

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

## TITLE PAGE

**Title: Considerations for Equitable Distribution of Digital Healthcare for People Who Use Drugs**

**Short running title: Equitable digital healthcare**

Zoi Papalamprakopoulou<sup>1,2</sup>, Sotirios Roussos<sup>3</sup>, Elisavet Ntagianta<sup>4</sup>, Vasiliki Triantafyllou<sup>4</sup>, George Kalamitsis<sup>4</sup>, Arpan Dharía<sup>1</sup>, Vana Sypsa<sup>3</sup>, Angelos Hatzakis<sup>2,3</sup>, Andrew H. Talal<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Nutrition, Jacobs School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY, USA

<sup>2</sup>Hellenic Scientific Society for the Study of AIDS, Sexually Transmitted and Emerging Diseases, Athens, Greece

<sup>3</sup>Department of Hygiene, Epidemiology and Medical Statistics, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

<sup>4</sup>Hellenic Liver Patient Association "Prometheus", Athens, Greece

**Corresponding author:**

Andrew H. Talal, MD, MPH

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

20 Jacobs School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences

21 University at Buffalo, State University of New York

22 UB-CTRRC, Suite 6090

23 875 Ellicott Street,

24 Buffalo, NY 14203

25 FAX: 716-854-1397

26 Email: [ahtalal@buffalo.edu](mailto:ahtalal@buffalo.edu)

27 Clintrials.gov registration number: NCT05794984

28 Manuscript word count: 2,797

29 Abstract word count: 250

30 **Keywords:** digital healthcare, telehealth, telemedicine, people who use drugs,  
31 healthcare access, health equity

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 **Abstract**

39 **Background:** Telehealth holds the potential to expand healthcare access for people  
40 who use drugs (PWUD). However, approaches to increase PWUDs' access to digital  
41 healthcare are not well-understood. We studied digital healthcare accessibility among  
42 PWUD.

43 **Methods:** We employed respondent-driven sampling to recruit 162 PWUD in Athens,  
44 Greece to collect data via a structured questionnaire. Participants were aged at least  
45 18 years and had an injection drug use (IDU) history. We assessed current internet  
46 and computer access, and experience with telemedicine. We utilized logistic  
47 regression to evaluate sociodemographic associations.

48 **Results:** Participants' mean (standard deviation) age was 45.9 (8.8) years, 84.0%  
49 were male, 90.1% Greek, 77.8% reported IDU within the past year, 85.2% were not  
50 linked to opioid treatment, and 50.0% were currently experiencing homelessness. Only  
51 1.9% had experience and 46.3% had familiarity with telemedicine. Internet and  
52 computer access were reported by 66.0% and 31.5% of participants, respectively.  
53 Compared to participants with secure housing, those currently experiencing  
54 homelessness reported decreased internet (50.6% vs 81.5%,  $p<0.001$ ) and computer  
55 access (11.1% vs 51.9%,  $p<0.001$ ). Multivariable analyses revealed that older age  
56 (per 1-year increase: odds ratio [OR]=0.94, 95% confidence interval [CI] [0.89, 0.99],  
57  $p=0.03$ ), IDU within the past year (0.29 [0.10, 0.88],  $p=0.03$ ), and homelessness (0.29,  
58 [0.13, 0.65],  $p=0.003$ ) were associated with lower odds of internet access.  
59 Homelessness was associated with lower odds of computer access (0.17, [0.07, 0.41],  
60  $p<0.001$ ).

61 **Conclusions:** Internet and infrastructure challenges, homelessness, and digital  
62 literacy gaps should be considered to bridge the digital divide and ensure equitable  
63 digital healthcare distribution for PWUD.

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

## 86 **Introduction**

87

88 People who use drugs (PWUD) are an underserved population facing health  
89 disparities, including reduced healthcare access and discrimination within  
90 conventional medical settings.<sup>1</sup> They frequently report unmet healthcare needs and  
91 predominately utilize emergency services when their health conditions deteriorate  
92 significantly.<sup>2,3</sup> Healthcare inequalities for PWUD are largely driven by stigma in  
93 medical settings and other barriers, including provider mistrust, economic challenges,  
94 chaotic lifestyles, and competing priorities.<sup>4-6</sup> Consequently, PWUD experience  
95 excess mortality, up to 16 times higher than the general population.<sup>7</sup> Much of this  
96 excess mortality is attributed to preventable causes, such as infectious diseases,  
97 including HIV and hepatitis C virus (HCV) infections, which impose substantial burden  
98 on PWUD.<sup>8</sup> Limited access to HIV and HCV treatment can greatly increase the risk of  
99 complications from these infection.<sup>9-11</sup> Addressing health disparities and expanding  
100 access to medical services for PWUD are essential for improving PWUDs' health  
101 outcomes.<sup>12</sup>

102 Digital healthcare offers a relatively innovative approach to improving healthcare  
103 access by reducing geographical and temporal barriers.<sup>13,14</sup> However, the digital divide  
104 is a critical consideration for the engagement of underserved populations in digital  
105 healthcare.<sup>15,16</sup> The digital divide refers to persisting healthcare disparities in digital  
106 healthcare access due largely to the influence of social determinants of health.<sup>17</sup> Thus,  
107 PWUD may continue to have poor health outcomes due to reduced access to digital  
108 healthcare, mirroring the barriers to accessing healthcare in conventional health  
109 systems.<sup>18</sup> While digital healthcare opens avenues for more accessible and inclusive

110 healthcare, ensuring equitable distribution of digital healthcare is crucial when seeking  
111 to engage underserved populations.

112 Telehealth solutions are increasingly being investigated to provide medical and  
113 behavioral support for PWUD, particularly in the areas of HIV, HCV, substance use  
114 treatment, and mental health.<sup>19-23</sup> Research indicates that telehealth interventions  
115 among PWUD have shown considerable effectiveness and high levels of patient  
116 satisfaction.<sup>24-30</sup> There is a reasonable expectation that healthcare access for PWUD  
117 could be enhanced through telehealth, extending to primary care and chronic condition  
118 management, potentially addressing other preventable causes of excess morbidity  
119 and mortality. However, limited access to the internet and the requisite digital  
120 infrastructure for telehealth contribute to the digital divide for PWUD.<sup>31</sup> Low digital and  
121 healthcare literacy are also important considerations for PWUD in accessing digital  
122 healthcare services.<sup>32</sup> To date, there is limited research on digital healthcare  
123 accessibility among PWUD. Investigating the population's internet and digital  
124 infrastructure access and identifying potentially influential factors are essential for  
125 tailoring digital healthcare interventions specifically for PWUD.

126 We aimed to explore digital healthcare accessibility among PWUD and to potentially  
127 identify factors contributing to the digital divide. Since universal healthcare systems  
128 seek to provide equitable healthcare access to all individuals, especially the  
129 underserved, and due to a lack of relevant data, we pursued this investigation in  
130 Greece.<sup>33,34</sup> These findings intend to inform policy and guide the development of  
131 strategies to ensure equitable digital healthcare distribution for PWUD and other  
132 underserved populations.

133

## 134 **Materials and methods**

135 Between June and July 2023, we conducted a cross-sectional study to assess digital  
136 healthcare accessibility, including internet and digital infrastructure access, as well as  
137 experience with telemedicine among PWUD in Athens, Greece. The study protocol  
138 was approved by the Institutional Review Boards of the Hellenic Scientific Society for  
139 the Study of AIDS, Sexually Transmitted and Emerging Diseases and the University  
140 at Buffalo. The study adhered to the Helsinki Declaration principles. We received and  
141 archived written informed consent from all study participants prior to their participation.  
142 We assessed, using an eligibility screener, whether participants met the inclusion  
143 criteria of being at least 18 years old, having a history of injection drug use (IDU),  
144 Greek verbal fluency, and the ability to provide informed consent. We defined PWUD  
145 as participants who had ever engaged in IDU.

