

Sociodemographic differences in patient experience with virtual care during COVID-19

Payal Agarwal^{1,2} MD payal.agarwal@wchospital.ca

Rick Wang³ MMath ri.wang@unityhealth.to

Christopher Meaney¹ MSc christopher.meaney@utoronto.ca

Sakina Walji¹ MD sakina.walji@sinaihealth.ca

Ali Damji¹ MD ali.damji@mail.utoronto.ca

Navsheer Gill Toor¹ MD NToor@southlakeregional.org

Gina Yip¹ MD gina.yip@gmail.com

Debbie Elman¹ MD Debbie.Elman@sunnybrook.ca

Tiffany Florindo¹ MD tiffany.florindo@medportal.ca

Susanna Fung¹ MD susannaf@gmail.com

Melissa Witty¹ MD wittym65@gmail.com

Thuy Nga Pham¹ MD thuynga.pham@utoronto.ca

Noor Ramji^{1,4} MD noor.ramji@unityhealth.to

Tara Kiran^{1,3,4,5} MD, MSc tara.kiran@utoronto.ca

¹Department of Family and Community Medicine, Temerty Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario

²Women's College Hospital Institute for Health System Solutions and Virtual Care, Women's College Hospital, Toronto, Ontario

³MAP Centre for Urban Health Solutions, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto, Canada

⁴Department of Family and Community Medicine, St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto, Ontario

⁵Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario

Corresponding author:

Tara Kiran, MD, MSc, MAP Centre for Urban Health Solutions, St. Michael's Hospital, Unity Health Toronto, 30 Bond St., Toronto, ON Canada M5B 1W8
tara.kiran@utoronto.ca, phone 416-864-3011, fax 416-864-3099

Manuscript Word Count: 2477

Number of Tables: 5

Number of Figures: 0

Number of Appendices: 2

Funding statement

Dr. Kiran is the Fidani Chair of Improvement and Innovation in Family Medicine at the University of Toronto and is supported as a Clinician Scientist by the Department of Family and Community Medicine (DFCM) at the University of Toronto and at St. Michael's Hospital. Funds from the Fidani Chair supported Dr. Agarwal as the Patient Experience Measurement Lead for the DFCM.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Prior presentations: None

Author contributions

PA and TK conceived of and designed the study together. RW and CM conducted the analysis. All authors helped interpret the data. PA drafted the manuscript with the support of TK and all authors critically reviewed it. All authors read and approved the final manuscript

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Ali Damji, Debbie Elman, Frances Cousins, Jennifer Stulberg, Joanne Laine-Gossin, Karuna Gupta, Linda Weber, Melissa Witty, Navsheer Gill Toor, Noor Ramji, Sakina Walji, Sam Tirkos, Susanna Fung, Susie Kim, Thuy Nga Pham, Tiffany Florindo for their support in developing and implementing the survey at their respective teaching practices, Trish O'Brien and Kirsten Eldridge for their support with survey implementation across all sites, Danielle Martin for her feedback on our draft manuscript, and the patient partners who helped us refine the survey questions.

Abstract

Purpose: We sought to understand patients' care-seeking behaviours during the pandemic, their use and views of different virtual care modalities, and whether these differed by sociodemographic factors.

Methods: We conducted a multi-site cross-sectional patient experience survey at thirteen academic primary care teaching practices between May and June of 2020. An anonymized link to an electronic survey was sent to a subset of patients with a valid email address on file; sampling was based on birth month. For each question, the proportion of respondents who selected each response was calculated, followed by a comparison by sociodemographic characteristics using chi-squared tests.

Results: In total, 7482 participants responded to the survey. Most received care from their primary care clinic during the pandemic (67.7%, 5068/7482), the majority via phone (82.5%, 4195/5086). Among those who received care, 30.53% (1509/4943) stated that they delayed seeking care because of the pandemic. Most participants reported a high degree of comfort with phone (92.4%, 3824/4139), video (95.2%, 238/250) and email or messaging (91.3%, 794/870). However, those reporting difficulty making ends meet, poor or fair health, and arriving in Canada in the last 10 years reported lower levels of comfort with virtual care and fewer wanted their practice to continue offering virtual options after the pandemic.

Conclusions: Our study suggest that newcomers, people living with a lower income, and those reporting poor or fair health have a stronger preference and comfort for in-person primary care. Further research should explore potential barriers to virtual care and how these could be addressed.

Keywords: COVID-19, Primary health care, virtual care, telemedicine

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has dramatically shifted the way health care is delivered and experienced by patients. Primary care practices in Canada, the US and elsewhere, rapidly switched to a virtual first approach in the first wave of the pandemic to limit transmission of the SARS-CoV2 virus and conserve Personal Protective Equipment¹. A study from Ontario found that shortly after the pandemic was declared, in-office visits reduced by 79% and virtual care increased 56-fold, comprising 71% of primary care physician visits². While this approach supported immediate public health goals, its impact on access, receipt of patient centered evidence-based care, and longer -term health outcomes is unclear³. As health systems consider what the “new normal” should look like, an examination of these impacts will be crucial.

