aspect that was not tested in this study, namely, how providing
374 telemedical consultations impacts trust. Establishing and maintaining trust is a central
375 element in effective patient-physician interactions and positively affects clinical outcomes (60,
376 61). Future studies should consider this aspect in more detail, especially if the provision of
377 information shifts from a personal to more automated format, e.g., using digital applications
378 for the provision of pre-anaesthesia information (43, 57, 62). In fact, a central aim of the
379 European Health Strategy (European E-Health Strategy; 40) is to digitalise the provision of

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

380 medical information for such procedures. Therefore, such implementations should be backed
381 by strong empirical evidence.

382 One restriction of our study is the inclusion of only a single hospital: this setting was able to
383 provide the infrastructure needed to conduct the study in a time and resource-efficient
384 manner during COVID. We nonetheless think that, in essence, the outcomes of this study are
385 applicable and transferable to other hospitals and healthcare providers. Recent national and
386 international reports show that other hospitals and providers face similar problems and lack
387 the possibilities and/or do not use professional interpretation services (1, 9, 14).

388 Finally, we did not collect more detailed socio-demographic data (e.g., educational level,
389 economic level, etc...), mainly due to ethical constraints. Although a more detailed analysis
390 could possibly yield deeper insights, reviews show that such research endeavours are
391 complex. Socio-demographic factors interact in a complex fashion (63). Given our study design
392 and participant numbers, such granular effects could not have been detected. Nonetheless,
393 we observed moderate to large effects for our main variables (for which the study was
394 statistically well powered), and our study results are cross-validated by other language barrier
395 studies (5, 14, 32, 34, 64).

396 Conclusions

397 Compared to lay interpreters, using professional interpreters significantly improves the
398 uptake of critical information about general anaesthesia. It is therefore first and foremost an
399 ethical imperative to act on these outcomes, as improved information transfer is directly
400 linked to better clinical outcomes (1, 7, 14, 16, 19, 65). Consequently, it increases patient
401 safety. Importantly, it might also be a financial imperative as studies clearly indicate long-term
402 cost benefits of using professional interpreters in medical care settings (30, 65).

403 We strongly recommend raising awareness, improving guidelines, teaching (66) and,
404 importantly, adopting structures and processes in the healthcare setting to overcome
405 language barriers. Physicians sometimes face conflicting interests in their established
406 healthcare routines. Although they often have some awareness of the negative effects of
407 language barriers, they are required to uphold the workflow within the clinical environment
408 with no or few interruptions and forced to treat patients in a time and cost-efficient manner.
409 It is therefore the responsibility of the healthcare provider to enable and enforce structures

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

410 and processes that allow clinical workflows to incorporate professional interpretation services
411 (67). Lastly and importantly, it is also the responsibility of the government and legislature to
412 act on empirical evidence. For example, recommendations on using lay interpreters within
413 Austria's public guidelines – "Providing pre-operation information for elective surgeries - BQLL
414 PRÄOP" (18, pp. 9-10)" – are clearly contested by the strong empirical evidence of our, and
415 other, studies in the literature (1,7, 8, 9,11, 14, 15, 28, 29, 65).

416 In a nutshell, use professional interpreters in clinical contexts. Anything else could, and should,
417 be considered as negligent and endangering patient safety.

418 Acknowledgements

419 We would like to thank Joanna Scudamore-Trezek for proofreading the MS.

420

421 Author Contributions

422 **Conceptualization:** Maria Kletecka-Pulker, David M. Baron

423 **Data Curation:** Gernot Gerger, Verena Albrecht

424 **Formal Analysis:** Gernot Gerger

425 **Visualization:** Gernot Gerger

426 **Methodology:** Maria Kletecka-Pulker, David M. Baron

427 **Investigation:** Verena Albrecht, David M. Baron, Nikolaus Graf, Armin Langauer, Aylin Bilir

428 **Writing – Original Draft:** Gernot Gerger

429 **Writing – Review & Editing:** Gernot Gerger, Elisabeth Klager, Klara Doppler, David M. Baron,
430 Harald Willschke, Maria Kletecka-Pulker, Nikolaus Graf, Aylin Bilir, Armin Langauer

431

432 References

433 1. Kletečka-Pulker M, Parrag S, Doppler K, Völkl-Kernstock S, Wagner M, Wenzel T.
434 Enhancing patient safety through the quality assured use of a low-tech video interpreting
435 system to overcome language barriers in healthcare settings. Wiener klinische
436 Wochenschrift. 2021;133(11-12):610-619.