146

### 147 Questionnaire development

148 Three experienced interviewers (Z.P., E.D., V.T.) administered a structured  
149 questionnaire that included sections on sociodemographic characteristics, drug use  
150 history, utilization of conventional medical care, internet and digital infrastructure  
151 access, as well as experience with telemedicine. We based the sections on  
152 sociodemographic characteristics and history of drug use on an instrument used in a  
153 large study among PWUD in Greece.<sup>35</sup> The instrument was based on the National HIV  
154 Behavioral Surveillance System for PWUD, implemented throughout the United  
155 States, and modified for relevance to Greek PWUD. We adapted the remaining  
156 questionnaire sections and questions from publications of the European Patients'  
157 Forum and the Eurostat Model questionnaires as well as from those used in prior

158 studies.<sup>36-38</sup> Before deploying the questionnaire, we performed cognitive testing by  
159 administering the questionnaire to five study-eligible individuals. Based upon the  
160 testing results, we slightly modified the questionnaire to ensure clarity and  
161 comprehension for the study population.

### 162 Recruitment of participants

163 We recruited participants through respondent-driven sampling (RDS), a chain referral  
164 methodology used to reach “hidden” or difficult-to-reach populations, in which research  
165 participation involves illegal or stigmatized behaviors.<sup>39</sup> In RDS, respondents recruit  
166 their peers. Its implementation begins with a limited number of initial recruits or  
167 "seeds".<sup>40</sup> Each seed receives three coupons and is asked to recruit three additional  
168 PWUD. If the recruits are study-eligible and agree to participate, they subsequently  
169 can become recruiters, with the process continuing until the desired sample size is  
170 achieved.<sup>41</sup> Recruits received a primary incentive of 10 euro for study participation  
171 followed by secondary incentives of up to 15 euro for subsequent recruitment  
172 activities.

### 173 Questionnaire administration

174 The interviewers directly entered participants' responses into a password-encrypted,  
175 secure computer database. All responses provided were participants' self-reports.  
176 Interviewers determined participants' housing status by asking them if they were  
177 currently living on the street, in abandoned buildings, or in shelters. Participants who  
178 responded affirmatively were grouped as participants who were currently experiencing  
179 homelessness.

### 180 Study outcomes



181 The main study outcomes included digital infrastructure access, defined as current  
182 internet and computer access, as well as experience with telemedicine. We assessed  
183 the main study outcomes based on participants' self-reported responses on the  
184 corresponding sections of the questionnaire. Secondary study outcomes included  
185 exploration of PWUDs' perceptions about telemedicine, including perceived benefits,  
186 limitations, and willingness to engage in a telemedicine encounter.

### 187 Statistical methods

188 We initially described participants' characteristics and questionnaire responses using  
189 mean values and standard deviation (SD) or counts and percentages, as appropriate.  
190 We obtained crude and RDS-weighted (RDS-II) estimates of the main outcomes along  
191 with the corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs).<sup>42</sup> For the 95% CIs of the  
192 weighted estimates, we used bootstrap with 1,000 replications.<sup>43</sup> Since 50% of our  
193 sample was experiencing homelessness, we assessed recruitment homophily for  
194 PWUD experiencing homelessness, *i.e.*, whether seeds more frequently recruited  
195 peers experiencing homelessness. Homophily values ranged from -1 to +1 (where +1  
196 corresponds to always recruiting from one's own group [people experiencing  
197 homelessness]) and 0 corresponds to random recruitment. We compared the  
198 responses of participants experiencing homelessness versus those with secure  
199 housing using t-tests and chi-squared tests, as appropriate. In addition, we performed  
200 univariable and multivariable analyses on the factors associated with the main study  
201 outcomes of current internet and computer access using logistic regression. Statistical  
202 calculations were performed using Stata (Stata Corp LLC. 2023. Stata Statistical  
203 Software: Release 18. College Station, TX), and  $p < 0.05$  was considered the cutoff for  
204 statistical significance.

205

## 206 **Results**

### 207 *Sociodemographic characteristics and injection drug use*

208 In total, 162 PWUD participated in the study (of these, 7 were RDS seeds and 155  
209 recruits) (Table 1). One seed did not recruit any participants; out of the six remaining  
210 seeds, 3 (50.0%) were currently experiencing homelessness. PWUD currently  
211 experiencing homelessness tended to recruit other peers experiencing homelessness  
212 (homophily equal to 0.38).

213 The mean (SD) age of participants was 45.9 (8.8) years, 84.0% (136/162) were male  
214 and 90.1% (146/162) were of Greek origin. In the past 12 months, 77.8% (126/162)  
215 reported IDU, and 50.0% (81/162) identified as currently experiencing homelessness.  
216 Approximately 58.6% (95/162) of participants had engaged in IDU at least daily in the  
217 past 12 months including injecting heroin (75.9%, 123/162), cocaine (36.4%, 59/162),  
218 and speedball (32.7%, 53/162). Additionally, 86.4% (140/162) of participants had  
219 previously attended a substance use treatment program and 60.5% (98/162) had  
220 participated in an opioid treatment program (OTP). However, only 14.8% (24/162)  
221 currently attended an OTP.

### 222 *Conventional medical care*

223 PWUD most frequently obtained healthcare at public hospitals (86.4%, 140/162)  
224 (Table 2). Only 54.3% (88/162) of participants indicated that they were currently under  
225 medical care. Approximately one-third (28.4%, 46/162) of participants disclosed  
226 difficulty in accessing healthcare within the past year. Forty-three percent (70/162) of  
227 participants reported geographical barriers that required travel to another city, region,

228 or country for healthcare. Furthermore, 56.8% (92/162) disclosed prior negative  
229 interactions with healthcare staff largely (88.0%, 81/92) attributed to previous  
230 substance use and associated stigma. Undesirable interactions included negative  
231 healthcare staff attitudes (88.0%, 81/92), refusal to administer treatment (39.1%,  
232 36/92), and use of inappropriate language (38.0%, 35/92).

### 233 Digital infrastructure access

234 The majority (89.5%, 145/162) of study participants had previously accessed the  
235 internet, primarily through mobile phones (77.9%, 113/145) or through computers  
236 (20.0%, 29/145) (Table 3). Participants most frequently used broadband as opposed  
237 to narrowband connections. Among participants who previously accessed the internet,  
238 most (77.2%, 112/145) reported use within the past 3 months with the majority (67.9%,  
239 76/145) reporting daily use.

240 Among all participants, approximately two-thirds (66.0%, 107/162, 95% CI [58.2 –  
241 73.3]) reported current internet access (RDS-weighted prevalence: 68.7%, 95% CI  
242 [53.7 – 81.3]). Compared to participants with secure housing, we observed  
243 significantly lower current internet access among those currently experiencing  
244 homelessness (81.5%, 66/81 vs. 50.6%, 41/81,  $p < 0.001$ ). In multivariable analysis, we  
245 observed that current homelessness (0.29, 95% CI: [0.13, 0.65],  $p = 0.003$ ), increasing  
246 age (per 1-year increase: 0.94, 95% CI: [0.89, 0.99],  $p = 0.03$ ) and IDU within the past  
247 12 months (0.29, 95% CI: [0.10, 0.88],  $p = 0.03$ ) were associated with decreased odds  
248 of current internet access (Table 4).

249 Overall, 31.5% (51/162) of participants reported current computer access. Compared  
250 to participants with secure housing, we observed significantly lower current computer  
251 access among those experiencing homelessness (51.9%, 42/81 vs. 11.1%, 9/81,

252 p<0.001). In multivariate analysis, we observed that current homelessness (0.17 [0.07,  
253 0.41], p<0.001) was associated with decreased odds of current computer access  
254 (Table 4).

### 255 Experience with telemedicine

256 Very few participants had ever used (1.9%, 3/162), and less than half (46.3%, 75/162)  
257 had familiarity with telemedicine (Supplemental file 1). Initially, most (71.0%, 115/162)  
258 participants indicated their preference to participate in telemedicine encounters in their  
259 homes. When provided the choice of participating in a telemedicine encounter in an  
260 OTP, most (136/162, 84.0%) participants endorsed receiving care through  
261 telemedicine in that setting.

262 Participants perceived telemedicine to be of high value due to its time-saving nature  
263 by eliminating the need to travel to an appointment (87.0%, 141/162), the convenience  
264 of being able to participate from anywhere (84.6%, 137/162), reduced provider wait  
265 times (84.0%, 136/162), and reduced infection exposure risk by avoiding in-person  
266 visits (79.0%, 128/162) (Supplemental files 2 and 3). Most participants (76.5%,  
267 124/162) perceived the inability to perform a physical examination as telemedicine's  
268 leading limitation. Other perceived limitations of telemedicine included the lack of  
269 direct personal contact (69.8%, 113/162), the need to use digital infrastructure for  
270 telemedicine participation (64.2%, 104/162), and potential technical issues (61.1%,  
271 99/162). Difficulty trusting the doctor (39.5%, 64/162) and substandard patient-doctor  
272 relationships (35.8%, 58/162) were the least frequently perceived telemedicine  
273 limitations (Supplemental files 4 and 5).