This shift to a virtual-first approach in primary care has raised several concerns. Clinicians have noted anecdotally that patients with worrisome symptoms are delaying care⁴. Some note that the switch to virtual care may make care more accessible⁵⁻⁸ , while others have highlighted barriers certain populations face in accessing virtual care⁹⁻¹². Prior studies suggest patient characteristics including older age and lower income may limit one’s ability to benefit from digital health and virtual care services¹³⁻¹⁴. In addition, patients may not have access to required technologies such as a phone or internet access¹⁵⁻¹⁶. Despite this, very little literature to date is available on patient experience during the COVID-19 pandemic and how these differ by sociodemographic characteristics. Most existing studies on patient experience during COVID-19 are from acute care, and do not stratify experience based on patient demographics¹⁷⁻²¹.

We conducted a patient survey at multiple academic primary care clinics in Ontario, Canada to better understand patient experience during COVID-19. We were interested in patients' care-seeking behaviours, their use and views of different virtual care modalities, and whether these differed by sociodemographic factors.

Methods

Study design and setting

We conducted a multi-site cross-sectional survey to understand patient experience during the COVID-19 pandemic at thirteen core teaching practices affiliated with the University of Toronto Department of Family and Community Medicine situated in the Greater Toronto Area, Canada's largest metropolitan area. Participating practices were located in Toronto and surrounding areas including Mississauga, Markham, and Barrie. Practices range in size from roughly 11 physicians serving 14,000 patients to 80 physicians serving 50,000 patients; some have multiple locations. Physicians in all teaching practices are part of Family Health Organizations and formally enroll patients, have shared responsibility for after-hours care, and are paid primarily by age-sex adjusted capitation; twelve of the thirteen sites were part of Family Health Teams that included non-physician health professionals such as nurses, nurse practitioners, social workers and dietitians.

The survey was developed to directly inform quality improvement (QI) efforts at participating sites during COVID-19. The initiative was formally reviewed by institutional authorities at Unity

Health Toronto and deemed to neither require Research Ethics Board approval nor written informed consent from participants.

Study Population and Recruitment

A link to an open electronic patient experience survey is emailed every quarter to a subset of patients with a valid email address on file; sampling each quarter is based on birth month with all eligible patients receiving a survey in a given year. The current analysis focuses on patients who were sent the survey between May and June of 2020 because they had a birthday during the months of March, April or May of 2020. Each site distributed an anonymized link to patients in the manner by which they usually communicate electronically to patients (i.e. by email or using a secure messaging service). In some cases, the email address on file may belong to a family member or caregiver to allow them the option of filling out the survey on behalf of the patient. Recruitment was done in English, with one site also doing recruitment and survey completion in French. No incentives were provided to participants.

Survey Design

The survey was developed collaboratively by the family physicians who had a QI leadership role at participating sites. Where possible, questions were informed by existing surveys including the Commonwealth Fund International Health Policy Survey²²⁻²³ and the Ontario Primary Care Experience Survey, which was developed as part of a larger Primary Care Performance Measurement strategy to measure the performance across 9 domains²⁴⁻²⁵. The survey went through several iterations based on feedback from practice QI teams, a survey methodologist, a biostatistician, patient education and engagement specialists, and patient and family advisors. A paragraph at the start of the survey outlined the purpose of the survey, the reason they were being

asked to participate, and highlighted that the survey was voluntary and anonymous. The final survey was prepared in Qualtrics software, a digital platform to capture experience data, and included 43 potential questions over 5 thematic domains including: 1) seeking and delaying care, 2) use and comfort with virtual care, 3) urgent care access, 4) patient centeredness and 5) patient demographic and contextual factors. Participants could end the survey at any point and were able to review previously answered questions before submission. (See appendix for full survey)

Data Collection and Storage

Data collected via the electronic survey were stored on Qualtrics. All data was downloaded onto a secure research server at the University of Toronto. A script was run to remove any potentially identifying information including 1) IP addresses, 2) Email address, 3) longitude/latitude coordinates and 4) any free text fields (which may contain unstructured protected health information).

Statistical Analysis

We performed an initial descriptive statistics analysis on the responses of all participants across all sites who answered at least one question in the survey. For each question, we calculated the proportion of respondents who selected each response. We then compared patient responses by sociodemographic characteristics including age, gender, education, self-reported financial issues, immigration status, primary language, self-reported health, and usual primary care provider (PCP). P values were calculated using chi-squared tests and all data analysis was conducted using R version 4.0.