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

- 437 2. Jaeger FN, Pellaud N, Laville B, Klauser P. The migration-related language barrier and
438 professional interpreter use in primary health care in Switzerland. BMC health services
439 research. 2019;19:1-10.
- 440 3. Samkange-Zeeb F, Samerski S, Doos L, Humphris R, Padilla B, Bradby H. “It's the First
441 Barrier” – Lack of common language a major obstacle when accessing/providing healthcare
442 services across Europe. *Frontiers in Sociology*. 2020;5.
- 443 4. Schenker Y, Wang F, Selig SJ, Ng R, Fernandez A. The impact of language barriers on
444 documentation of informed consent at a hospital with on-site interpreter services. *J Gen
445 Intern Med*. 2007;22 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):294-9.
- 446 5. Jacobs EA, Shepard DS, Suaya JA, Stone EL. Overcoming language barriers in health
447 care: Costs and benefits of interpreter services. *American Journal of Public Health*.
448 2004;94(5):866-9.
- 449 6. Gadon M, Balch GI, Jacobs EA. Caring for patients with limited english proficiency:
450 The perspectives of small group practitioners. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*.
451 2007;22(S2):341-6.
- 452 7. Kletečka-Pulker M, Parrag S. Videodolmetschen als Kommunikationshilfe bei
453 Flüchtlingen [Video-interpretation services in refugees]. *Pädiatrie & Pädologie*.
454 2018;53(S1):56-60.
- 455 8. Mangal JP, Farmer BS. Language Barriers in Healthcare. In: O'Malley CB, Levy A, Chase
456 A, Prasad S, editors. *Cases on diversity, equity, and inclusion for the health professions
457 Educator*. Hershey, PA, USA: IGI Global; 2023; 113-29.
- 458 9. WHO. Declaration on the promotion of patients' rights in Europe. Art. 3. 1994.
- 459 10. European Court of Human Rights. European convention on human rights. 1953. Art8.
- 460 11. Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. Art. 3, 2012.
- 461 12. Swedish migration agency. [Available from:
462 [https://www.migrationsverket.se/English/Private-individuals/Protection-and-asylum-in-
463 Sweden/While-you-are-waiting-for-a-decision/Health-care.html](https://www.migrationsverket.se/English/Private-individuals/Protection-and-asylum-in-Sweden/While-you-are-waiting-for-a-decision/Health-care.html)].
- 464 13. Kaelin L, Kletečka-Pulker M, Körtner HJ. Wie viel Deutsch braucht man, um gesund zu
465 sein? : Migration, Übersetzung und Gesundheit, Band 10 [How much German do you need to
466 remain healthy? Migration, interpretation and health]: BiblioScout; 2013.
- 467 14. Bischoff A, Denhaerynck K. What do language barriers cost? An exploratory study
468 among asylum seekers in Switzerland. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2010;10(1):248.
- 469 15. Tang EW, Go J, Kwok A, Leung B, Lauck S, Wong ST, et al. The relationship between
470 language proficiency and surgical length of stay following cardiac bypass surgery. *European
471 Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing*. 2016;15(6):438-46.
- 472 16. Joo H, Fernández A, Wick EC, Moreno Lepe G, Manuel SP. Association of language
473 barriers with perioperative and surgical outcomes: A systematic review. *JAMA Network
474 Open*. 2023;6(7):e2322743-e.
- 475 17. Al Shamsi H, Almutairi AG, Al Mashrafi S, Al Kalbani T. Implications of language
476 barriers for healthcare: A systematic review. *Oman Med J*. 2020;35(2):e122.