274

## 275 Discussion

276 We pursued this investigation to evaluate digital healthcare accessibility among  
277 PWUD in Athens, Greece. We found that the vast majority of study participants lacked  
278 experience with telemedicine, consistent with results obtained from most European  
279 countries.<sup>44</sup> When we investigated digital infrastructure accessibility, we found that  
280 two-thirds of participants reported currently connecting to the internet, while one-third  
281 reported current computer access. In multivariate analysis, we identified that current  
282 homelessness, older age, and IDU within the past 12 months were associated with  
283 significantly reduced internet and/or computer access among PWUD. These findings  
284 highlight important considerations for expansion of digital health among underserved  
285 populations. Figure 1 describes several considerations for utilizing digital approaches  
286 to distribute healthcare equitably to underserved populations.

287 One third of participants reported difficulty accessing healthcare within the past year  
288 and only approximately half indicated that they were under medical care at the time of  
289 the questionnaire administration. Geographic barriers and stigma were frequently  
290 cited obstacles to healthcare access in conventional healthcare venues, consistent  
291 with prior studies.<sup>45-47</sup> Study participants were more concerned with digital  
292 infrastructural challenges rather than with the expression of empathy through  
293 telemedicine. These perceptions align with findings from both a staff-facilitated  
294 telemedicine model for HCV care integrated into OTPs and a peer-facilitated telehealth  
295 model for HIV care conducted in syringe services programs. In both of these  
296 interventions participants highly valued empathy, trust, and telehealth's destigmatizing  
297 approach.<sup>27,48</sup> Considering that stigma is a significant barrier to healthcare access for  
298 PWUD, engendering trust and empathy are key for effective healthcare delivery,

299 including through digital approaches.<sup>5,27,49</sup> With a separate group of PWUD in Athens  
300 Greece, we conducted focus groups for an indepth understanding of barriers and  
301 facilitators of their digital health use. Focus group participants suggested that an initial  
302 in-person appointment, eye contact during telehealth encounters, partnerships with  
303 PWUD-supportive community organizations, and patient education could enhance  
304 trust in telehealth.<sup>50</sup> Our current investigation also identified the need to enhance  
305 patient education and digital literacy, as less than half of the participants had familiarity  
306 with telemedicine.

307 Internet access and digital infrastructure are absolute requirements for digital health  
308 participation, yet limited data exist on digital infrastructure access among PWUD. A  
309 previous survey of 204 PWUD in Greece revealed that over 90.0% had internet  
310 access.<sup>51</sup> Participants in that study were recruited from substance use treatment  
311 programs, which may not represent the real-world experiences of PWUD outside those  
312 supportive environments. In contrast, only 14.8% (24/162) of participants in our study  
313 were enrolled in an OTP. Since IDU is a potential transmission route for HCV and HIV,  
314 tailored telehealth interventions should be directed toward PWUD.<sup>52</sup> Our study  
315 sample, of whom the majority (77.8%, 126/162) disclosed IDU within the past 12  
316 months, is representative of the PWUD population that should be prioritized in  
317 subsequent telehealth interventions.

318 Our study sample included a substantial proportion currently experiencing  
319 homelessness (50.0%), a difficult population to enroll in research.<sup>53</sup> The homelessness  
320 percentage was higher than in other studies among a similar Athenian population,  
321 where rates of homelessness ranged from 23.1% to 25.6%.<sup>35,53</sup> The inclusion of  
322 PWUD experiencing homelessness as seeds (*i.e.*, three of six actively recruiting study

323 seeds), the moderate homophily among participants experiencing homelessness and  
324 the small sample size account for the over-representation of this population subgroup.  
325 Nonetheless, the recruitment of many participants experiencing homelessness  
326 enabled us to investigate their digital healthcare accessibility and insights into  
327 telemedicine for the first time. As expected, we found that homelessness is associated  
328 with reduced access to both conventional and digital healthcare.

329 When designing interventions to ensure equitable distribution of digital healthcare to  
330 PWUD, approaches inclusive of those experiencing homelessness are necessary.<sup>30,54</sup>  
331 Our study participants indicated that they predominately used mobile phones to  
332 access the internet, consistent with another study in which over 75.0% of participants  
333 used mobile phones for this purpose.<sup>55</sup> In that study, PWUD participants were provided  
334 mobile phones through a government-supported program for low-income individuals.  
335 These findings highlight the government's central role in supporting digital healthcare  
336 access among underserved populations. The frequent turnover of government-issued  
337 devices due to theft or resale by PWUD is an important consideration when assessing  
338 their worthiness. Fleeting device ownership may limit their suitability for digital  
339 healthcare access by PWUD. Additionally, restricting the phone's functionality to solely  
340 that required for telehealth encounters may discourage its use. Other  
341 sociodemographic factors, such as increasing age and unemployment, could further  
342 affect PWUDs' ability to leverage the benefits of digital healthcare.<sup>56</sup> A potential  
343 solution to bridging the digital divide for healthcare delivery to underserved populations  
344 could be the expansion of the facilitated telemedicine model, where digital healthcare  
345 is integrated into convenient locations for PWUD, such as OTPs, and is supported by  
346 case managers.<sup>25,57</sup> Most study participants expressed a willingness to receive care  
347 through telemedicine in an OTP.

348 Of the study limitations, the most important is that our sample consists of PWUD  
349 recruited from downtown Athens, which may not be representative of PWUD  
350 populations in other geographical areas. Participants' responses, including the  
351 prevalence of HCV and HIV, were self-reported, introducing potential ascertainment  
352 bias.<sup>58</sup> Furthermore, individuals experiencing homelessness are more susceptible to  
353 acquiring HIV and HCV, which may have resulted in the high self-reported prevalences  
354 observed in our study population.<sup>59</sup>

355

## 356 **Conclusions**

357 PWUD who are currently experiencing homelessness accessed the internet and  
358 computers at significantly lower rates compared to those with stable housing. In  
359 addition to homelessness, older age, and IDU within the past 12 months were  
360 associated with reduced access to the necessary infrastructure for telehealth  
361 participation. These factors exacerbate the digital divide among PWUD and should be  
362 considered, along with approaches to bridge digital literacy gaps, when designing  
363 digital healthcare interventions for PWUD. Further studies are needed to investigate  
364 implementation approaches for digital healthcare delivery to underserved populations.  
365 Expanding internet and digital infrastructure access is essential to promote health  
366 equity in the distribution of digital healthcare to PWUD.

367

## 368 **Acknowledgments**

369



370 We thank the study participants for their involvement with the study and the staff of  
371 Prometheus for enabling us to utilize their site.

372

### 373 **Authors' contribution statement**

374

375 Z.P.: writing – original draft, project administration (lead); investigation (lead);  
376 supervision (lead); visualization (lead). S.R.: formal analysis (equal); software (lead);  
377 writing – review and editing (equal). E.D.: resources (equal); writing – review and  
378 editing (supporting). V.T.: resources (equal); writing – review and editing (supporting).  
379 G.K.: resources (equal); writing – review and editing (supporting). A.D.: writing –  
380 review and editing (supporting). V.S.: formal analysis (equal); software (supporting);  
381 writing – review and editing (supporting). A.H.: investigation (lead); methodology  
382 (lead); supervision (lead); visualization (lead); writing – review and editing  
383 (supporting). A.H.T.: investigation (lead); methodology (lead); supervision (lead);  
384 visualization (lead); funding acquisition; writing – review and editing (equal). All authors  
385 approved the final version of the manuscript.

386

387

### 388 **Authors' disclosure statements**

389

390 A.H.T. received grants from Merck, Gilead, and Abbott Laboratories and has served  
391 as an advisor at Gilead, Novo Nordisk, and AbbVie. VS has received grants from  
392 Gilead and AbbVie paid to affiliated institutions, and she has served as a lecturer for  
393 Gilead and AbbVie. The remaining authors declare that they have no competing  
394 interests.