Results

The survey link was emailed to 32,307 patients at 13 practices (see Appendix). We presented sociodemographic data (Table 1) on the 7482 participants who answered one or more questions in the survey (23.3% response rate). Sixty-five percent of respondents were female (4379/6713) and 78.3% (5159/6588) reported having a college, university or graduate degree. Nine percent of respondents (590/6556) reported trouble making ends meet at the end of the month, while 29.0% (1928/6656) were not born in Canada (with 16.9% of these having arrived in the last 10 years). Eight percent (553/6851) reported filling out the survey on behalf of a family member. Fifty-five surveys were completed in French.

Care-seeking during COVID-19

Of all respondents, 67.7% (5068/7482) reported they received care in some way from their primary care clinic since the start of the pandemic. Financial status and self-reported health were significantly associated with care seeking behaviours during the pandemic ($p < 0.001$); a higher proportion of patients who noted trouble making ends meet (yes: 74.8%, 441/590, no: 65.3%, 3396/5201, prefer not to answer: 68.0%, 520/765) and those with lower self-rated health (fair or poor: 76.9%, 752/978, excellent: 59.8%, 599/1002) reported receiving care during the study period. Of the 32.3% (2414/7482) of patients who did not receive care during the study period, the most commonly cited reasons were that patients had no health need (72.4%) and patients were worried about safety (9.5%).

Of the 5068 patients who reported receiving care at their primary care practice during the pandemic, 30.5% (1509/4943) stated that they delayed seeking care because of the pandemic.

Gender, age, education level, financial status and self-reported health status were significantly associated with differences in seeking care ($p < 0.05$ for all); for example, a higher proportion of those with trouble making ends meet and those with lower self-rated health reported delays in seeking care (see Table 2).

Use and perceptions of virtual care

Eighty-two (4195/5086) percent of participants reported receiving care by phone, 30.5% (1553/5086) in-person, 17.4% (886/5086) via email or secure messaging, and 5.1% (260/5086) via video. Age, immigration status and self-rated health were significantly associated with differences in receiving in person care ($p < 0.05$ for all); the proportion who reported receiving in-person care was lower among those over the age of 65, those not born in Canada and those with lower self-rated health (Table 3). Women, young adults, those who rate their health as fair or poor and those who reported trouble making ends meet reported higher rates of phone use (see Table 3). Age and education level were significantly associated with differences in using email and secure messaging ($p < 0.001$ for all); those over the age of 65 (16.9%, 269/1592) and those with a high school degree or less (13.5%, 130/962) reported less use of email and secure messaging relative to other groups.

Overall, most respondents indicated they were extremely or somewhat comfortable with the privacy and security of virtual modalities including phone (92.4%, 3824/4139), video (95.2%, 238/250) and email or secure messaging (91.3%, 794/870). Financial status, immigration status and self-reported health status were significantly associated with differences in comfort with virtual care use ($p < 0.05$ for all); those having trouble making ends meet, those not born in

Canada and those rating their health as fair or poor reported lower levels of comfort with phone calls and email or secure messaging relative to other groups (see Table 4).

Future preferences for virtual care

Seventy-five percent (3798/5068), 52.2% (2644/5068), and 42.9% (2172/5068) of respondents said they wanted their practice to continue offering phone, email/secure messaging, and video after the pandemic, respectively. Age, education status, financial status, immigration status and self-reported health status were significantly associated with differences in wanting ongoing use of each of the three virtual care modalities ($p < 0.05$ for all); those over age 65, those whose education was high school or less, those reporting yes or “I don’t know” when asked about difficulty making ends meet, those born outside Canada, and those in fair or poor health reported the lowest desire for the three virtual care modalities to continue after the pandemic compared to other groups (see Table 5).

Discussion

Our analysis of more than 7400 patient experience surveys across 13 primary care clinics during the first months of the COVID-19 pandemic found important differences in care-seeking and comfort with virtual care based on patient income, self-reported health, and other demographic characteristics. Most participants received care from their primary care clinic in some way during the study period; however, almost a third who sought care reported they delayed it due to concerns about the pandemic. Patients who had trouble making ends meet and those who reported their health as fair or poor were more likely to seek care during the pandemic, yet were also more likely to report they delayed seeking care. Patient generally reported a high degree of

comfort with phone, video and email or secure messaging. But, those reporting difficulty making ends meet, poor or fair health, and arriving in Canada in the last 10 years reported lower levels of comfort and less likely to want their practice to continue offering these virtual options.

Our results, similar to other emerging literature, suggests a complex relationship between the social determinants of health and patient comfort and preference regarding accessing care through virtual tools. A US based study prior to the pandemic found that while younger patients and those with physical disabilities were more likely to use video visits to access care, those who reported lower incomes and lived in rural populations were less likely to use this modality²⁶. A recent US-based primary care study found that after care shifted to a virtual-first approach during the pandemic, a significantly smaller proportion of visits overall were with people who were low income, non-white, or non-English speakers²⁷. However, a Canadian based study found that similar to our participants, those with the highest care needs (older, multiple co-morbidities), were more likely to access primary care during the early months of the pandemic compared to other groups².