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

- 477 18. De Moissac D, Bowen S. Impact of language barriers on quality of care and patient
478 safety for official language minority francophones in Canada. *Journal of Patient Experience*.
479 2019;6(1):24-32.
- 480 19. Gutman CK, Lion KC, Fisher CL, Aronson PL, Patterson M, Fernandez R. Breaking
481 through barriers: The need for effective research to promote language-concordant
482 communication as a facilitator of equitable emergency care. *Journal of the American College*
483 *of Emergency Physicians Open*. 2022;3(1).
- 484 20. Kohlenberger J, Buber-Ennser I, Rengs B, Leitner S, Landesmann M. Barriers to health
485 care access and service utilisation of refugees in Austria: Evidence from a cross-sectional
486 survey. *Health Policy*. 2019;123(9):833-9.
- 487 21. Kohls M. Morbidität und Mortalität von Migranten in Deutschland [Morbidity and
488 mortality of migrants in Germany]: DEU; 2011.
- 489 22. Abbato S, Greer R, Ryan J, Vayne-Bossert P, Good P. The impact of provision of
490 professional language interpretation on length of stay and readmission rates in an acute care
491 hospital setting. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*. 2019;21(5):965-70.
- 492 23. Bundesministerium für Soziales, Gesundheit, Pflege und Konsumentenschutz. Austria.
493 Bundesqualitätsleitlinie zur integrierten Versorgung von erwachsenen Patientinnen und
494 Patienten für die präoperative Diagnostik bei elektiven Eingriffen – BQL PRÄOP [Austrian
495 state quality guidelines for pre-operative diagnostics in elective surgeries], 2018. [Available
496 from:
497 <https://www.sozialministerium.at/Themen/Gesundheit/Gesundheitssystem/Gesundheitssystem-und-Qualitaetssicherung/Qualitaetsstandards/Bundesqualitaetsleitlinie-zur-integrierten-Versorgung-von-erwachsenen-Patientinnen-und-Patienten-fuer-die-praeoperative-Diagnostik-bei-elektiven-Eingriffen---BQL-PRAEOP.html>]
498
499
500
- 501 24. Cohen S, Moran-Ellis J, Smaje C. Children as informal interpreters in GP consultations:
502 Pragmatics and ideology. *Sociology of Health & Illness*. 1999;21(2):163-86.
- 503 25. Gérain P, Zech E. Informal caregiver burnout? Development of a theoretical
504 framework to understand the impact of caregiving. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2019;10:1748.
- 505 26. Katz V. Children as brokers of their immigrant families' health-care connections.
506 *Social Problems*. 2014;61(2):194-215.
- 507 27. Galanti GA. *Caring for patients from different cultures: Case studies from American*
508 *hospitals*: University of Pennsylvania Press; 2014.
- 509 28. Handtke O, Schilgen B, Mösko M. Culturally competent healthcare – A scoping review
510 of strategies implemented in healthcare organizations and a model of culturally competent
511 healthcare provision. *PLOS ONE*. 2019;14(7):e0219971.
- 512 29. Diamond LC, Schenker Y, Curry L, Bradley EH, Fernandez A. Getting By: Underuse of
513 interpreters by resident physicians. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2009;24(2):256-62.
- 514 30. Brandl EJ, Schreiter S, Schouler-Ocak M. Are trained medical interpreters worth the
515 cost? A review of the current literature on cost and cost-effectiveness. *J Immigr Minor*
516 *Health*. 2020;22(1):175-81.
- 517 31. Flores G, Abreu M, Barone CP, Bachur R, Lin H. Errors of medical interpretation and
518 their potential clinical consequences: a comparison of professional versus ad hoc versus no
519 interpreters. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2012;60(5):545-53.

