

Barriers and Facilitators in Implementing Online Educational Interventions for Physicians: Systematic Review of Reviews

Authors

Akbota Tolegenova¹, Akbota Kanderzhanova¹, Faye Foster¹, Paolo Colet¹, Valentina Stolyarova¹, Antonio Sarria-Santamera¹.

¹Department of Medicine, Nazarbayev University School of Medicine, 5/1 Kerey and Zhanibek Khans St, Astana 020000, Kazakhstan.

Corresponding author:

Akbota Tolegenova

Address: 5/1 Kerey and Zhanibek Khans Street, Astana 020000, Kazakhstan

Phone: +77478165196

E-mail: atolegenova@nu.edu.kz

Keywords

Nurses, Education, Autism.

Funding

This study is a part of project SOM20230404 that is funded by Grant 064.01.01 of Nazarbayev University.

Declaration of conflicting interest

The Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Abstract

The implementation of online educational interventions for physicians presents both barriers and facilitators that shape the integration of digital learning into medical education frameworks. This systematic review of reviews aims to synthesize evidence on factors influencing the successful implementation of online educational interventions for physicians. We conducted searches across databases including, PubMed/Medline, Cochrane, Web of Science, Embase, PsycInfo, CINAHL spanning the years 2018 to 2023. Inclusion criteria comprised systematic reviews focusing on the implementation of e-learning. Data synthesis followed meta-ethnography principles, with categorization guided by the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR). Twenty-one relevant reviews were analyzed, highlighting factors within the CFIR domains: Innovation, Outer Setting, Inner Setting, Individuals, and Implementation Process. Facilitators included evidence-based practices, adaptability, leadership engagement, and resource availability, while barriers encompassed limited funding, regulatory hurdles, technological constraints, and resistance to change. The results emphasize how crucial it is for healthcare institutions, policymakers, educators, and technology providers to work together in order to effectively incorporate online learning into medical education. In conclusion, the study highlights the importance of tailored implementation strategies and policy recommendations, utilizing evidence-based practices and addressing various factors, to enhance online medical education's effectiveness and ensure its integration into healthcare systems for improved patient outcomes.

Barriers and Facilitators in Implementing Online Educational Interventions for Physicians: Systematic Review of Reviews

Online learning has revolutionized education globally, providing students with accessible and flexible learning opportunities that extend beyond academics to encompass extracurricular activities (Hiltz & Turoff, 2005). From interactive content and global collaboration to adaptive learning and teacher professional development, online platforms have become indispensable tools for modern education, shaping a dynamic and inclusive learning environment (Haleem et al., 2022).

Online Education

Defined by Singh and Thurman (2019) as the delivery of educational content through the internet, online education, allows students to learn independently of their physical or virtual location. Instructors create online teaching modules to enhance interactivity in both synchronous and asynchronous settings. It encompasses the utilization of technological advancements to guide, create, and convey educational content while enabling interactive communication between students and instructors (Thanji & Vasantha, 2016).

Moreover, it was found that online learning offers the advantages of flexibility, accessibility, and personalized learning experiences, empowering students to engage with educational content at their own pace and convenience (Mukhtar et al., 2020). According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2022), in the fall of 2021, approximately 60% of college students, totaling 11,205,320 individuals nationwide, enrolled in at least one online course across the USA. The substantial increase in online enrollment is indicative of a rising pattern in the changing realm of education, particularly within the healthcare profession.

Physicians and Online Education

This surge in online education is crucial given the projections by the World Health Organization (WHO) (2016), which anticipates a potential deficit of 10 million health workers by 2030. This shortage poses significant challenges in delivering effective healthcare services, particularly in developing countries where limited faculty and institutional resources compound existing issues in healthcare quality (Berendes et al., 2011).

Adding to the difficulty, medical staff often face deficient knowledge and skills, exacerbated by a widening gap between the rapid advances and innovations in healthcare and their effective dissemination to frontline professionals, especially physicians working in primary health centers (Pakenham-Walsh & Bukachi, 2009). This knowledge and skill disparity creates a significant obstacle in maintaining a high standard of healthcare provision (Mosadeghrad, 2014).

To address this critical issue, various healthcare fraternities have launched comprehensive training programs, prominently featuring continuing professional development and continuing medical education initiatives (Davis et al., 2008). These programs aim not only to link the existing knowledge and skill gap but also to allow healthcare professionals, particularly physicians, with a latest advancements in approaches and best practices in their respective fields (Ahuja, 2019). Through these initiatives, professionals are better equipped to meet the evolving demands of the healthcare landscape, contributing to an overall improvement in the quality of healthcare services (Mosadeghrad, 2014).

One way to help physicians meet evolving demands is through online educational trainings. Those web-based educational interventions offer a cost-effective, easily implementable, and accessible approach for healthcare professionals, providing a platform for effective learning and skill enhancement (Fredericks et al., 2014). Numerous studies have demonstrated the efficacy of internet-based educational interventions across various medical topics (Martinić et al., 2022; Laine et al., 2019). Moreover, a thorough evaluation of 26 studies on online educational interventions for physicians revealed that such interventions consistently result in a significant improvement in the participants' knowledge levels. This finding implies a positive relationship between engaging in online health education and an increase of knowledge among participants (Claflin et al., 2021).

Factors Influencing Implementation

Among this paradigm shift, examining the factors influencing the successful implementation of online educational interventions for physicians becomes crucial. While the advantages of online education are apparent, challenges and barriers may hinder the seamless integration of these interventions into the established medical education framework (O'Doherty

et al., 2018). Technological constraints, such as limited access to reliable internet connectivity or outdated hardware, can hinder the effectiveness of online learning experiences, especially in low-middle income countries (Adedoyin & Soykan, 2020). Institutional resistance and lack of support can also hinder online intervention implementation (Bury et al., 2006). Additionally, understanding physician preferences and addressing concerns about the efficacy of online learning methodologies are also found to be crucial for fostering acceptance and engagement (Ismail et al., 2021).