As many predict virtual care will continue to be a part of care delivery post-pandemic, this study highlights the importance of integrating patient experience data into future care delivery planning. Similar to other recently published data^{2,28,29}, our experience data indicates phone was by far the most utilized modality of virtual care and overall, participants were comfortable using virtual modalities to receive care. Patients who report financial troubles and poor health, had a higher percentage reporting accessing care (virtually and in person) during the pandemic compared to other groups; however, they reported greater concerns with the privacy and security

of virtual care and less desire for virtual care to be an ongoing part of their primary care experience. This suggests that while public health measures may have pushed populations with the highest care needs to use virtual care, these modalities did not provide all patients with an equitable, patient-centered care experience. Further research should explore reasons behind the relative discomfort and low interest in virtual care and how barriers could be addressed. While access to technology may be part of this problem, other factors such as health and digital literacy, and support from peers and health care providers may also be significant³⁰. Without further patient experience and demographic data to understand the ongoing use of virtual care, we risk leaving behind those who need care most.

Strengths and Limitations

Our study had several key strengths and limitations. Our study included a large sample of respondents from multiple clinics across both urban and suburban communities. Patients were randomly sampled using birth month. Survey questions were relevant to COVID-19 and informed by primary care leaders and patients. However, our findings are open to selection bias because of the response rate, mode of delivery, and the survey being offered primarily in English; however, demographics of our sample confirm that we reached a diverse group of patients. We found substantial differences in utilization and perspectives of virtual care by sociodemographic characteristics, but these may be an underestimate of true differences. Our survey reports on experience during the early phase of the pandemic and patients' comfort and preferences may have evolved since. Finally, although our sample was taken from 13 primary care practices, these were all academic practices in the Greater Toronto Area where physicians were paid by capitation which may limit the generalizability of the findings.

Conclusions

We found that most patients were comfortable using virtual modalities and wanted virtual care options to continue. However, there were important differences by sociodemographic characteristics, for example, with those having difficulty making ends meet, reporting poor or fair health, and being born outside of Canada being less likely to report comfort with virtual modalities and less likely to want virtual care options to continue post-pandemic. Moving forward, clinicians and system decision makers need to carefully consider how we integrate virtual care into practices to ensure equity in access to primary care.

References

1. Lemire F, Slade S. Reflections on family practice and the pandemic first wave. *Can Fam Physician*. 2020;66(6):468.
2. Glazier RH, Green ME, Wu FC, Frymire E, Kopp A, Kiran T. Shifts in office and virtual primary care during the early COVID-19 pandemic in Ontario, Canada. *CMAJ*. 2021;193(6):E200-E210. doi:10.1503/cmaj.202303
3. Philip K, Cumella A, Farrington-Douglas J, Laffan M, Hopkinson N. Respiratory patient experience of measures to reduce risk of COVID-19: findings from a descriptive cross-sectional UK wide survey. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(9):e040951. doi:[10.1136/bmjopen-2020-040951](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-040951)
4. Krist AH, DeVoe JE, Cheng A, Ehrlich T, Jones SM. Redesigning Primary Care to Address the COVID-19 Pandemic in the Midst of the Pandemic. *Ann Fam Med*. 2020;18(4):349-354. doi:[10.1370/afm.2557](https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.2557)
5. Bhatia RS, Jamieson T, Shaw J, Piovesan C, Kelley LT, Falk W. Canada's virtual care revolution: A framework for success. *Commentary - C.D.Howe Institute*. 2020(586):0_1,0_2,1-20. <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/canadas-virtual-care-revolution-framework-success/docview/2480820454/se-2?accountid=201395>
6. Zulman DM, Verghese A. Virtual Care, Telemedicine Visits, and Real Connection in the Era of COVID-19: Unforeseen Opportunity in the Face of Adversity. *JAMA*. 2021;325(5):437-438. doi:[10.1001/jama.2020.27304](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.27304)
7. Herzer KR, Pronovost PJ. Ensuring Quality in the Era of Virtual Care. *JAMA*. 2021;325(5):429-430. doi:[10.1001/jama.2020.24955](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.24955)