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

- 520 32. Karliner LS, Jacobs EA, Chen AH, Mutha S. Do professional interpreters improve
521 clinical care for patients with limited english proficiency? A systematic review of the
522 literature. *Health Services Research*. 2007;42(2):727-54.
- 523 33. Bernstein J, Bernstein E, Dave A, Hardt E, James T, Linden J, et al. Trained medical
524 interpreters in the emergency department: Effects on services, subsequent charges, and
525 follow-up. *J Immigr Health*. 2002;4(4):171-6.
- 526 34. Lindholm M, Hargraves JL, Ferguson WJ, Reed G. Professional language interpretation
527 and inpatient length of stay and readmission rates. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*.
528 2012;27(10):1294-9.
- 529 35. Hampers LC, Cha S, Gutglass DJ, Binns HJ, Krug SE. Language barriers and resource
530 utilisation in a pediatric emergency department. *Pediatrics*. 1999;103(6 Pt 1):1253-6.
- 531 36. Thieme-Compliance, Diomed. AN01E Fragebogen Narkose/Regionalanästhesie
532 [Questionnaire Full/Local Anaesthesia]. 2022;03/2022v2.
- 533 37. De Hert S, Imberger G, Carlisle J, Diemunsch P, Fritsch G, Moppett I, et al.
534 Preoperative evaluation of the adult patient undergoing non-cardiac surgery. *European*
535 *Journal of Anaesthesiology*. 2011;28(10):684-722.
- 536 38. Trimmel H, Fitzka R, Kreuziger J, von Goedecke A. „Briefing-Check“ Anästhesie
537 [Briefing check anaesthesia]. *Der Anaesthesist*. 2013;62(1):53-60.
- 538 39. Neumann C, Strassberger-Nerschbach N, Delis A, Kamp J, Görtzen-Patin A, Cudian D,
539 et al. Remote anaesthesia patient informed consent - an overview of the current
540 implementation in Europe. 2022.
- 541 40. De Sutter E, Meszaros J, Borry P, Huys I. Digitizing the informed consent process: A
542 review of the regulatory landscape in the European Union. *Frontiers in Medicine*. 2022;9.
- 543 41. Global Strategy on Digital Health. WHO, Geneva, 2022-2025.
- 544 42. Austrian government. Gesundheitsreform: "Digital vor ambulant vor stationär"
545 [Health reform: Digital before ambulatory before stationary]. 2023 [Available from:
546 <https://www.gesundheit.gv.at/news/aktuelles/aktuell-2023/gesundheitsreform.html>].
- 547 43. Benhebesse S, Gibas G, Kietaihl S. Präoperative Risikoabklärung und
548 Anästhesieaufklärung mittels Telefonvisite. [Pre-operative risk assessment by phone-based
549 telemedicine]. *Wiener Medizinische Wochenschrift*. 2020;170(13-14):359-66.
- 550 44. Law TT, Suen DT, Tam YF, Cho SY, Chung HP, Kwong A, et al. Telephone pre-
551 anaesthesia assessment for ambulatory breast surgery. *Hong Kong Med J*. 2009;15(3):179-
552 82.
- 553 45. World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: Ethical principles for medical
554 research involving human subjects. *Jama*. 2013;310(20):2191-4.
- 555 46. Von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The
556 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement:
557 Guidelines for reporting observational studies. *The Lancet*. 2007;370(9596):1453-7.
- 558 47. Abouleish AE, Leib ML, Cohen NH. ASA provides examples to each ASA physical status
559 class. *ASA Newsletter*. 2015;79(6):38-49.
- 560 48. Mayhew D, Mendonca V, Murthy BVS. A review of ASA physical status – historical
561 perspectives and modern developments. *Anaesthesia*. 2019;74(3):373-9.

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

- 562 49. R-Core-Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna,
563 Austria, 2021 [Available from: <https://www.R-project.org/>].
- 564 50. R-Studio-Team. Integrated development for R. PBC, Boston2020 [Available from:
565 <http://www.rstudio.com/>].
- 566 51. Patil I. Visualizations with statistical details: The 'ggstatsplot' approach. Journal of
567 Open Source Software. 2021;6(61):3167.
- 568 52. Faul F, Erdfelder E, Buchner A, Lang A-G. Statistical power analyses using G*Power
569 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. Behavior Research Methods.
570 2009;41(4):1149-60.
- 571 53. Baron J. Thinking and deciding: Cambridge University Press; 2023.
- 572 54. Ashton CM, Haidet P, Paterniti DA, Collins TC, Gordon HS, O'Malley K, et al. Racial and
573 ethnic disparities in the use of health services. Journal of General Internal Medicine.
574 2003;18(2):146-52.
- 575 55. Moore DA, Schatz D. The three faces of overconfidence. Social and Personality
576 Psychology Compass. 2017;11(8):e12331.
- 577 56. Longtin Y, Sax H, Leape LL, Sheridan SE, Donaldson L, Pittet D. Patient participation:
578 current knowledge and applicability to patient safety. Mayo Clinic Proceedings.
579 2010;85(1):53-62.
- 580 57. Marsman M, van den Beuken WMF, van Klei WA, Kappen TH. Autonomous patient
581 consent for anaesthesia without preoperative consultation: a qualitative feasibility study
582 including low-risk procedures. BJA Open. 2022;3.
- 583 58. Dullet NW, Geraghty EM, Kaufman T, Kissee JL, King J, Dharmar M, et al. Impact of a
584 university-based outpatient telemedicine program on time savings, travel costs, and
585 environmental pollutants. Value in Health. 2017;20(4):542-6.
- 586 59. Centaine LS, Anthony CS, Matthew P, Paul Anthony S, Liam JC. Quantifying the
587 societal benefits from telehealth: Productivity and reduced Travel. Value in health regional
588 issues. 2022.
- 589 60. Barton JL, Trupin L, Tonner C, Imboden J, Katz P, Schillinger D, et al. English language
590 proficiency, health literacy, and trust in physician are associated with shared decision making
591 in Rheumatoid Arthritis. The Journal of Rheumatology. 2014;41(7):1290-7.
- 592 61. Ramachandran M, Brinton C, Wiljer D, Upshur R, Gray CS. The impact of eHealth on
593 relationships and trust in primary care: A review of reviews. BMC Primary Care. 2023;24(1).
- 594 62. Neumann C, Schleifer G, Strassberger-Nerschbach N, Kamp J, Massoth G, Görtzen-
595 Patin A, et al. Digital online anaesthesia patient informed consent before elective diagnostic
596 procedures or surgery: Recent practice in children—An exploratory ESAIC survey. Journal of
597 Clinical Medicine. 2022;11(3):502.
- 598 63. Li SC. Factors affecting therapeutic compliance: A review from the patient's
599 perspective. Therapeutics and Clinical Risk Management. 2008;Volume 4:269-86.
- 600 64. Joo H, Fernández A, Wick EC, Moreno Lepe G, Manuel SP. Association of language
601 barriers with perioperative and surgical outcomes. JAMA Network Open.
602 2023;6(7):e2322743.