395

## 396 **Funding statement**

397

398 Supported by a grant from the Troup Fund of the Kaleida Health Foundation grant  
399 awarded to AHT. Clintrials.gov registration number: NCT05794984. Trial registry  
400 name: "Telemedicine and Social Media for People Who Inject Drugs (PWID) in  
401 Greece". URL: <https://classic.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT05794984>

402

## 403 **Data Sharing**

404

405 The study data are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

406

## 407 **References**

408 1. Austin EJ, Tsui JI, Barry MP, et al. Health care-seeking experiences for people  
409 who inject drugs with hepatitis C: Qualitative explorations of stigma. *J Subst Abuse*  
410 *Treat.* 2022;137(108684, doi:10.1016/j.jsat.2021.108684

411 2. Lewer D, Freer J, King E, et al. Frequency of health-care utilization by adults  
412 who use illicit drugs: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Addiction*  
413 2020;115(6):1011-1023, doi:10.1111/add.14892

414 3. Dasgupta S, Tie Y, Lemons-Lyn A, et al. HIV-positive persons who inject drugs  
415 experience poor health outcomes and unmet needs for care services. *AIDS Care*  
416 2021;33(9):1146-1154, doi:10.1080/09540121.2020.1826396

417 4. Lewis R, Baugher AR, Finlayson T, et al. Healthcare Access and Utilization  
418 Among Persons Who Inject Drugs in Medicaid Expansion and Nonexpansion States:

- 419 22 United States Cities, 2018. *J Infect Dis.* 2020;222(Supplement\_5): S420-S428,  
420 doi:10.1093/infdis/jiaa337
- 421 5. Biancarelli DL, Biello KB, Childs E, et al. Strategies used by people who inject  
422 drugs to avoid stigma in healthcare settings. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2019;198(80-86),  
423 doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2019.01.037
- 424 6. Zeremski M, Zibbell JE, Martinez AD, et al. Hepatitis C virus control among  
425 persons who inject drugs requires overcoming barriers to care. *World J Gastroenterol.*  
426 2013;19(44):7846-51, doi:10.3748/wjg.v19.i44.7846
- 427 7. Larney S, Tran LT, Leung J, et al. All-Cause and Cause-Specific Mortality  
428 Among People Using Extramedical Opioids: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis.  
429 *JAMA Psychiat.* 2020;77(5):493-502, doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2019.4170
- 430 8. Artenie A, Stone J, Fraser H, et al. Incidence of HIV and hepatitis C virus among  
431 people who inject drugs, and associations with age and sex or gender: a global  
432 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2023;8(6):533-  
433 552, doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253\(23\)00018-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253(23)00018-3)
- 434 9. Popping S, Kall M, Nichols BE, et al. Quality of life among people living with  
435 HIV in England and the Netherlands: a population-based study. *Lancet Reg Health*  
436 *Eur.* 2021;8(100177), doi:10.1016/j.lanep.2021.100177
- 437 10. Sandmann L, Schulte B, Manns MP, Maasoumy B. Treatment of Chronic  
438 Hepatitis C: Efficacy, Side Effects and Complications. *Visc Med.* 2019;35(3):161-170,  
439 doi:10.1159/000500963
- 440 11. Nagot N, D'Ottavi M, Quillet C, et al. Reaching Hard-to-Reach People Who Use  
441 Drugs: A Community-Based Strategy for the Elimination of Hepatitis C. *Open Forum*  
442 *Infect Dis.* 2022;9(6):ofac181, doi:10.1093/ofid/ofac181

- 443 12. Woodward EN, Matthieu MM, Uchendu US, et al. The health equity  
444 implementation framework: proposal and preliminary study of hepatitis C virus  
445 treatment. *Implement Sci.* 2019;14(1):26, doi:10.1186/s13012-019-0861-y
- 446 13. Barbosa W, Zhou K, Waddell E, et al. Improving Access to Care: Telemedicine  
447 Across Medical Domains. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2021;42(463-481,  
448 doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-090519-093711
- 449 14. Zhang Y, Peña MT, Lal LS, et al. Telemental Health Services Usage and  
450 Association with Health Care Utilization and Expenditures Among Vulnerable  
451 Medicare Beneficiaries in 2019: A Comparative Study Using Propensity Score  
452 Matching. *Telemed J E Health* 2024;30(7):1848-1856, doi:10.1089/tmj.2023.0632
- 453 15. Sivakumar A, Madden L, DiDomizio E, et al. Treatment of Hepatitis C virus  
454 among people who inject drugs at a syringe service program during the COVID-19  
455 response: The potential role of telehealth, medications for opioid use disorder and  
456 minimal demands on patients. *Int J Drug Policy* 2022;101(103570,  
457 doi:10.1016/j.drugpo.2021.103570
- 458 16. Baudier P, Kondrateva G, Ammi C, et al. Digital transformation of healthcare  
459 during the COVID-19 pandemic: Patients' teleconsultation acceptance and trusting  
460 beliefs. *Technovation* 2023;120(102547,  
461 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2022.102547>
- 462 17. Saeed SA, Masters RM. Disparities in Health Care and the Digital Divide. *Curr*  
463 *Psychiatry Rep.* 2021;23(9):61, doi:10.1007/s11920-021-01274-4
- 464 18. Haimi M. The tragic paradoxical effect of telemedicine on healthcare disparities-  
465 a time for redemption: a narrative review. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak.* 2023;23(1):95,  
466 doi:10.1186/s12911-023-02194-4

- 467 19. Bartholomew TS, Tookes HE, Chueng TA, et al. Availability of telehealth-based  
468 services at syringe services programs under the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency.  
469 Harm Reduct J. 2023;20(1):122, doi:10.1186/s12954-023-00861-3
- 470 20. Suarez E, Jr., Bartholomew TS, Plesons M, et al. Adaptation of the Tele-Harm  
471 Reduction intervention to promote initiation and retention in buprenorphine treatment  
472 among people who inject drugs: a retrospective cohort study. Ann Med.  
473 2023;55(1):733-743, doi:10.1080/07853890.2023.2182908
- 474 21. Tookes HE, Bartholomew TS, Suarez E, et al. Acceptability, feasibility, and pilot  
475 results of the tele-harm reduction intervention for rapid initiation of antiretrovirals  
476 among people who inject drugs. Drug Alcohol Depend. 2021;229(109124),  
477 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2021.109124>
- 478 22. Cooper CL, Hatashita H, Corsi DJ, et al. Direct-Acting Antiviral Therapy  
479 Outcomes in Canadian Chronic Hepatitis C Telemedicine Patients. Ann Hepatol.  
480 2017;16(6):874-880, doi:10.5604/01.3001.0010.5277
- 481 23. Health Resources and Services Administration. How do I use telehealth for  
482 behavioral health care? 2024. Available from:  
483 [https://telehealth.hhs.gov/patients/additional-resources/telehealth-and-behavioral-](https://telehealth.hhs.gov/patients/additional-resources/telehealth-and-behavioral-health#:~:text=Telehealth%20can%20be%20used%20to,Medication%2Dassisted%20treatment.)  
484 [health#:~:text=Telehealth%20can%20be%20used%20to,Medication%2Dassisted%20treatment.](https://telehealth.hhs.gov/patients/additional-resources/telehealth-and-behavioral-health#:~:text=Telehealth%20can%20be%20used%20to,Medication%2Dassisted%20treatment.) [Last Accessed; July 30].
- 486 24. Talal AH, Andrews P, McLeod A, et al. Integrated, Co-located, Telemedicine-  
487 based Treatment Approaches for Hepatitis C Virus Management in Opioid Use  
488 Disorder Patients on Methadone. Clin Infect Dis. 2019;69(2):323-331,  
489 doi:10.1093/cid/ciy899