Study Rationale and Aim

With numerous reviews covering different factors of online educational interventions, it can be challenging for researchers, healthcare managers, or policymakers to find and apply relevant evidence that fits their specific needs (Ross et al., 2016). Existing reviews have explored various aspects of online medical education, including its impact on knowledge acquisition, attitudes, skills, and patient outcomes (Lawn et al., 2017). However, synthesizing this information is crucial to provide a nuanced understanding of the barriers and facilitators that shape the implementation factors of online educational interventions for physicians. These insights are vital for developing effective strategies to successfully integrate online intervention into healthcare, contributing valuable perspectives to the ongoing discussions about the future of physicians' knowledge in the digital age. This study is a systematic review of reviews. Its primary aim is to identify and synthesize evidence from existing reviews on barriers and facilitators in implementing online educational interventions for physicians.

Methods

This study is a systematic review of reviews, which is a comprehensive research method that involves synthesizing and analyzing the findings of multiple systematic reviews on a particular topic or research question and defined by Smith et al. (2011). According to his methodology, this study design aggregates and assesses the evidence presented in various systematic reviews and allows researchers to gain a broader perspective, considering a range of interventions, outcomes, populations, or settings. This systematic review has been registered with PROSPERO under the registration number CRD42024589492.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The PICOS (Population, Intervention, Control, Outcomes, and Study Type) strategy was systematically employed to construct the eligibility criteria for the inclusion and exclusion of studies in this review (Amir-Behghadami & Janati, 2020).

Population: The target population comprised healthcare professionals across various disciplines, including but not limited to physicians, nurses, pharmacists, and allied health professionals. Studies involving participants within the healthcare profession were included.

Intervention: The internet-based educational interventions designed for healthcare professionals encompassed various e-health initiatives, including online courses, telemedicine training, web-based modules, and digital resources to enhance professional knowledge, skills, awareness, services, and communication.

Control: This study was not restricted to comparator studies.

Outcome: The outcomes of interest included qualitative data on factors influencing the implementation of internet-based educational interventions, both facilitating and hindering aspects. Additionally, the focus was on strategies reported in the literature to promote the successful implementation of e-health initiatives among healthcare professions.

Study type: The study type included systematic reviews, meta-analyses, qualitative meta-syntheses, thematic synthesis and meta-ethnographies written in English. These study designs were chosen to ensure a comprehensive overview of the existing literature and to facilitate the synthesis of evidence from multiple sources. Primary research studies, secondary analyses, commentaries, and editorials were excluded to maintain the focus on aggregated findings.

Search Strategy

To ensure an exhaustive search, a comprehensive strategy was developed. Cochrane Library, Web of Science, PubMed/Medline, EMBASE, PSCHINFO databases were systematically searched using MESH and Emtree. CINAHL database was also utilized to search for grey literature. Boolean operators (AND, OR) were employed to combine relevant terms to enhance search precision. Search strings were as following:

1. ('Internet-based education' OR 'Online education' OR 'E-learning' OR 'Web-based training' OR 'Electronic health education' OR 'Digital learning' OR 'Internet interventions' OR 'Telemedicine education') AND ('Healthcare professionals' OR 'Medical professionals' OR 'Nurses' OR 'Physicians' OR 'Pharmacists' OR 'Allied health professionals' OR 'Healthcare workers') AND ('Review' OR 'Systematic review' OR 'Meta-analysis' OR 'Literature review') AND ('Implementation' OR 'Program development')
2. ('Internet-based education' OR 'E-learning' OR 'Telemedicine education') AND ('Healthcare professionals' OR 'Medical professionals') AND ('Review' OR 'Systematic review' OR 'Meta-analysis') AND ('Implementation' OR 'Program development')

The reference lists of all the studies included were manually examined to discover additional relevant records and evaluate their eligibility.

Study Selection

Two researchers, AT and AK, conducted the selection of studies process independently. All the duplicates were removed, and then titles and abstracts were reviewed. Full articles of reviews that are relevant to the research questions evaluated against the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Any disagreements were comprehensively discussed and resolved. The reasons for excluding studies at this stage were recorded. They will be explicitly detailed in the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) diagram, providing transparency and clarity in the study selection process (Liberati et al., 2009).

Quality Assessment

As the review includes qualitative studies, Enhancing Transparency in Reporting the Synthesis of Qualitative Research (ENTREQ) statement that comprises 21 items was used (Tong et al., 2012). These items are subsequently categorized into five domains, namely introduction, methods and methodology, literature search and selection, appraisal, and synthesis of findings, which helped to assess the quality of selected reviews.

Data Extraction

A table was created to collect data from each review that was examined. This form encompassed CFIR construct, CFIR component, CFIR sub-component, sources and intervention designs. To ensure the reliability and consistency of our findings, two independent reviewers, AT and AK, conducted the data extraction process independently. Any discrepancies were addressed through discussion. Subsequently, two additional researchers, FF and VS, cross-verified the final dataset to ensure the accuracy of the extracted information.

Synthesis of results


Themes identified from qualitative studies were directly matched with the constructs in the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR). CFIR was created by Damschroder et al. (2022), and it provides a structured approach for understanding and evaluating the factors influencing the successful implementation of innovations, interventions, or programs in diverse settings. The five major domains of CFIR (Intervention Characteristics, Outer Setting, Inner Setting, Characteristics of Individuals, and Process) were used to categorize and organize the extracted. Within each domain, specific constructs and sub-constructs were utilized to provide a nuanced understanding of the factors influencing the implementation of educational interventions for physicians. However, quantitative studies were transformed into themes and then were coded against the CFIR constructs. This allowed for a thorough analysis that integrated qualitative and adapted quantitative data insights. Furthermore, key themes associated with the facilitators and barriers impacting the implementation of online educational interventions were gathered also from discussion section of the papers. These sections frequently provided supplementary explanations, contributing valuable perspectives that enhanced the findings.