8. Appireddy R, Jalini S, Shukla G, Boissé Lomax L. Tackling the Burden of Neurological Diseases in Canada with Virtual Care During the COVID-19 Pandemic and Beyond. *Can J Neurol Sci.* 2020;47(5):594-597. doi:[10.1017/cjn.2020.92](https://doi.org/10.1017/cjn.2020.92)
9. Rashid M. Virtual Inequity: Do virtual visits risk leaving some people behind? *Can Fam Physician.* 2020. Available at: <https://www.cfp.ca/news/2020/09/25/09-25>
10. Das LT, Gonzalez CJ. Preparing Telemedicine for the Frontlines of Healthcare Equity. *J GEN INTERN MED.* 2020;35(8):2443-2444. doi:[10.1007/s11606-020-05941-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-020-05941-9)
11. Fujioka JK, Budhwani S, Thomas-Jacques T, et al. Challenges and Strategies for Promoting Health Equity in Virtual Care: Protocol for a Scoping Review of Reviews. *JMIR Res Protoc.* 2020;9(12):e22847. doi:[10.2196/22847](https://doi.org/10.2196/22847)
12. Peretz PJ, Islam N, Matiz LA. Community Health Workers and Covid-19 — Addressing Social Determinants of Health in Times of Crisis and Beyond. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;383(19):e108. doi:[10.1056/NEJMp2022641](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2022641)
13. Chan S, O’Riordan A, Appireddy R. Exploring the Determinants and Experiences of Senior Stroke Patients with Virtual Care. *Can J Neurol Sci.* 2021;48(1):87-93. doi:[10.1017/cjn.2020.162](https://doi.org/10.1017/cjn.2020.162)
14. Scheerder A, van Deursen A, van Dijk J. Determinants of Internet skills, uses and outcomes. A systematic review of the second- and third-level digital divide. *Telematics and Informatics.* 2017;34(8):1607-1624. doi:[10.1016/j.tele.2017.07.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2017.07.007)
15. Velasquez D, Mehrotra A. Ensuring the Growth of Telehealth During COVID-19 Does Not Exacerbate Disparities in Care. *Health Affairs Blog.* 2020. doi:[10.1377/hblog20200505.591306](https://doi.org/10.1377/hblog20200505.591306)

16. Tang E, Li MK, Mauti ER, Masi R, Goldberg R. “Doctor Zoom will see you now”: An equity-focused perspective on virtual care in the era of COVID-19. *University of Toronto Medical Journal*. 2021;98(2):4. Available at: <https://utmj.org/index.php/UTMJ/article/view/1424/1306>
17. Khairat S, Pillai M, Edson B, Gianforcaro R. Evaluating the Telehealth Experience of Patients With COVID-19 Symptoms: Recommendations on Best Practices. *Journal of Patient Experience*. 2020;7(5):665-672. doi:[10.1177/2374373520952975](https://doi.org/10.1177/2374373520952975)
18. Sirotich E, Dillingham S, Grainger R, et al. Capturing Patient-Reported Outcomes During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Development of the COVID-19 Global Rheumatology Alliance Patient Experience Survey. *Arthritis Care Res*. 2020;72(7):871-873. doi:[10.1002/acr.24257](https://doi.org/10.1002/acr.24257)
19. Garrido-Cumbrera M, Marzo-Ortega H, Christen L, et al. Assessment of impact of the COVID-19 pandemic from the perspective of patients with rheumatic and musculoskeletal diseases in Europe: results from the REUMAVID study (phase 1). *RMD Open*. 2021;7(1):e001546. doi:[10.1136/rmdopen-2020-001546](https://doi.org/10.1136/rmdopen-2020-001546)
20. Silvera GA, Wolf JA, Stanowski A, Studer Q. The influence of COVID-19 visitation restrictions on patient experience and safety outcomes: A critical role for subjective advocates. *Patient Experience Journal*. 2021;8(1):30-39. doi:[10.35680/2372-0247.1596](https://doi.org/10.35680/2372-0247.1596)
21. Bains J, Greenwald PW, Mulcare MR, et al. Utilizing Telemedicine in a Novel Approach to COVID-19 Management and Patient Experience in the Emergency Department. *Telemedicine and e-Health*. 2021;27(3):254-260. doi:[10.1089/tmj.2020.0162](https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2020.0162)
22. CIHI. Commonwealth Fund survey, 2019. <https://www.cihi.ca/en/commonwealth-fund-survey-2019>