- 490 25. Talal AH, Markatou M, Liu A, et al. Integrated Hepatitis C–Opioid Use Disorder  
491 Care Through Facilitated Telemedicine: A Randomized Trial. *JAMA*  
492 2024;331(16):1369-1378, doi:10.1001/jama.2024.2452
- 493 26. Talal AH, McLeod A, Andrews P, et al. Patient Reaction to Telemedicine for  
494 Clinical Management of Hepatitis C Virus Integrated into an Opioid Treatment  
495 Program. *Telemed J E Health* 2019;25(9):791-801, doi:10.1089/tmj.2018.0161
- 496 27. Talal AH, Sofikitou EM, Wang K, et al. High Satisfaction with Patient-Centered  
497 Telemedicine for Hepatitis C Virus Delivered to Substance Users: A Mixed-Methods  
498 Study. *Telemed J E Health* 2023;29(3):395-407, doi:10.1089/tmj.2022.0189
- 499 28. Wang L, Weiss J, Ryan EB, et al. Telemedicine increases access to  
500 buprenorphine initiation during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Subst Abuse Treat.*  
501 2021;124(doi:10.1016/j.jsat.2020.108272
- 502 29. Lai JT, Chapman BP, Carreiro SP, et al. A Pilot Study of a Telemedicine-based  
503 Substance Use Disorder Evaluation to Enhance Access to Treatment Following Near-  
504 Fatal Opioid Overdose. *Proc Annu Hawaii Int Conf Syst Sci* 2020;2020(3488-3496
- 505 30. Adams CS, Player MS, Berini CR, et al. A Telehealth Initiative to Overcome  
506 Health Care Barriers for People Experiencing Homelessness. *Telemed J E Health*  
507 2021;27(8):851-858, doi:10.1089/tmj.2021.0127
- 508 31. Ftouni R, AlJardali B, Hamdanieh M, et al. Challenges of Telemedicine during  
509 the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak.*  
510 2022;22(1):207, doi:10.1186/s12911-022-01952-0
- 511 32. Delisle-Reda S, Bruneau J, Martel-Laferrrière V. Telehealth for people who inject  
512 drugs: An acceptable method of treatment but challenging to access. *J Addict Dis.*  
513 2022;40(4):514-517, doi:10.1080/10550887.2022.2035166

- 514 33. World Health Organization. Universal health coverage. 2023. Available from:  
515 [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/universal-health-coverage-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/universal-health-coverage-(uhc)#:~:text=Overview,products%2C%20and%20enjoying%20decent%20work)  
516  [\(uhc\)#:~:text=Overview,products%2C%20and%20enjoying%20decent%20work](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/universal-health-coverage-(uhc)#:~:text=Overview,products%2C%20and%20enjoying%20decent%20work).  
517 [Last Accessed; 2024].
- 518 34. Myloneros T, Sakellariou D. The effectiveness of primary health care reforms in  
519 Greece towards achieving universal health coverage: a scoping review. BMC Health  
520 Serv Res. 2021;21(1):628, doi:10.1186/s12913-021-06678-9
- 521 35. Hatzakis A, Sypsa V, Paraskevis D, et al. Design and baseline findings of a  
522 large-scale rapid response to an HIV outbreak in people who inject drugs in Athens,  
523 Greece: the ARISTOTLE programme. Addiction 2015;110(9):1453-67,  
524 doi:10.1111/add.12999
- 525 36. Talal AH, Markatou M, Sofikitou EM, et al. Patient-centered HCV care via  
526 telemedicine for individuals on medication for opioid use disorder: Telemedicine for  
527 Evaluation, Adherence and Medication for Hepatitis C (TEAM-C). Contemp Clin Trials  
528 2022;112(106632, doi:10.1016/j.cct.2021.106632
- 529 37. Eurostat. Digital economy and society statistics - households and individuals.  
530 2023. Available from: [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Digital_economy_and_society_statistics_-_households_and_individuals)  
531 [explained/index.php?title=Digital\\_economy\\_and\\_society\\_statistics\\_-](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Digital_economy_and_society_statistics_-_households_and_individuals)  
532 [\\_households\\_and\\_individuals](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Digital_economy_and_society_statistics_-_households_and_individuals). [Last Accessed; October 26].
- 533 38. European Patients Forum. Access to healthcare. EPF's survey-final report.  
534 2016. Available from: [https://www.eu-patient.eu/globalassets/policy/access/final-](https://www.eu-patient.eu/globalassets/policy/access/final-access-survey-report_16-dec.pdf)  
535 [access-survey-report\\_16-dec.pdf](https://www.eu-patient.eu/globalassets/policy/access/final-access-survey-report_16-dec.pdf). [Last Accessed; December 16].
- 536 39. Heckathorn DD. Respondent-Driven Sampling: A New Approach to the Study  
537 of Hidden Populations. Soc Probl. 1997;44(2):174-199, doi:10.2307/3096941

- 538 40. Heckathorn DD. Respondent-Driven Sampling II: Deriving Valid Population  
539 Estimates from Chain-Referral Samples of Hidden Populations. Soc Probl.  
540 2014;49(1):11-34, doi:10.1525/sp.2002.49.1.11
- 541 41. Kapadia SN, Katzman C, Fong C, et al. Hepatitis C testing and treatment  
542 uptake among young people who use opioids in New York City: A cross-sectional  
543 study. J Viral Hepat. 2021;28(2):326-333, doi:10.1111/jvh.13437
- 544 42. Volz E, Heckathorn DD. Probability Based Estimation Theory for Respondent  
545 Driven Sampling. J Off Stat. 2008;24(1):79
- 546 43. Schonlau M, Liebau E. Respondent-Driven Sampling. Stata J 2012;12(1):72-  
547 93, doi:10.1177/1536867x1201200106
- 548 44. Powell RE, Henstenburg JM, Cooper G, et al. Patient Perceptions of Telehealth  
549 Primary Care Video Visits. Ann Fam Med. 2017;15(3):225-229, doi:10.1370/afm.2095
- 550 45. Motavalli D, Taylor JL, Childs E, et al. "Health Is on the Back Burner:" Multilevel  
551 Barriers and Facilitators to Primary Care Among People Who Inject Drugs. J Gen  
552 Intern Med. 2021;36(1):129-137, doi:10.1007/s11606-020-06201-6
- 553 46. Sagrestano LM, Clay J, Finerman R, et al. Transportation vulnerability as a  
554 barrier to service utilization for HIV-positive individuals. AIDS Care 2014;26(3):314-9,  
555 doi:10.1080/09540121.2013.819403
- 556 47. Amiri S, Lutz R, Socías ME, et al. Increased distance was associated with lower  
557 daily attendance to an opioid treatment program in Spokane County Washington. J  
558 Subst Abuse Treat. 2018;93(26-30), doi:10.1016/j.jsat.2018.07.006
- 559 48. Scaramutti C, Hervera B, Rivera Y, et al. Improving access to HIV care among  
560 people who inject drugs through tele-harm reduction: a qualitative analysis of  
561 perceived discrimination and stigma. Harm Reduct J. 2024;21(1):50,  
562 doi:10.1186/s12954-024-00961-8



- 563 49. Abadie R, Goldenberg S, Welch-Lazoritz M, Fisher CB. Establishing trust in  
564 HIV/HCV research among people who inject drugs (PWID): Insights from empirical  
565 research. PLoS One 2018;13(12):e0208410, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0208410
- 566 50. Papalamprakopoulou Z, Ntagianta E, Triantafyllou V, et al. Telehealth to  
567 increase healthcare access; perspectives of people who use drugs, PREPRINT  
568 (Version 1). 2024, doi:<https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4518090/v1>
- 569 51. Mimigiannis C, Gallos P, Mantas J. The Drug Addicts' Usage of Information and  
570 Communication Technologies. Stud Health Technol Inform. 2020;275(236-237,  
571 doi:10.3233/shti200734
- 572 52. Novak SP, Kral AH. Comparing injection and non-injection routes of  
573 administration for heroin, methamphetamine, and cocaine users in the United States.  
574 J Addict Dis. 2011;30(3):248-57, doi:10.1080/10550887.2011.581989
- 575 53. Roussos S, Paraskevis D, Psychogiou M, et al. Ongoing HIV transmission  
576 following a large outbreak among people who inject drugs in Athens, Greece (2014–  
577 20). Addiction 2022;117(6):1670-1682, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/add.15812>
- 578 54. Patanwala MY, Garcia CM, Kushel M. Health Care for People Experiencing  
579 Homelessness. JAMA 2024, doi:10.1001/jama.2024.5213
- 580 55. Ozga JE, Paquette C, Syvertsen JL, Pollini RA. Mobile phone and internet use  
581 among people who inject drugs: Implications for mobile health interventions. Subst  
582 Abus. 2022;43(1):592-597, doi:10.1080/08897077.2021.1975871
- 583 56. Collins KM, Armenta RF, Cuevas-Mota J, et al. Factors associated with patterns  
584 of mobile technology use among persons who inject drugs. Subst Abus.  
585 2016;37(4):606-612, doi:10.1080/08897077.2016.1176980