Results

A total of 3340 papers were found as a result of searches as it can be seen in Figure 1. Of them, 1,862 were excluded based on the screening of the title or an abstract. Remaining 180 studies were screened as a full paper before a decision could be made. Finally, of the full papers assessed, 18 met the criteria for inclusion and were thus selected for this review.

Figure 1

PRISMA Flow Diagram of Study Selection



All the papers included were published between years 2018 to 2023. The settings of the studies vary and include seven medical education institutions, nine mixed settings (which involve various healthcare or educational contexts), two hospitals, one primary care, one outpatient settings, and one specific medical school named Tel Aviv Sackler Medical School. All papers were written in English (Appendix).

The synthesized information from the reviews is classified and grouped according to the

main constructs and components of the CFIR framework. The parts with the most information support are explained below.

Table 1

Implementation Barriers and Facilitators under the Innovation Construct

CFIR construct	CFIR component	CFIR sub-component	Sources
Innovation	Innovation Source		
	Innovation Evidence-Base		2, 3, 10, 17
	Innovation Relative Advantage		3
	Innovation Adaptability		1, 5, 16
	Innovation Trialability		
	Innovation Complexity		3, 5, 6
	Innovation Design		2, 6, 7, 10, 16, 17
	Innovation Cost		

Note. 1. (Barde, 2020); 2. (Bogossian et al., 2023); 3. (Boutros et al., 2023); 4. (Car et al., 2022); 5. (Claflin et al., 2022); 6. (Danilovich et al., 2021); 7. (Dankner et al., 2018); 8. (Darley et al., 2022); 9. (Dawe & McKelvie, 2020); 10. (Delungahawatta et al., 2022); 11. (Eltahir et al., 2023); 12. (Hincapié et al., 2020); 13. (Joshi et al., 2021); 14. (Kho et al., 2020); 15. (Mohammadibakhsh et al., 2023); 16. (Regmi & Jones, 2020); 17. (Thomae et al., 2023); 18. (Ye et al., 2023).

The implementation of innovations and educational interventions in medical settings is influenced by a multitude of factors.

Under the Innovation construct, facilitators such as evidence-based practices, adaptability, and innovative designs (see Table 1) are found to contribute to the successful implementation of online learning initiatives. For instance, simulation and workshops, specific skills training, and the integration of technology have been highlighted by Regmi & Jones (2020) as effective strategies to improve medical education. Similarly, Bogossian et al. (2023) emphasize the importance of addressing socialization issues and promoting cohesive approaches in interprofessional education (IPE) implementations.

Outer setting factors, including local conditions, partnerships, policies and laws (see Table 2), are stated as notably influencing the implementation process. Car et al. (2022) underscore the importance of adequate physical infrastructure and clear guidelines for digital health professions education. However, challenges such as regulatory hurdles and limited funding impede progress in this domain.

Table 2

Implementation Barriers and Facilitators under the Outer Setting Construct

CFIR construct	CFIR component	CFIR sub-component	Sources
Outer setting	Critical Incidents		
	Local Attitudes		
	Local Conditions		4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 15, 17, 18
	Partnerships & Connections		2, 4, 6, 9, 11, 14, 17, 18
	Policies & Laws		2, 4, 5, 9, 12, 15, 18
	Financing		1, 4, 18
	External Pressure		
		Societal Pressure	
		Market Pressure	3
		Performance-Measurement Pressure	

Note. 1. (Kaur, Sethi, & Barde, 2020); 2. (Bogossian et al., 2023); 3. (Boutros et al., 2023); 4. (Car et al., 2022); 5. (Claflin et al., 2022); 6. (Danilovich et al., 2021); 7. (Dankner et al., 2018); 8. (Darley et al., 2022); 9. (Dawe & McKelvie, 2020); 10. (Delungahawatta et al., 2022); 11. (Eltahir et al., 2023); 12. (Hincapié et al., 2020); 13. (Joshi et al., 2021); 14. (Kho et al., 2020); 15. (Mohammadibakhsh et al., 2023); 16. (Regmi & Jones, 2020); 17. (Thomae et al., 2023); 18. (Ye et al., 2023).

Within the Inner setting, structural characteristics such as physical and information technology infrastructure, communication, and cultural aspects, particularly recipient-centeredness and learning-centeredness, are identified as crucial factors in implementing online educational interventions for physicians (see Table 3). Additionally, tension for change and resource availability, including finance, time, and materials, are highlighted as key factors influencing implementation success. For instance, Claflin et al. (2022) emphasize the importance of adaptability and ongoing support for facilitators in health education interventions, while Danilovich et al. (2021) underscore the need for a comprehensive assessment of online education systems in family medicine residency programs. This underscores the significance of addressing structural, cultural, and resource-related considerations in effectively implementing online educational interventions within medical settings.

Individual-level factors, including leadership engagement, motivation, and capability (see Table 4), are identified to shape the implementation of e-learning. Joshi et al. (2021) emphasize the importance of leadership engagement and sufficient resources in online medical education, while Delungahawatta et al. (2022) discuss the significance of interactive and asynchronous e-learning interventions, alongside challenges like financial barriers and resistance to change.