23. Commonwealth Fund. 2019 Commonwealth Fund International Health Policy Survey of Primary Care Physicians.
<https://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/surveys/2019/dec/2019-commonwealth-fund-international-health-policy-survey-primary>
24. Hutchison B, Haj-Ali W, Dobell G, Yeritsyan N, Degani N, Gushue S. Prioritizing and Implementing Primary Care Performance Measures for Ontario. *Healthc Policy*. 2020;16(1):43-57. doi:[10.12927/hcpol.2020.26291](https://doi.org/10.12927/hcpol.2020.26291)
25. Health Quality Ontario. Primary Care Patient Experience Survey: Support Guide. 2015.
<http://www.hqontario.ca/Portals/0/documents/qi/primary-care/primary-care-patient-experience-survey-support-guide-en.pdf>
26. Park J, Erikson C, Han X, Iyer P. Are State Telehealth Policies Associated With The Use Of Telehealth Services Among Underserved Populations? *Health Affairs*. 2018;37(12):2060-2068. doi:[10.1377/hlthaff.2018.05101](https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2018.05101)
27. Nouri S, Khoong E, Lyles C, Karliner L. Addressing Equity in Telemedicine for Chronic Disease Management During the Covid-19 Pandemic. *NEJM Catalyst Innovations in Care Delivery*. 2020. <https://catalyst.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/CAT.20.0123>
28. Mehrotra A, Ray K, Brockmeyer DM, Barnett ML, Bender JA. Rapidly Converting to “Virtual Practices”: Outpatient Care in the Era of Covid-19. *NEJM Catalyst Innovations in Care Delivery*. 2020. <https://catalyst.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/CAT.20.0091>
29. Bhatia RS, Chu C, Pang A, Tadrous M, Stamenova V, Cram P. Virtual care use before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: a repeated cross-sectional study. *CMAJ Open*. 2021;9(1):E107-E114. doi:[10.9778/cmajo.20200311](https://doi.org/10.9778/cmajo.20200311)

30. Weiss D, Rydland HT, Øversveen E, Jensen MR, Solhaug S, Krokstad S. Innovative technologies and social inequalities in health: A scoping review of the literature. Virgili G, ed. *PLoS ONE*. 2018;13(4):e0195447. doi:[10.1371/journal.pone.0195447](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0195447)

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of survey respondents (n=7482)

Demographic characteristic	Survey respondents n (%)
Age (n=6744)	
0 to 5 years old	169 (2.51%)
6 to 17 years old	166 (2.46%)
18 to 24 years old	120 (1.78%)
25 to 34 years old	520 (7.71%)
35 to 49 years old	1412 (20.94%)
50 to 64 years old	2002 (29.69%)
65 to 79 years old	1921 (28.48%)
80 years or older	434 (6.44%)
Gender (n=6713)	
Woman	4379 (65.23%)
Man	2221 (33.09%)
Other	60 (0.89%)
Prefer not to answer	53 (0.79%)
Education level (n=6588)	
Highschool or less	1429 (21.69%)
College/University	3198 (48.54%)
Graduate/Professional	1961 (29.77%)
Trouble making ends meet (n=6556)	
Yes	590 (9.00%)
No	5201 (79.33%)
Don't know/Prefer not to answer	765 (11.67%)
Born in Canada (n=6656)	
Yes	4728 (71.03%)
No	1928 (28.97%)
Arrive in last 10 years (n=1856)	

	Yes	326 (17.56%)
	No	1530 (82.44%)
Preferred language (n=6678)		
	English	6576 (98.47%)
	Non-English	102 (1.53%)
Self rated health (n=6665)		
	Excellent	1002 (15.03%)
	Very good	2599 (38.99%)
	Good	2086 (31.30%)
	Fair/Poor	978 (14.67%)
Usual PCP (n=6545)		
	Staff physician	4842 (73.98%)
	Resident physician	1217 (18.59%)
	Nurse practitioner	173 (2.64%)
	Unsure	313 (4.78%)

Table 2. Proportion of respondents who received care at their primary care practice who reported that they delayed seeking care because of the pandemic, by sociodemographic characteristic

Demographics	Delayed Care n (%)	P-value
All	1509 (30.53%)	
Age		
<18 years old	61 (29.90%)	<0.01
18-34 years old	158 (35.03%)	
35-64 years old	704 (31.44%)	
65+ years old	429 (26.85%)	
Gender		
Woman	932 (31.65%)	<0.001
Man	376 (26.07%)	
Other	20 (42.55%)	
Prefer not to answer	18 (46.15%)	
Education		
Highschool or less	238 (24.74%)	<0.001
College/University	637 (30.09%)	
Graduate/Professional	443 (33.95%)	
Trouble making ends meet		
Yes	188 (42.63%)	<0.001
No	928 (27.33%)	
Don't know/Prefer not to answer	196 (37.69%)	
Born in Canada		
Yes	966 (30.92%)	0.07
No	366 (28.09%)	
Arrive <10 years		
Yes	66 (29.33%)	0.79
No	289 (28.20%)	

Preferred Language			
	English	1322 (30.20%)	0.49
	Non-English	24 (34.78%)	
Self rated health			
	Excellent	153 (25.54%)	<0.001
	Very good	475 (28.84%)	
	Good	433 (30.20%)	
	Fair/Poor	275 (36.57%)	
Usual PCP			
	Staff physician	976 (30.13%)	0.47
	Resident physician	246 (29.85%)	
	Nurse practitioner	45 (36.59%)	
	Unsure	52 (29.21%)	

Table 3. Percentage of patients who reported receiving care by phone and in person during the pandemic, by sociodemographic characteristic