- 586 57. Kim RG, McDonell C, McKinney J, et al. Staff-Facilitated Telemedicine Care  
587 Delivery for Treatment of Hepatitis C Infection among People Who Inject Drugs.  
588 Healthcare 2024;12(7):715
- 589 58. Althubaiti A. Information bias in health research: definition, pitfalls, and  
590 adjustment methods. J Multidiscip Healthc. 2016;9(211-7, doi:10.2147/jmdh.S104807
- 591 59. Arum C, Fraser H, Artenie AA, et al. Homelessness, unstable housing, and risk  
592 of HIV and hepatitis C virus acquisition among people who inject drugs: a systematic  
593 review and meta-analysis. Lancet Public Health 2021;6(5):e309-e323,  
594 doi:10.1016/s2468-2667(21)00013-x
- 595

## Conventional healthcare



! Geographical barriers

! Stigma

## Digital healthcare



- ✓ Addresses geographical obstacles
- ✓ Less patient-provider empathy concerns

## Equitable Digital Healthcare Distribution

Expand digital infrastructure access

Enhance digital and health education

### Considerations

- Homelessness
- Older age
- Recent IDU

Figure legend: Promotion of Equitable Digital Healthcare Distribution.

People who use drugs (PWUD) are a medically underserved population who reported encountering geographical obstacles and stigma in accessing healthcare in conventional settings. Digital healthcare simultaneously overcomes geographical obstacles accompanied by few empathy concerns. Therefore, the equitable distribution of digital healthcare services to PWUD is critical to avoid worsening future healthcare access. In our investigation we found that homelessness, increasing age, and injection drug use within the past 12 months were associated with reduced internet and digital infrastructure access. We also identified gaps in digital literacy. To promote equitable distribution of digital healthcare, thereby ensuring health equity, requires expansion of internet and digital infrastructure access for underserved populations and addressing digital literacy gap.

Abbreviations: IDU, injection drug use.

1 **Table 1:** Sociodemographic characteristics, injecting drug use history, and participation in  
 2 substance use treatment program among people who use drugs (N=162) recruited in  
 3 Athens, Greece, according to housing status.  
 4

Characteristic	Total (N=162)	According to housing status		p
		Not experiencing homelessness (N=81)	Experiencing homelessness (N=81)	
<b>A. Socio-demographic characteristics</b>				
Age (years), mean (SD)	45.9 (8.8)	45.6 (8.1)	46.2 (9.6)	0.65
Sex, n (%)				0.20
Men	136 (84.0)	65 (80.3)	71 (87.7)	
Women	25 (15.4)	16 (19.8)	9 (11.1)	
Transgender	1 (0.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)	
Reside in Athens, Greece n (%)	157 (96.9)	77 (95.1)	80 (98.8)	0.08
Ethnicity, n (%)				0.23
Greek	146 (90.1)	76 (93.8)	70 (86.4)	
Other	15 (9.3)	5 (6.2)	10 (12.3)	
Refused to answer/ don't know	1 (0.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)	
Employment status, n (%)				0.16
Employed/Student/Retired	17 (10.5)	12 (14.8)	5 (6.2)	
Unemployed/Unable to work	142 (87.7)	67 (82.7)	75 (92.6)	
Other	3 (1.9)	2 (2.5)	1 (1.2)	
Monthly household income <sup>1</sup> , n (%)				<0.001
Up to 350€	116 (71.6)	45 (55.6)	71 (87.7)	
351-700€	19 (11.7)	17 (21.0)	2 (2.5)	
More than 701€	24 (14.8)	18 (22.2)	6 (7.4)	

Refused to answer/ don't know	3 (1.9)	1 (1.2)	2 (2.5)	
Marital status, n (%)				0.01
Single	88 (54.3)	38 (46.9)	50 (61.7)	
Partnered /Married	33 (20.4)	24 (29.6)	9 (11.1)	
Divorced/Separated/Widowed	41 (25.3)	19 (23.5)	22 (27.2)	
Highest education level, n (%)				0.45
Graduated primary school	38 (23.5)	17 (21.0)	21 (25.9)	
Graduated high school	82 (50.6)	40 (49.4)	42 (51.9)	
Graduated colleges/universities/Master/PhD	41 (25.3)	24 (29.6)	17 (21.0)	
Refused to answer/ don't know	1 (0.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.2)	
<b>B. IDU history</b>				
IDU in the past 12 months, n (%)	126 (77.8)	64 (79.0)	62 (76.5)	0.71
Frequency of IDU in the past 12 months, n (%)				0.87
At least daily	95 (58.6)	48 (59.3)	47 (58.0)	
Less than daily	67 (41.4)	33 (40.7)	34 (42.0)	
At least daily IDU in past 12 months of the following, n (%)				
Heroin/Thai	123 (75.9)	63 (77.8)	60 (74.1)	0.95
Cocaine	59 (36.4)	13 (16.0)	11 (13.6)	0.42
Buprenorphine	18 (11.1)	8 (9.9)	10 (12.3)	0.60
Hallucinogens (i.e., LSD)	2 (1.2)	2 (2.5)	0 (0)	0.01
Sisa/Methamphetamine	19 (11.7)	8 (9.9)	11 (13.6)	0.45
Speedball	53 (32.7)	28 (34.6)	25 (30.9)	0.87
Sharing syringes in past 12 months, n (%)				0.28
No	137 (84.6)	71 (87.7)	66 (81.5)	
Yes	25 (15.4)	10 (12.4)	15 (18.5)	
<b>C. Participation in substance use treatment program</b>				
Ever participated in a substance use treatment program, n (%)	140 (86.4)	71 (87.7)	69 (85.2)	0.65
Ever participated in an OTP, n (%)	98 (60.5)	50 (61.7)	48 (59.3)	0.75

---

Currently participate in an OTP, n (%)	24 (14.8)	12 (14.8)	12 (14.8)	0.91
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	------

---

5 Abbreviations: SD, standard deviation; IDU, injection drug use; LSD, Lysergic acid  
6 diethylamide; OTP, opioid treatment program.

7 <sup>1</sup> For participants currently experiencing homelessness, household income was  
8 measured as if they lived alone.

9

10 **Table 2:** Access to conventional medical care among people who use drugs (N=162)  
 11 recruited in Athens, Greece, according to housing status.  
 12

Characteristic	Total (N=162)	According to housing status		p
		Not experiencing homelessness (N=81)	Experiencing homelessness (N=81)	
<b>A. Conventional medical care access</b>				
Participants currently under care for their healthcare conditions, n (%)	88 (54.3)	43 (53.1)	45 (55.6)	0.75
Participants who had visited a healthcare provider within the past 3 months, n (%)	85 (52.5)	37 (45.7)	48 (59.3)	0.08
Participant rating of level of difficulty in obtaining healthcare services within the past 12 months, n (%)				0.04
Easy or very easy	79 (48.8)	39 (48.2)	40 (49.4)	
Moderate	25 (15.4)	16 (19.8)	9 (11.1)	
Difficult or very difficult	46 (28.4)	17 (21.0)	29 (35.8)	
I did not seek healthcare services within the past 12 months	12 (7.4)	9 (11.1)	3 (3.7)	
Where participants last accessed a healthcare provider, n (%)				0.02
At a public hospital	140 (86.4)	64 (79.0)	76 (93.8)	
At private medical practice	12 (7.4)	11 (13.6)	1 (1.2)	
At a health center	5 (3.1)	3 (3.7)	2 (2.5)	
Other	5 (3.1)	3 (3.7)	2 (2.5)	
<b>B. Healthcare barriers</b>				



Participants who reported geographical obstacles <sup>1</sup> , n (%)	70 (43.2)	37 (45.7)	33 (40.5)	0.53
Participants who reported a negative experience when accessing healthcare, n (%)	92 (56.8)	41 (50.6)	51 (63.0)	0.11
Participants attributed the negative experience to, n (%)				
Drug use history <sup>2</sup>	81 (88.0)	36 (87.8)	45 (88.2)	0.95
Income/social status <sup>2</sup>	20 (21.7)	6 (14.6)	14 (27.4)	0.14
Participants reported the following type of negative experience, n (%)				
Attitude of healthcare staff <sup>2</sup>	81 (88.0)	37 (90.2)	44 (86.3)	0.56
Refusal to provide me with treatment <sup>2</sup>	36 (39.1)	13 (31.7)	23 (45.1)	0.19
Inappropriate language <sup>2</sup>	35 (38.0)	22 (53.7)	13 (25.5)	0.006
Denial of my rights <sup>2</sup>	16 (17.4)	6 (14.6)	10 (19.6)	0.53

13 <sup>1</sup> Defined as the need to travel to another region, city, or country for healthcare.