Table 3

Implementation Barriers and Facilitators under the Inner Setting Construct

CFIR construct	CFIR component	CFIR sub-component	Sources
Inner setting	Structural Characteristics		
		Physical Infrastructure	1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 17, 18
		Information Technology Infrastructure	1, 3, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18
		Work Infrastructure	6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15
	Relational Connections		
	Communications		1, 4, 9, 11, 13, 14
	Culture		1
		Human Equality-Centeredness	18
		Recipient-Centeredness	2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16
		Deliverer-Centeredness	
		Learning-Centeredness	6, 9, 16
	Tension for Change		4, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14
	Compatibility		
	Relative Priority		
	Incentive Systems		
	Mission Alignment		
	Available Resources		
		Funding	2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17
		Space	4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 16, 17
		Materials & Equipment	5, 8
	Access to Knowledge & Information		4, 5

Note. 1. (Kaur, Sethi, & Barde, 2020); 2. (Bogossian et al., 2023); 3. (Boutros et al., 2023); 4. (Car et al., 2022); 5. (Claflin et al., 2022); 6. (Danilovich et al., 2021); 7. (Dankner et al., 2018); 8. (Darley et al., 2022); 9. (Dawe & McKelvie, 2020); 10. (Delungahawatta et al., 2022); 11. (Eltahir et al., 2023); 12. (Hincapié et al., 2020); 13. (Joshi et al., 2021); 14. (Kho et al., 2020); 15. (Mohammadibakhsh et al., 2023); 16. (Regmi & Jones, 2020); 17. (Thomae et al., 2023); 18. (Ye et al., 2023).

In the Implementation process domain, key components such as engaging, reflecting and evaluating, and adapting are identified as important factors in implementation (see Table 5). For example, Kaur, Sethi, & Barde (2020) emphasize the significance of engaging participants and soliciting their feedback on the intervention, while Claflin et al. (2022) highlight the adaptability of developed e-learning initiatives. This underscores the importance of active involvement, continuous assessment, and flexibility in the implementation process to ensure the effectiveness and sustainability of online educational interventions for physicians.

Table 4

Implementation Barriers and Facilitators under the Individuals Construct.

CFIR construct	CFIR component	CFIR sub-component	Sources
Individuals	High-Level Leaders		
	Mid-level Leaders		
	Opinion Leaders		12
	Implementation Facilitators		
	Implementation Leads		4, 5, 9, 13, 14, 15, 17
	Implementation Team Members		
	Other Implementation Support		19
	Innovation Deliverers		
	Innovation Recipients		
	Characteristics	Need	
		Capability	1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17
		Opportunity	
		Motivation	9, 10, 11, 16, 17

Note. 1. (Kaur, Sethi, & Barde, 2020); 2. (Bogossian et al., 2023); 3. (Boutros et al., 2023); 4. (Car et al., 2022); 5. (Claflin et al., 2022); 6. (Danilovich et al., 2021); 7. (Dankner et al., 2018); 8. (Darley et al., 2022); 9. (Dawe & McKelvie, 2020); 10. (Delungahawatta et al., 2022); 11. (Eltahir et al., 2023); 12. (Hincapié et al., 2020); 13. (Joshi et al., 2021); 14. (Kho et al., 2020); 15. (Mohammadibakhsh et al., 2023); 16. (Regmi & Jones, 2020); 17. (Thomae et al., 2023); 18. (Ye et al., 2023).

Table 5

Implementation Barriers and Facilitators under the Implementation Process Domain Construct.

CFIR construct	CFIR component	CFIR sub-component	Sources
Implementation Process Domain	Teaming		
	Assessing Needs	Innovation Deliverers	11
		Innovation Recipients	
	Assessing Context		
	Planning		17
	Tailoring Strategies		17
	Engaging	Innovation Deliverers	
		Innovation Recipients	1, 3, 11, 16
	Doing		
	Reflecting & Evaluating	Implementation	2, 5, 6, 7, 10
		Innovation	
	Adapting		5, 16

Note. 1. (Kaur, Sethi, & Barde, 2020); 2. (Bogossian et al., 2023); 3. (Boutros et al., 2023); 4. (Car et al., 2022); 5. (Claflin et al., 2022); 6. (Danilovich et al., 2021); 7. (Dankner et al., 2018); 8. (Darley et al., 2022); 9. (Dawe & McKelvie, 2020); 10. (Delungahawatta et al., 2022); 11. (Eltahir et al., 2023); 12. (Hincapié et al., 2020); 13. (Joshi et al., 2021); 14. (Kho et al., 2020); 15. (Mohammadibakhsh et al., 2023); 16. (Regmi & Jones, 2020); 17. (Thomae et al., 2023); 18. (Ye et al., 2023).

Discussion

The conversation about incorporating online learning into medical education reveals a complex mix of factors that impact its successful implementation. To effectively integrate online learning, it is crucial to embrace innovations that are evidence-based and adaptable. However,

various external challenges, such as technological and limited funding, must be navigated to ensure smooth adoption. Within organizations, creating a supportive culture and establishing comprehensive assessment systems are vital components of success. Yet, ongoing challenges include addressing resistance to change, tailoring interventions to community needs, and ensuring adequate resources. Looking ahead, collaborative efforts involving stakeholders from different levels are indispensable to foster an environment that supports innovation and drives significant improvements in medical education through online learning.

A key challenge identified by Adedoyin & Soykan (2020) is limited access to reliable internet connectivity and outdated hardware, which can significantly impede the effectiveness of online learning experiences, especially in low- and middle-income countries. This aligns with our research findings that highlight the importance of robust technological infrastructure for online learning adoption. Ensuring that institutions have the necessary technology resources, from reliable internet to modern hardware, is essential for the success of online education initiatives. Institutional resistance and lack of support represent another barrier to the effective implementation of online learning. Bury et al. (2006) found that resistance to change within institutions can significantly hinder the adoption of online interventions. This observation resonates with the broader research results, which emphasize the need for a supportive organizational culture that embraces innovation. Addressing resistance to change and fostering a culture that supports innovation are critical steps in overcoming institutional barriers to online learning.

The results of the study suggest that customized implementation techniques that make use of evidence-based practices, flexibility, and creative designs are necessary to improve the performance of online learning programs in healthcare environments. Fostering an environment that is favorable to implementation success requires addressing both inner and outside setting variables, such as physical and cultural characteristics, as well as local conditions, collaborations, and policies. Implementation efforts can also be strengthened by placing a higher priority on individual-level elements like motivation and leadership engagement, as well as by using efficient implementation procedures that highlight stakeholder interaction and flexibility. In order to determine how well these suggestions will work to improve doctors' adoption and sustainability of

online learning programs, more investigation and assessment are necessary in the future. This will help to advance both medical education and healthcare delivery.