Demographics	In person care n (%)	P-value	Phone care n (%)	P-value
All	1553 (30.64%)		4195(82.77%)	
Age				
<18 years old	102 (50.00%)	<0.001	143 (70.10%)	<0.001
18-34 years old	181 (40.13%)		404 (89.58%)	
35-64 years old	603 (26.93%)		1922 (85.84%)	
65+ years old	476 (29.79%)		1338 (83.73%)	
Gender				
Woman	882 (29.95%)	0.57	2559 (86.89%)	<0.001
Man	443 (30.72%)		1163 (80.65%)	
Other	17 (36.17%)		41 (87.23%)	
Prefer not to answer	9 (23.08%)		33 (84.62%)	
Education Level				
Highschool or less	303 (31.50%)	0.42	787 (81.81%)	<0.05
College/University	618 (29.19%)		1818 (85.88%)	
Graduate/Professional	396 (30.34%)		1109 (84.98%)	
Trouble making ends meet				
Yes	122 (27.66%)	0.28	396 (89.80%)	<0.001
No	1047 (30.83%)		2840 (83.63%)	
Born in Canada				
Yes	977 (31.27%)	<0.05	2630 (84.19%)	0.13
No	363 (27.86%)		1121 (86.03%)	
Arrive <10 years				
Yes	77 (34.22%)	<0.05	196 (87.11%)	0.73
No	276 (26.93%)		881 (85.95%)	
Preferred language				

English	1326 (30.29%)	0.88	3706 (84.67%)	1.00
Non-English	22 (31.88%)		58 (84.06%)	
Self Reported Health				
Excellent	221 (36.89%)	<0.001	470 (78.46%)	<0.001
Very good	522 (31.69%)		1390 (84.40%)	
Good	383 (26.71%)		1222 (85.22%)	
Fair/Poor	220 (29.26%)		673 (89.49%)	
Usual PCP				
Staff physician	963 (29.73%)	0.10	2750 (84.90%)	0.22
Resident physician	270 (32.77%)		701 (85.07%)	
Nurse practitioner	46 (37.40%)		97 (78.86%)	
Unsure	50 (28.09%)		146 (82.02%)	

Table 4. Percentage of patients who reported they were comfortable with the privacy and security of using phone, video and email or secure messaging to receive care during the pandemic, by sociodemographic characteristic

Demographics	Phone n (%)	P-value	Video n (%)	P-value	Email Messaging n (%)	P-value
All	3824 (92.39%)		238 (95.20%)		794 (91.26%)	
Age						
<18 years old	138 (96.50%)	<0.05	19 (95.00%)	0.60	17 (94.44%)	0.43
18-34 years old	371 (91.83%)		28 (93.33%)		90 (87.38%)	
35-64 years old	1800 (93.65%)		104 (94.55%)		383 (90.54%)	
65+ years old	1223 (91.41%)		63 (98.44%)		249 (92.57%)	
Gender						
Woman	2385 (93.20%)	<0.001	128 (96.97%)	0.17	501 (90.60%)	<0.001
Man	1077 (92.61%)		75 (94.94%)		219 (92.80%)	
Other	40 (97.56%)		4 (80.00%)		15 (100.00%)	
Prefer not to answer	24 (72.73%)		6 (85.71%)		2 (40.00%)	
Education Level						
Highschool or less	743 (94.41%)	0.17	47 (92.16%)	0.20	121 (93.08%)	0.65
College/University	1679 (92.35%)		94 (97.92%)		358 (90.63%)	
Graduate/Professional	1032 (93.06%)		66 (92.96%)		250 (91.91%)	
Trouble making ends meet						
Yes	354 (89.39%)	<0.001	24 (92.31%)	0.63	70 (85.37%)	<0.001
No	2679 (94.33%)		153 (96.23%)		576 (93.96%)	
I don't know/Prefer not to answer	400 (87.53%)		30 (96.77%)		75 (78.12%)	
Born in Canada						
Yes	2471 (93.95%)	<0.001	159 (95.78%)	1.00	526 (92.93%)	<0.05
No	1019 (90.90%)		54 (94.74%)		204 (87.18%)	

Arrive in the last 10 years						
Yes	176 (89.80%)	0.80	7 (100.00%)	1.00	34 (82.93%)	0.52
No	799 (90.69%)		45 (93.75%)		163 (88.11%)	
Preferred language						
English	3440 (92.82%)	0.50	209 (95.43%)	0.48	727 (91.33%)	0.40
Non-English	52 (89.66%)		3 (75.00%)		7 (77.78%)	
Self Reported Health						
Excellent	455 (96.81%)	<0.001	30 (93.75%)	0.98	105 (95.45%)	<0.05
Very good	1324 (95.25%)		65 (95.59%)		259 (93.50%)	
Good	1131 (92.55%)		72 (94.74%)		235 (90.04%)	
Fair/Poor	579 (86.03%)		42 (95.45%)		133 (85.81%)	
Usual PCP						
Staff physician	2575 (93.64%)	<0.05	164 (96.47%)	0.17	568 (92.21%)	0.07
Resident physician	640 (91.30%)		28 (87.50%)		107 (87.70%)	
Nurse practitioner	86 (88.66%)		4 (100.00%)		17 (89.47%)	
Unsure	130 (89.04%)		11 (91.67%)		24 (80.00%)	