14 <sup>2</sup>Calculated as proportions of the participants (N=92) who reported a negative experience  
15 when accessing healthcare.

16

17 **Table 3:** Technological infrastructure access among people who use drugs (N=162)  
 18 recruited in Athens, Greece, according to housing status.  
 19

Characteristic	Total (N=162)	According to housing status		p
		Not experiencing homelessness (N=81)	Experiencing homelessness (N=81)	
Participants who had ever accessed the internet, n (%)	145 (89.5)	75 (92.6)	70 (86.4)	0.20
Participants' most used device to access the internet <sup>1</sup> , n (%)				0.63
Mobile phone	113 (77.9)	58 (77.3)	55 (78.6)	
Computer	29 (20.0)	15 (20.0)	14 (20.0)	
Participants used the following types of internet connections <sup>1</sup> , n (%)				
Broadband connections e.g., ADSL, VDSL, public Wi-Fi connections, mobile phone	82 (56.5)	56 (74.6)	26 (37.1)	<0.001
Narrowband connection e.g., via mobile phone network less than 3G	55 (37.9)	34 (45.3)	21 (30.0)	0.03
Participants last used the internet <sup>1</sup> , n (%)				0.03
Within the last 3 months	112 (77.2)	64 (85.3)	48 (68.6)	
Between 3 months and one year ago	18 (12.4)	4 (5.3)	14 (20.0)	
More than 1 year ago	14 (9.6)	6 (8.0)	8 (11.4)	
Participant average use of the internet within the last 3 months <sup>2</sup> , n (%)				0.66
Every day or almost every day	76 (67.9)	45 (70.3)	31 (64.6)	
At least once a week (but not every day)	26 (23.2)	14 (21.9)	12 (25.0)	
Less than once a week	9 (8.0)	4 (6.2)	5 (10.4)	

Participants who had a current internet access, n (%)	107 (66.0)	66 (81.5)	41 (50.6)	<0.001
Participants who had a current computer access, n (%)	51 (31.5)	42 (51.9)	9 (11.1)	<0.001

20 Abbreviations: ADSL, asymmetric digital subscriber line; VDSL, very high-speed digital  
 21 subscriber line; 3G, third generation mobile telephone.

22 <sup>1</sup>Calculated as proportions of the participants (N=145) who reported ever access to the  
 23 internet.

24 <sup>2</sup>Calculated as proportions of the participants (N=112) who reported last use of the  
 25 internet within the past 3 months.

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42 **Table 4.** Logistic regression results to identify factors associated with current internet and  
 43 computer access among people who use drugs (N=162) recruited in Athens, Greece.

44

	Odds Ratio	95% CI	p
<b>A. Current internet access</b>			
Age	0.94	[0.89, 0.99]	0.03
In the past 12 months, did you use intravenous drugs other than those prescribed to you for medical reasons?			
No	1.00		
Yes	0.29	[0.10, 0.88]	0.03
Are you currently experiencing homelessness? <sup>1</sup>			
No	1.00		
Yes	0.29	[0.13, 0.65]	0.003
How many years have you attended school?	1.13	[0.96, 1.33]	0.15
What is your ethnicity?			
Greek	1.00		
Non Greek	1.23	[0.31, 4.81]	0.77
What best describes your employment status?			
Employed/Student/Retired	1.00		
Unemployed/Unable to work	0.63	[0.17, 2.33]	0.49
Marital status			

Single	1.00		
Relationship/Married	1.38	[0.50, 3.86]	0.54
Divorced/Separated/Widowed	1.59	[0.60, 4.21]	0.35
<b>B. Current computer access</b>			
Age	0.94	[0.88, 1.00]	0.05
In the past 12 months, did you use intravenous drugs other than those prescribed to you for medical reasons?			
No	1.00		
Yes	1.90	[0.60, 6.07]	0.28
Are you currently experiencing homelessness? <sup>1</sup>			
No	1.00		
Yes	0.17	[0.07, 0.41]	<0.001
How many years have you attended school?			
	1.10	[0.90, 1.35]	0.36
What is your ethnicity?			
Greek	1.00		
Non Greek	0.42	[0.08, 2.28]	0.32
What best describes your employment status?			
Employed/Student/Retired	1.00		
Unemployed/Unable to work	0.25	[0.07, 0.98]	0.05
Marital status			
Single	1.00		

Relationship/Married	1.79	[0.68, 4.76]	0.24
Divorced/Separated/Widowed	0.77	[0.25, 2.33]	0.64

---

45 Abbreviations: CI, Confidence interval

46 <sup>1</sup>Currently experiencing homelessness defined as currently living on the street, in

47 abandoned buildings, or in shelters.

1 **Supplemental file 1.** Telemedicine experience and perceptions among people who use  
 2 drugs (N=162) recruited in Athens, Greece, according to housing status.

3

Characteristic	Total (N=162)	According to housing status		p
		Not experiencing homelessness (N=81)	Experiencing homelessness (N=81)	
Participants who had ever heard about telemedicine, n (%)	75 (46.3)	45 (55.6)	30 (37.0)	0.02
Participants who had ever used telemedicine, n (%)	3 (1.9)	2 (2.5)	1 (1.2)	1.00
Participants who find telemedicine concept interesting, n (%)	98 (60.5)	49 (60.5)	49 (60.5)	1.00
Participant perceptions about telemedicine versus conventional medical care, n (%)				0.65
Conventional medical care is superior	89 (54.9)	45 (55.6)	44 (54.3)	
Telemedicine is superior	29 (17.9)	16 (19.8)	13 (16.0)	
It has no difference	32 (19.8)	16 (19.8)	16 (19.8)	
Refused/don't know	12 (7.4)	4 (4.9)	8 (9.9)	
Participant preferred location to receive telemedicine, n (%)				0.64
OTP	36 (22.2)	19 (23.5)	17 (21.0)	
Home	115 (71.0)	56 (69.1)	59 (72.8)	
Internet café	2 (1.2)	2 (2.5)	0 (0.0)	
Participant willingness to receive telemedicine care in an OTP, n (%)	136 (84.0)	64 (79.0)	72 (88.9)	0.09

4 Abbreviation: OTP, opioid treatment program.

5 **Supplemental file 2.** Potential benefits of telemedicine, as identified by people who use  
6 drugs (N=162) recruited in Athens, Greece, and according to housing status. Participants  
7 were allowed to choose more than one response.

8

Characteristic	Total (N=162)	According to housing status		p
		Not experiencing homelessness (N=81)	Experiencing homelessness (N=81)	
Convenience (e.g., can do it from home), n (%)	137 (84.6)	73 (90.1)	64 (79.0)	0.05
Time-saving (not having to travel to an appointment), n (%)	141 (87.0)	73 (90.1)	68 (84.0)	0.24
Reduce travel expenses, n (%)	123 (75.9)	67 (82.7)	56 (69.1)	0.04
Not waiting as long to be seen for an ailment, n (%)	136 (84.0)	68 (84.0)	68 (84.0)	1.00
Not paying as much, n (%)	84 (51.9)	44 (54.3)	40 (49.4)	0.53
Higher level of flexibility, n (%)	109 (67.3)	56 (69.1)	53 (65.4)	0.62
Reduction of risk for infections by avoiding in-person visits, n (%)	128 (79.0)	68 (84.0)	60 (74.1)	0.12
More efficient in interactions with a healthcare provider, n (%)	82 (50.6)	44 (54.3)	38 (46.9)	0.35
Treated with respect (non-judgmental), n (%)	95 (58.6)	51 (63.0)	44 (54.3)	0.26

9



10 **Supplemental file 3.** Rating on a scale from 1-5 (where 1=minimum and 5=maximum) of  
 11 every potential benefit of telemedicine chosen in the previous question, according to the  
 12 importance to them, among people who use drugs (N=162) recruited in Athens, Greece,  
 13 and according to housing status.