The study has a number of advantages and disadvantages. The utilization of pre-existing evaluations poses a possible constraint as the quality and technique may differ, thereby impacting the dependability of the combined results. Publication bias may have an impact on the outcomes of the studies that are included in systematic reviews. Furthermore, even though the CFIR framework is useful for examining implementation issues, it could miss some subtleties and complexities that are specific to each setting. However the study also provides several advantages. Conducting a methodical literature study can enhance the reliability and repeatability of results. A thorough method of examining obstacles and enablers to the implementation of online educational interventions for physicians is to employ the CFIR framework. Overall, despite its limitations, the study offers valuable insights that can inform future research and practice in medical education.

Future investigations should concentrate on longitudinal studies to monitor the long-term efficacy of online medical education programs. It is essential to comprehend how technology may support successful online learning, investigate cultural aspects that influence implementation, and create specialized implementation techniques. Additionally, to produce high-quality evidence for well-informed decision-making in medical education, rigorous evaluation techniques like randomized controlled trials are required. We also suggest policy recommendations that include funding for evaluation studies, prioritizing investments in digital infrastructure, encouraging interprofessional education, enforcing clear regulatory frameworks, and establishing supportive policies for digital health education. These regulations seek to improve patient outcomes and healthcare delivery by guaranteeing the efficacy, accessibility, and quality of online medical education.

References

- Adedoyin, O. B., & Soykan, E. (2020). Covid-19 pandemic and online learning: the challenges and opportunities. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 31(2), 863–875.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1813180>
- Ahuja, A. S. (2019). The impact of artificial intelligence in medicine on the future role of the physician. *PeerJ*, 7, Article e7702. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.7702>
- Alavi, A., & Amjadi, N. (2015). A review on considerations needed educating new physicians. *Journal of medicine and life*, 8(Spec Iss 3), 1–5.
- Amir-Behghadami, M., & Janati, A. (2020). Population, ntervention, comparison, outcomes and study (PICOS) design as a framework to formulate eligibility criteria in systematic reviews. *Emergency Medicine Journal : EMJ*, 37(6), Article 387.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/emered-2020-209567>
- Berendes, S., Heywood, P., Oliver, S., & Garner, P. (2011). Quality of private and public ambulatory health care in low and middle income countries: Systematic review of comparative studies. *PLOS Medicine*, 8(4), Article e1000433.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000433>
- Bogossian, F., New, K., Kendall, G., Barr, N., Dodd, N., Hamilton, A., Nash, G., Masters, N., Pelly, F., Reid, C., Shakhovskoy, R., & Taylor, J. (2022). The implementation of interprofessional education: a scoping review. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 28(1), 243–277. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-022-10128-4>
- Boutros, P., Kassem, N., Nieder, J., Jaramillo, C., Von Petersdorff, J., Walsh, F., Bärnighausen, T., & Barteit, S. (2023). Education and training adaptations for health workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: A scoping review of lessons learned and innovations. *Healthcare*, 11(21), 2902. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare11212902>
- Bury, R., Martin, L., & Roberts, S. (2006). Achieving change through mutual development: supported online learning and the evolving roles of health and information professionals. *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, 23(s1), 22–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2006.00677.x>

- Car, L. T., Poon, S., Kyaw, B. M., Cook, D. A., Ward, V., Atun, R., Majeed, A., Johnston, J., Van Der Kleij, R., Molokhia, M., Florian, W., Lupton, M., Chavannes, N. H., Ajuebor, O., Prober, C. G., & Car, J. (2022). Digital education for health professionals: An evidence map, conceptual framework, and research agenda. *JMIR. Journal of Medical Internet Research/Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *24*(3), e31977.
<https://doi.org/10.2196/31977>
- Childs, S., Blenkinsopp, E., Hall, A., & Walton, G. (2005). Effective e-learning for health professionals and students—barriers and their solutions. A systematic review of the literature—findings from the HeXL project. *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, *22*(s2), 20–32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-3327.2005.00614.x>
- Clafin, S. B., Klekociuk, S. Z., Fair, H., Bostock, E. C. S., Farrow, M., Doherty, K., & Taylor, B. (2021). Assessing the impact of online health education interventions from 2010-2020: A Systematic review of the evidence. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, *36*(1), 201–224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08901171211039308>
- Clafin, S. B., Klekociuk, S. Z., Fair, H., Bostock, E. C. S., Farrow, M., Doherty, K., & Taylor, B. (2021). Assessing the impact of online health education interventions from 2010-2020: A systematic review of the evidence. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, *36*(1), 201–224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08901171211039308>
- Damschroder, L. J., Reardon, C. M., Widerquist, M. a. O., & Lowery, J. C. (2022). The updated Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research based on user feedback. *Implementation Science*, *17*(1), Article 75. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-022-01245-0>
- Danilovich, N., Kitto, S., Price, D., Campbell, C., Hodgson, A., & Hendry, P. (2021). Implementing competency-based medical education in family medicine: A narrative review of current trends in assessment. *Family Medicine*, *53*(1), 9–22.
<https://doi.org/10.22454/fammed.2021.453158>
- Dankner, R., Gabbay, U., Leibovici, L., Sadeh, M., & Sadetzki, S. (2018). Implementation of a competency-based medical education approach in public health and epidemiology training of medical students. *Israel Journal of Health Policy Research*, *7*(1).