Table 5. Preferences for ongoing uses of virtual care options after the pandemic, by sociodemographic characteristic

Demographics	Phone n (%)	P-value	Video n (%)	P-value	Email Messaging n (%)	P-value
All	3798 (74.94%)		2172 (42.86%)		2644 (52.17%)	
Age						
<18 years old	171 (83.82%)	<0.05	120 (58.82%)	<0.001	117 (57.35%)	<0.001
18-34 years old	385 (85.37%)		252 (55.88%)		292 (64.75%)	
35-64 years old	1886 (84.23%)		1206 (53.86%)		1352 (60.38%)	
65+ years old	1291 (80.79%)		549 (34.36%)		834 (52.19%)	
Gender						
Woman	2510 (85.23%)	<0.001	1418 (48.15%)	0.45	1758 (59.69%)	<0.01
Man	1142 (79.20%)		662 (45.91%)		780 (54.09%)	
Other	37 (78.72%)		23 (48.94%)		31 (65.96%)	
Prefer not to answer	29 (74.36%)		21 (53.85%)		20 (51.28%)	
Education Level						
Highschool or less	770 (80.04%)	<0.05	384 (39.92%)	<0.001	468 (48.65%)	<0.001
College/University	1777 (83.94%)		993 (46.91%)		1227 (57.96%)	
Graduate/Professional	1098 (84.14%)		705 (54.02%)		846 (64.83%)	
Trouble making ends meet						
Yes	362 (82.09%)	<0.001	195 (44.22%)	<0.001	257 (58.28%)	<0.001
No	2869 (84.48%)		1665 (49.03%)		2037 (59.98%)	
I don't know/Prefer not to answer	387 (74.42%)		204 (39.23%)		232 (44.62%)	
Born in Canada						
Yes	2687 (86.01%)	<0.001	1579 (50.54%)	<0.001	1890 (60.50%)	<0.001
No	1005 (77.13%)		527 (40.45%)		683 (52.42%)	
Arrive in the last 10 years						
Yes	166 (73.78%)	0.13	89 (39.56%)	0.90	101 (44.89%)	<0.05

No	806 (78.63%)		413 (40.29%)		554 (54.05%)	
Preferred language						
English	3642 (83.21%)	0.12	2086 (47.66%)	0.08	2532 (57.85%)	<0.05
Non-English	52 (75.36%)		25 (36.23%)		29 (42.03%)	
Self Reported Health						
Excellent	519 (86.64%)	<0.01	330 (55.09%)	<0.001	382 (63.77%)	<0.001
Very good	1392 (84.52%)		843 (51.18%)		977 (59.32%)	
Good	1179 (82.22%)		635 (44.28%)		809 (56.42%)	
Fair/Poor	597 (79.39%)		294 (39.10%)		394 (52.39%)	
Usual PCP						
Staff physician	2730 (84.29%)	<0.001	1613 (49.80%)	<0.001	1943 (59.99%)	<0.001
Resident physician	659 (79.98%)		336 (40.78%)		415 (50.36%)	
Nurse practitioner	104 (84.55%)		55 (44.72%)		73 (59.35%)	
Unsure	133 (74.72%)		79 (44.38%)		92 (51.69%)	

Appendix A: Site Demographics

Site name	City	Number of surveys sent (N= 32, 307)	Number of responses (N=7,532)	Response Rate (%)
Barrie and Community Family Health Team	Barrie	748	279	37%
Credit Valley Family Health Team	Mississauga	2,056	645	31%
Health for All Family Health Team	Markham	1,900	535	28%
Mount Sinai Academic Family Health Team	Toronto	2,100	391	19%
Southlake Family Health Team	Newmarket	1,968	735	37%
North York Family Health Team	North York	1,466	390	27%
Platinum Medical Family Health Organization	Scarborough	1,792	222	12%
Sunnybrook Academic Family Health Team	Toronto	1,447	409	28%
St. Joseph's Health Centre Family Medicine/Urban Family Health Team	Toronto	1,135	265	23%
St. Michael's Hospital Academic Family Health Team	Toronto	5,180	1337	26%

South East Toronto Family Health Team	Toronto	5,244	591	11%
Summerville Family Health Team	Mississauga	5,070	1426	28%
Women's College Hospital Family Practice Health Centre	Toronto	2,201	307	14%