14

Characteristic	Total (N=162)	According to housing status		p
		Not experiencin g homelessne ss (N=81)	Experiencin g homelessne ss (N=81)	
Convenience (e.g., can do it from home), n (%)				0.80
1	2 (1.5)	1 (1.4)	1 (1.6)	
2	4 (2.9)	2 (2.7)	2 (3.1)	
3	26 (19.0)	11 (15.1)	15 (23.4)	
4	23 (16.8)	13 (17.8)	10 (15.6)	
5	82 (59.9)	46 (63.0)	36 (56.2)	
Time-saving (not having to travel to an appointment), n (%)				0.35
1	1 (0.7)	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	
2	7 (5.0)	5 (6.8)	2 (2.9)	
3	12 (8.5)	6 (8.2)	6 (8.8)	
4	31 (22.0)	12 (16.4)	19 (27.9)	
5	90 (63.8)	49 (67.1)	41 (60.3)	
Reduce travel expenses, n (%)				0.53

1	2 (1.6)	2 (3.0)	0 (0.0)	
2	3 (2.4)	1 (1.5)	2 (3.6)	
3	9 (7.3)	5 (7.5)	4 (7.1)	
4	24 (19.5)	15 (22.4)	9 (16.1)	
5	85 (69.1)	44 (65.7)	41 (73.2)	
Not waiting as long to be seen for an ailment, n (%)				0.89
1	2 (1.5)	1 (1.5)	1 (1.5)	
2	5 (3.7)	3 (4.4)	2 (2.9)	
3	8 (5.9)	4 (5.9)	4 (5.9)	
4	14 (10.3)	5 (7.4)	9 (13.2)	
5	107 (78.7)	55 (80.9)	52 (76.5)	
Not paying as much, n (%)				0.59
1	3 (3.6)	2 (4.5)	1 (2.5)	
2	1 (1.2)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.5)	
3	10 (11.9)	5 (11.4)	5 (12.5)	
4	15 (17.9)	10 (22.7)	5 (12.5)	
5	55 (65.5)	27 (61.4)	28 (70.0)	
Higher level of flexibility, n (%)				0.43
2	6 (5.5)	2 (3.6)	4 (7.5)	
3	9 (8.3)	3 (5.4)	6 (11.3)	
4	21 (19.3)	10 (17.9)	11 (20.8)	
5	73 (67.0)	41 (73.2)	32 (60.4)	
Reduction of risk for infections by avoiding in-person visits, n (%)				0.98
1	3 (2.3)	2 (2.9)	1 (1.7)	
2	2 (1.6)	1 (1.5)	1 (1.7)	
3	8 (6.2)	4 (5.9)	4 (6.7)	
4	19 (14.8)	11 (16.2)	8 (13.3)	
5	96 (75.0)	50 (73.5)	46 (76.7)	

More efficient in interactions with a healthcare provider, n (%)				0.63
2	6 (7.3)	3 (6.8)	3 (7.9)	
3	13 (15.9)	5 (11.4)	8 (21.1)	
4	17 (20.7)	9 (20.5)	8 (21.1)	
5	46 (56.1)	27 (61.4)	19 (50.0)	
Treated with respect (non-judgmental), n (%)				0.48
1	1 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.3)	
2	4 (4.2)	2 (3.9)	2 (4.5)	
3	11 (11.6)	5 (9.8)	6 (13.6)	
4	13 (13.7)	5 (9.8)	8 (18.2)	
5	66 (69.5)	39 (76.5)	27 (61.4)	

16 **Additional file 4.** Potential limitations of telemedicine, as identified by people who use  
 17 drugs (N=162) recruited in Athens, Greece, and according to housing status.  
 18 Participants were allowed to choose more than one response.

19

Characteristic	Total (N=162)	According to housing status		p
		Not experiencing homelessness (N=81)	Experiencing homelessness (N=81)	
Privacy issues, n (%)	94 (58.0)	45 (55.6)	49 (60.5)	0.52
Security threats, n (%)	82 (50.6)	41 (50.6)	41 (50.6)	1.00
Technical problems, n (%)	99 (61.1)	55 (67.9)	44 (54.3)	0.08
Requires technology devices, n (%)	104 (64.2)	56 (69.1)	48 (59.3)	0.19
No direct personal contact, n (%)	113 (69.8)	59 (72.8)	54 (66.7)	0.39
No physical examination possible, n (%)	124 (76.5)	60 (74.1)	64 (79.0)	0.46
Difficulty trusting the doctor, n (%)	64 (39.5)	37 (45.7)	27 (33.3)	0.11
Substandard patient-doctor relationship, n (%)	58 (35.8)	30 (37.0)	28 (34.6)	0.74

20

21 **Additional file 5.** Rating on a scale from 1-5 (where 1=minimum and 5=maximum) of  
 22 every potential limitation of telemedicine chosen in the previous question, according to  
 23 the importance to them, among people who use drugs (N=162) recruited in Athens,  
 24 Greece, and according to housing status.

25

Characteristic	Total (N=162)	According to housing status		p
		Not experiencing homelessness (N=81)	Experiencing homelessness (N=81)	
Privacy issues, n (%)				0.50
1	5 (5.3)	3 (6.7)	2 (4.1)	
2	5 (5.3)	3 (6.7)	2 (4.1)	
3	16 (17.0)	9 (20.0)	7 (14.3)	
4	13 (13.8)	8 (17.8)	5 (10.2)	
5	55 (58.5)	22 (48.9)	33 (67.3)	
Security threats, n (%)				0.67
1	2 (2.4)	1 (2.4)	1 (2.4)	
2	7 (8.5)	4 (9.8)	3 (7.3)	
3	12 (14.6)	8 (19.5)	4 (9.8)	
4	11 (13.4)	4 (9.8)	7 (17.1)	
5	50 (61.0)	24 (58.5)	26 (63.4)	
Technical problems, n (%)				0.43
1	2 (2.0)	2 (3.6)	0 (0.0)	
2	12 (12.1)	5 (9.1)	7 (15.9)	
3	25 (25.3)	14 (25.5)	11 (25.0)	
4	16 (16.2)	11 (20.0)	5 (11.4)	
5	44 (44.4)	23 (41.8)	21 (47.7)	

Requires technology devices, n (%)				0.90
1	2 (1.9)	1 (1.8)	1 (2.1)	
2	4 (3.8)	3 (5.4)	1 (2.1)	
3	13 (12.5)	7 (12.5)	6 (12.5)	
4	13 (12.5)	6 (10.7)	7 (14.6)	
5	72 (69.2)	39 (69.6)	33 (68.8)	
No direct personal contact, n (%)				0.04
1	4 (3.5)	2 (3.4)	2 (3.7)	
2	10 (8.8)	3 (5.1)	7 (13.0)	
3	20 (17.7)	14 (23.7)	6 (11.1)	
4	14 (12.4)	11 (18.6)	3 (5.6)	
5	65 (57.5)	29 (49.2)	36 (66.7)	
No physical examination possible, n (%)				0.52
1	2 (1.6)	1 (1.7)	1 (1.6)	
2	8 (6.5)	2 (3.3)	6 (9.4)	
3	14 (11.3)	5 (8.3)	9 (14.1)	
4	26 (21.0)	14 (23.3)	12 (18.8)	
5	74 (59.7)	38 (63.3)	36 (56.2)	
Difficulty trusting the doctor, n (%)				0.24
1	1 (1.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (3.7)	
2	2 (3.1)	1 (2.7)	1 (3.7)	
3	21 (32.8)	16 (43.2)	5 (18.5)	
4	9 (14.1)	5 (13.5)	4 (14.8)	
5	31 (48.4)	15 (40.5)	16 (59.3)	
Substandard patient-doctor relationship, n (%)				0.11
1	1 (1.7)	0 (0.0)	1 (3.6)	

2	3 (5.2)	1 (3.3)	2 (7.1)
3	13 (22.4)	7 (23.3)	6 (21.4)
4	12 (20.7)	10 (33.3)	2 (7.1)
5	29 (50.0)	12 (40.0)	17 (60.7)

---

26