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13584-017-0194-8>

- Darley, S., Coulson, T., Peek, N., Moschogianis, S., Van Der Veer, S. N., Wong, D. C., & Brown, B. (2022). Understanding how the design and implementation of online consultations affect primary care quality: Systematic review of evidence with recommendations for designers, providers, and researchers. *JMIR. Journal of Medical Internet Research/Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 24(10), e37436. <https://doi.org/10.2196/37436>
- Davis, N., Davis, D. A., & Bloch, R. (2008). Continuing medical education: AMEE education guide No 35. *Medical Teacher*, 30(7), 652–666.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01421590802108323>
- Dawe, R., & McKelvie, M. (2020). International health experiences in postgraduate medical education: A meta-analysis of their effect on graduates' clinical practice among underserved populations. *Canadian Medical Education Journal*, 11(4), e70-e79.
<https://doi.org/10.36834/cmej.56940>
- Delungahawatta, T., Dunne, S. S., Hyde, S., Halpenny, L., McGrath, D., O'Regan, A., & Dunne, C. P. (2022). Advances in e-learning in undergraduate clinical medicine: a systematic review. *BMC Medical Education*, 22(1), Article 711. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-022-03773-1>
- Eltahir, N. M. E., Alsalhi, N. N. R., Torrisi-Steele, N. G., & Al-Qatawneh, N. S. S. (2023). The implementation of online learning in conventional higher education institutions during the spread of COVID-19: A comparative study. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET)*, 18(01), 68–99. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v18i01.36005>
- Feng, J. Y., Chang, Y., Chang, H. Y., Erdley, W. S., Lin, C., & Chang, Y. (2013). Systematic review of effectiveness of situated e-learning on medical and nursing education. *Worldviews on Evidence-based Nursing*, 10(3), 174–183.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/wvn.12005>
- Fredericks, S., Martorella, G., & Catallo, C. (2014). A systematic review of web-based educational interventions. *Clinical Nursing Research*, 24(1), 91–113.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1054773814522829>

- Haleem, A., Javaid, M., Qadri, M. A., & Suman, R. (2022). Understanding the role of digital technologies in education: A review. *Sustainable Operations and Computers*, 3, 275–285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.susoc.2022.05.004>
- Hiltz, S. R., & Turoff, M. (2005). Education goes digital. *Communications of the ACM*, 48(10), 59–64. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1089107.1089139>
- Hincapié, M. A., Gallego, J. C., Gempeler, A., Piñeros, J. A., Nasner, D., & Escobar, M. F. (2020). Implementation and usefulness of telemedicine during the COVID-19 pandemic: A scoping review. *Journal of Primary Care & Community Health*, 11, 215013272098061. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2150132720980612>
- Ismail, I. I., Abdelkarim, A., & Al-Hashel, J. Y. (2021). Physicians' attitude towards webinars and online education amid COVID-19 pandemic: When less is more. *PLOS ONE*, 16(4), Article e0250241. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0250241>
- Joshi, T., Budhathoki, P., Adhikari, A., Poudel, A., Raut, S., & Shrestha, D. B. (2021). Improving medical education: A narrative review. *Curēus*. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.18773>
- Kaur, J., Sethi, D., & Barde, S. (2020). Hurdles and possible solutions in development and implementation of online learning in nursing education: An integrative review. *Indian Journal of Forensic Medicine & Toxicology*, 14(4), 3870–3874. <https://doi.org/10.37506/ijfmt.v14i4.12237>
- Kho, J., Gillespie, N., & Martin-Khan, M. (2020). A systematic scoping review of change management practices used for telemedicine service implementations. *BMC Health Services Research*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-020-05657-w>
- Kirkman, M. A., Sevdalis, N., Arora, S., Baker, P., Vincent, C., & Ahmed, M. (2015). The outcomes of recent patient safety education interventions for trainee physicians and medical students: a systematic review. *BMJ Open*, 5(5), e007705. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-007705>
- Laine, A., Välimäki, M., Löyttyniemi, E., Pekurinen, V., Marttunen, M., & Anttila, M. (2019). The impact of a web-based course concerning patient education for mental health care professionals: Quasi-experimental study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 21(3),

Article e11198. <https://doi.org/10.2196/11198>

- Lawn, S., Zhi, X., & Morello, A. (2017). An integrative review of e-learning in the delivery of self-management support training for health professionals. *BMC Medical Education*, 17(1), Article 183. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-017-1022-0>
- Liberati, A., Altman, D. G., Tetzlaff, J., Mulrow, C. D., Gøtzsche, P. C., Ioannidis, J. P. A., Clarke, M., Devereaux, P. J., Kleijnen, J., & Moher, D. (2009). The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration. *BMJ*, 339(jul21 1), Article b2700. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.b2700>
- Martinić, M. K., Mališa, S., Aranza, D., Čivljak, M., Marušić, A., Sapunar, D., Peričić, T. P., Buljan, I., Tokalić, R., Čavić, D., & Puljak, L. (2022). Creating an online educational intervention to improve knowledge about systematic reviews among healthcare workers: mixed-methods pilot study. *BMC Medical Education*, 22(1), Article 722. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-022-03763-3>
- Mohammadibakhsh, R., Aryankhesal, A., Sohrabi, R., Alihosseini, S., & Behzadifar, M. (2023). Implementation challenges of family physician program: a systematic review on global evidence. *Medical Journal of the Islamic Republic of Iran*. <https://doi.org/10.47176/mjiri.37.21>
- Mosadeghrad, A. M. (2014). Factors influencing healthcare service quality. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, 3(2), 77–89. <https://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2014.65>
- Mosadeghrad, A. M. (2014). Factors influencing healthcare service quality. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, 3(2), 77–89. <https://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2014.65>
- Mukhtar, K., Javed, K., Arooj, M., & Sethi, A. (2020). Advantages, limitations and recommendations for online learning during COVID-19 pandemic era. *Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences*, 36(COVID19-S4), S27–S31. <https://doi.org/10.12669/pjms.36.covid19-s4.2785>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2022). *Number and percentage of students enrolled in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by distance education participation*,

location of student, level of enrollment, and control and level of institution: Fall 2020 and fall 2021 (Table 311.15). Digest of Education Statistics.