Short title: Professional remote interpreting

603 65. Hurtig RR, Alper RM, Berkowitz B. The cost of not addressing the communication
604 barriers faced by hospitalized patients. Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups.
605 2018;3(12):99-112.

606 66. Erik SC, Tatiana MB, Dale L, Guadalupe G, Dayana S, Matthew F. Overcoming the
607 language barrier: A novel curriculum for training medical students as volunteer medical
608 interpreters. BMC Medical Education. 2022; 22(27).

609 67. Khoong EC, Fernandez A. Addressing Gaps in interpreter use: Time for
610 implementation science informed multi-level interventions. Journal of General Internal
611 Medicine. 2021;36(11):3532-6.


612 Supporting Information

613 **Sup A: List of lay interpreters.**


614 **Sup B: Exploratory analysis: Can patients self-educating explain**
615 **differences in recollecting facts about anaesthesia?**

616 **Sup C. Response Data Questionnaire**

Do you understand everything?



Are you missing any information?



Do you have any open questions?





Fig1


Spontaneous breathing during anaesthesia?

$\chi^2_{\text{Pearson}}(2) = 25.59, p = 2.78e-06, \hat{V}_{\text{Cramer}} = 0.51, CI_{95\%} [0.31, 1.00], n_{\text{obs}} = 90$




Food intake before anaesthesia?

$\chi^2_{\text{Pearson}}(2) = 26.07, p = 2.18e-06, \hat{V}_{\text{Cramer}} = 0.52, CI_{95\%} [0.32, 1.00], n_{\text{obs}} = 90$



Food intake after anaesthesia?

$\chi^2_{\text{Pearson}}(2) = 18.85, p = 8.07e-05, \hat{V}_{\text{Cramer}} = 0.43, CI_{95\%} [0.22, 1.00], n_{\text{obs}} = 90$



Drinking before anaesthesia?

$\chi^2_{\text{Pearson}}(2) = 25.08, p = 3.58e-06, \hat{V}_{\text{Cramer}} = 0.51, CI_{95\%} [0.31, 1.00], n_{\text{obs}} = 90$





Fig2


Reasons not to eat after anaesthesia?

$\chi^2_{\text{Pearson}}(2) = 13.79, p = 1.01\text{e-}03, \hat{V}_{\text{Cramer}} = 0.36, \text{CI}_{95\%} [0.13, 1.00], n_{\text{obs}} = 90$




Side effects of breathing tube?

$\chi^2_{\text{Pearson}}(2) = 23.37, p = 8.41\text{e-}06, \hat{V}_{\text{Cramer}} = 0.49, \text{CI}_{95\%} [0.29, 1.00], n_{\text{obs}} = 90$



Side effects of anaesthesia?

$\chi^2_{\text{Pearson}}(2) = 9.45, p = 8.85\text{e-}03, \hat{V}_{\text{Cramer}} = 0.29, \text{CI}_{95\%} [0.00, 1.00], n_{\text{obs}} = 90$



Which physiological signals are monitored?

$\chi^2_{\text{Pearson}}(2) = 26.70, p = 1.59\text{e-}06, \hat{V}_{\text{Cramer}} = 0.53, \text{CI}_{95\%} [0.33, 1.00], n_{\text{obs}} = 90$




Fig3