https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d22/tables/dt22_311.15.asp

O'Doherty, D., Dromey, M., Lougheed, J., Hannigan, A., & McGrath, D. (2018). Barriers and solutions to online learning in medical education – an integrative review. *BMC Medical Education*, 18(1), Article 130. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-018-1240-0>

Pakenham-Walsh, N., & Bukachi, F. (2009). Information needs of health care workers in developing countries: a literature review with a focus on Africa. *Human Resources for Health*, 7(1), Article 30. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1478-4491-7-30>

Regmi, K., & Jones, L. (2020). A systematic review of the factors – enablers and barriers – affecting e-learning in health sciences education. *BMC Medical Education*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-020-02007-6>

Rohwer, A. (2017). E-learning of evidence-based health care (EBHC) to increase EBHC competencies in healthcare professionals: a systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 13(1), 1–147. <https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2017.4>

Ross, J., Stevenson, F., Lau, R., & Murray, E. (2016). Factors that influence the implementation of e-health: a systematic review of systematic reviews (an update). *Implementation Science*, 11(1), Article 146. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-016-0510-7>

Singh, V., & Thurman, A. C. (2019). How many ways can we define online learning? A systematic literature review of definitions of online learning (1988-2018). *American Journal of Distance Education*, 33(4), 289–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08923647.2019.1663082>

Smith, V., Devane, D., Begley, C., & Clarke, M. (2011). Methodology in conducting a systematic review of systematic reviews of healthcare interventions. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 11(1), Article 15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-11-15>

Steinert, Y., Mann, K., Centeno, A., Dolmans, D., Spencer, J., Gelula, M. H., & Prideaux, D. (2006). A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to improve teaching effectiveness in medical education: BEME guide No. 8. *Medical Teacher*, 28(6),

497–526. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01421590600902976>

Thanji, M., & Vasantha, S. (2016). ICT factors influencing consumer adoption of E-Commerce offerings for education. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, 9(32), 1–6.

<https://doi.org/10.17485/ijst/2016/v9i32/98650>

Thomae, A. V., Rogge, A. A., Helmer, S. M., Icke, K., & Witt, C. M. (2022). Development, implementation, and evaluation of an e-learning in integrative oncology for physicians and students involving experts and learners: Experiences and recommendations. *Journal of Cancer Education*, 38(3), 805–812. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13187-022-02189-1>

Tong, A., Flemming, K., McInnes, E., Oliver, S., & Craig, J. C. (2012). Enhancing transparency in reporting the synthesis of qualitative research: ENTREQ. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 12(1), Article 181. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-12-181>

World Health Organization. (2016). Health workforce. World Health Organization.

https://www.who.int/health-topics/health-workforce#tab=tab_1

Ye, J., He, L., & Beestrup, M. (2023). Implications for implementation and adoption of telehealth in developing countries: a systematic review of China's practices and experiences. *Npj Digital Medicine*, 6(1), Article 174. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-023-00908-6>

Barriers and Facilitators in Implementing Online Educational Interventions for Physicians: Systematic Review of Reviews Supplement 1

Summary Details of the 18 Included Studies

Author	Date published	Aim/purpose	Setting	Number of papers included	Summary of facilitators	Summary of barriers
Bogossian et al.	2023	To summarize the evidence for implementation of IPE, and identify challenges and key lessons to guide faculty in interprofessional education implementation.	Mixed	27	Addressing socialization issues. Promoting cohesive approaches. Including learners in debrief sessions. Institutional policy support, partnerships between academia and healthcare, high-level institutional backing. Adoption of organizational change theory, frameworks for illustrating changes. Stakeholder engagement. Accessibility, time-saving, and environmental benefits of virtual learning.	Socialization issues. Learning context challenges. Insufficient faculty development. Limited institutional support, challenges in leadership and resource allocation. Logistical difficulties. Varied accreditation standards. Social and cultural influences, sustainability concerns.
Boutros et al.	2023	To evaluate the influence of COVID-19 on medical education and training, analyze the implemented adjustment measures, and assess their efficacy in enhancing the education and training of healthcare workers amid the pandemic.	Mixed	88	Engagement of trainees in virtual clinical work. Provision of research opportunities. Integration of simulation training.	Overabundance of webinars. Repetitive content, and low engagement. Technological issues, unstable internet, and limited computer resources.
Car et al.	2022	To analyze the available evidence,	Mixed	77	Adequate physical infrastructure.	Lack of infrastructure. Regulatory

		pinpoint any existing gaps, and determine research priorities, with the aim of facilitating thorough and pertinent investigations in the field of digital health professions education.			Clear guidelines and standards set. Financial support from institutions, encouraging interdisciplinary collaboration. Quality assurance.	challenges. Limited research. Limited funding. Resistance to change. Context-specific challenges.
Clafin et al.	2022	To systematically evaluate the assessment and impact of online health education interventions, analyzing methodologies employed, summarizing key discoveries, and pinpointing areas of knowledge deficiency.	Mixed	26	Adaptability. Proper training and ongoing support for facilitators. Providing facilitators with access to relevant knowledge. Sufficient resources, including staff, time, and funding. Strong leadership support and engagement.	Mismatch between the intervention and community needs or resources. Inadequate support from organizational leaders. Overly complex interventions. Inadequate Monitoring and Feedback. External factors, such as policies or incentives.
Danilovich et al.	2021	To integrate the results of research conducted over the past two decades, exploring competency-based assessment techniques employed in family medicine residency and continuous professional development (CPD), with the goal of pinpointing any existing deficiencies in their current methodologies.	Mixed	37	Comprehensive assessment systems. Ongoing direct observation and feedback. Integration of innovative learning methods. Consistent inclusion of new learning activities. Supportive strategies for practicing physicians' learning and practice improvement.	Inadequate standardized assessment training for faculty. Difficulty integrating new learning methods into assessments. Challenges in evaluating competency-based assessments. Limited support systems for practicing physicians post-training.
Dankner et al.	2018	This paper outlines the committee's process and	Sackler School of	Not defined	Committee of experienced faculty. Support from	The limited timeframe. Resistance to change. Limited

		recommendations, which received approval and adoption from the teaching committee at Tel Aviv Sackler Medical School, and have been implemented over the past four years.	Medicine		teaching committee. Competency-Based Medical Education (CBME) approach. Longitudinal approach. Efficient utilization of time.	resources, including funding, faculty expertise, and infrastructure. Curricular overload. Evaluation and assessment challenges.
Darley et al.	2022	To synthesize studies examining the effects of online consultations (OC) on the quality of primary care, considering how system design and implementation influence these outcomes.	Primary care	63	Condition complexity. Technology. Allocating resources and managing workload.	Challenges in managing complex queries. Staff and patient resistance to OC adoption.
Dawe & McKelvie	2020	To assess the impact of postgraduate International Health Experiences (IHEs) on the future careers of clinicians, particularly in relation to their engagement with underserved populations.	Medical education institutions	3	Supportive organizational culture. Strong leadership support. Readiness for Implementation of the organization. Collaborations with external partners. Motivation of individuals to engage. Acquisition of skills and knowledge. Feedback and communication. Mentorship and support	Absence of institutional support or resources. Resistance to change. External policies or regulations that hinder the integration. Limited funding. Travel restrictions, visa issues, or language barriers. Absence of mentorship or guidance.
Delungahawatta et al.	2022	To investigate the breadth and influence of e-learning interventions on medical student education in clinical medicine, with the objective of assisting	Mixed	42	Interactive and asynchronous interventions. Digital skills and motivation. Effective feedback mechanisms. Building quality	Lack of access to technology. Financial barriers, such as the cost of acquiring and maintaining technology infrastructure. Resistance to change. Lack of

		medical educators in the integration of e-learning tactics within program curricula.			assurance into e-learning interventions. Usability and user experience	training and support
Eltahir et al.	2023	To examine the implementation of online learning in traditional higher medical education institutions during the COVID-19 pandemic.	Mixed	Not defined	Rapid adoption of technology. Institutional support. Flexibility and accessibility. Training for Instructors. Government support and infrastructure.	Technological challenges. Pedagogical limitations. Motivation and engagement issues.
Hincapié et al.	2020	To review and consolidate existing literature regarding the surge in telemedicine adoption during the COVID-19 pandemic, aiming to offer rationale and direction for its implementation to address pandemic-related constraints globally.	Mixed	45	None was mentioned	Restrictive administrative regulations and the absence of solid legal frameworks. Insufficient economic investment in technological resources. Reluctance of medical providers and patients.
Joshi et al.	2021	To review core competencies in medical education as outlined by the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME), and To explore teaching methods.	Mixed	21	Leadership engagement. Sufficient resources. A supportive and positive organizational culture. Involving staff in the decision-making process	Lack of leadership support. Resistance to change. Poor communication
Kaur, J., Sethi, D., & Barde, S.	2020	To explore the hurdles and propose possible solutions for the development and implementation of online learning in	Mixed	Not defined	Training and continuous commitment. Cost redefining. Team collaboration. Positive culture.	Technological challenges. Resistance to change. Resource limitations. Pedagogical challenges.

		nursing education.				
Kho et al.	2020	To examine the application of change management (CM) practices in the implementation of telemedicine services across diverse healthcare domains and nations.	Mixed	48	Involving key stakeholders. Training and education. Creating guidelines, clinical protocols, and adapting existing. Monitoring and flexibility. Leadership support.	Resistance to change. Lack of leadership support. Constraints in terms of financial resources, technological infrastructure. Inadequate communication between stakeholders, lack of clarity in roles.
Mohammadibakhsh et al.	2023	To conduct a systematic examination of the global challenges in implementing family physician programs.	Outpatient setting	35	Effective governance structures. Adequate financing and payment systems. Appropriate education and training. Efficient management of health services. Cultural acceptance and trust.	Ineffective governance mechanisms. Lack of sufficient financing and payment systems. High workloads for healthcare providers. Cultural challenges, including mistrust of family physicians. Resistance from specialists.
Regmi & Jones	2020	To systematically compile and analyze the factors, both facilitating and hindering, that impact e-learning in health sciences education (e-HSE) as documented in medical literature.	Medical education institution	24	Interaction and collaboration between learners and facilitators. Considering learners' motivation and expectations. Utilizing user-friendly technology. Putting learners at the center of pedagogy	Poor motivation and expectation. Resource-intensive. Not suitable for all disciplines/contents. Lack of IT skills.
Thomae et al.	2023	To develop, execute, and assess an e-Learning initiative focused on complementary and integrative medicine material, tailoring the instructional	Medical education institution	Not defined	Stakeholder involvement. Expert panel guidance. Stepwise development. Collaboration with E-learning editor. Blended	Limited technological proficiency. Time and resource constraints. Resistance to change. Mismatched learning preferences. Lack of institutional support.

		formats to accommodate the distinct requirements of two distinct cohorts: postgraduate oncology physicians and undergraduate medical students			learning approach.
Ye et al.	2023	A systematic review aiming to understand the features, obstacles, and effective instances of telehealth implementation amid the COVID-19 pandemic in China.	Hospitals	32	<p>Access to technological infrastructure. Collaboration with technology companies. Engagement of health IT Professionals. integration of telehealth into clinical practice. Establishing regulatory frameworks. Cost-saving potential of telehealth.</p> <p>Limited access to technological infrastructure. Impact of the digital divide. Privacy concerns. Lack of regulatory oversight. Burden on healthcare providers. Infrastructure development challenges. Cultural acceptance issues. Accessibility barriers. Regulatory compliance. sustainability challenges.</p>