

1 **Title: Patient satisfaction with telemedicine in the Philippines during the COVID-19 pandemic**

2 **Running head: Patient satisfaction with telemedicine in the Philippines**

3 Alicia Victoria G. Noceda ^{1*}, Lianne Margot M. Acierto ¹, Morvenn Chaimek C. Bertiz ¹, David

4 Emmanuel H. Dionisio ¹, Chelsea Beatrice L. Laurito ¹, Girrard Alphonse T. Sanchez ¹, Arianna

5 Maever L. Amit ^{1,2}

6 **Affiliations:**

7 ¹ School of Medicine and Public Health, Ateneo de Manila University, Philippines

8 ² National Clinical Trials and Translation Center, National Institutes of Health, University of the

9 Philippines Manila, Philippines

10 *** Corresponding author:**

11 Alicia Victoria G. Noceda

12 School of Medicine and Public Health

13 Ateneo de Manila University

14 Philippines

15 E-mail: aliciagnoceda@gmail.com

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39 **ABSTRACT**

40

41 **Introduction:** The capacity to deliver essential health services has been negatively impacted by the
42 COVID-19 pandemic particularly due to lockdown restrictions. Telemedicine provides a safe,
43 efficient, and effective solution that addresses the needs of patients and the health system. However,
44 there remain implementation challenges and barriers to patient adoption in resource-limited settings as
45 in the Philippines. This study thus aimed to describe patient perspectives and experiences with
46 telemedicine services, and explore the factors that influence telemedicine use and satisfaction.

47 **Methods:** This study used a mixed-methods design through online surveys and in-depth interviews.
48 An online survey using Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (CAHPS)
49 Clinician & Group Adult Visit Survey 4.0 (beta) and Telehealth Usability Questionnaire (TUQ) was
50 accomplished by 200 participants aged 18 to 65 years. A subsample of 16 participants was
51 interviewed to provide insights to the quantitative data. We used descriptive statistics to analyze
52 survey data and grounded theory to analyze data from interviews.

53 **Results:** Participants were generally satisfied with telemedicine services, with most reporting that this
54 was an efficient and convenient alternative to face-to-face consultations. However, only 2 in 5
55 perceived telemedicine as affordable. Our quantitative findings suggest that participants preferred
56 telemedicine services rather than in-person consultations, especially in cases where they feel that their
57 condition is not urgent and does not need extensive physical examination. Safety against COVID-19,
58 and the availability of multiple communication platforms contributed to patient satisfaction with
59 telemedicine. Negative perceptions of patients on their telemedicine provider, perceived higher costs,
60 poor connectivity and other technological issues were found to be barriers to patient satisfaction.

61 **Discussion:** Telemedicine is viewed as a safe and efficient alternative to receiving care. Continued
62 adoption of telemedicine will require improvements in technology and better patient communication
63 related to their telemedicine provider and the associated costs.

64 **Keywords:** telehealth, telemedicine, patient satisfaction, COVID-19, Philippines

65

66

67

68 INTRODUCTION

69 The COVID-19 pandemic has negatively impacted the capacity to deliver essential health
70 services especially among low-and-middle income countries such as the Philippines (1). Hospital
71 admissions and procedures declined as lockdown restrictions were imposed in the country (2).
72 Telemedicine provides an opportunity to minimize exposure to health workers and patients, while
73 allowing patients to access high-quality healthcare that is safe, efficient, and cost-effective (3,4).
74 Further, the utilization of telemedicine for non-urgent cases reduces the surge of outpatient visits
75 following the COVID-19 crisis (5).

76 Although telemedicine has been recognized globally as a viable option to expand the reach of
77 limited healthcare providers and resources during the pandemic, challenges including potential costs,
78 limited technical resources, data privacy issues, and risks to patient safety pose problems to its wide-
79 scale implementation (6,8). In the Philippines, health care and services were predominantly delivered
80 through face-to-face means with an increase in the use of telemedicine especially in urban settings
81 during the pandemic (7). Studying patient satisfaction is critical to guide action plans for the quality
82 improvement of telemedicine services (8,9). To date, only three quantitative local studies have
83 documented patient perspectives and experiences with telemedicine services during the pandemic
84 (10–12). Our study builds on the existing evidence and aimed to provide a more in-depth insight into
85 telemedicine use and satisfaction through the lens of patients in a low-an-middle income country. In
86 better understanding patient experience and satisfaction with telemedicine, this study may provide
87 insights into opportunities for integrating telemedicine into routine care and improving telemedicine
88 services for widespread adoption even beyond the pandemic.

89 METHODS

90 Study Design

91 This study used an explanatory mixed-methods design consisting of an online survey and in-
92 depth interviews. The qualitative component was guided by grounded theory to study concrete
93 realities of participants and experiences using telemedicine services to render a conceptual
94 understanding of patient satisfaction through an inductive, iterative, and interactive method (13).

95 Study Participants

96 Participants were individuals aged 18 to 65 who reside in the Philippines and received
97 telemedicine services during the COVID-19 pandemic.

98 **Sampling and Study Size**

99 Convenience sampling was used given the logistical constraints to conduct field data
100 collection during the pandemic. For the online survey, participants were invited through networks,
101 telemedicine providers, Facebook, and Instagram. A subsample of the survey participants was invited
102 for an in-depth interview. We selected them based on age, sex, location, and survey answers relating
103 to their telemedicine experience and satisfaction to allow maximum variation sampling, which aims to
104 capture as many population contexts as possible. The chosen respondents were individually contacted
105 using contact details they provided in the survey through text or email. A total of 200 participants
106 answered the online survey and 16 of them were interviewed.

107 **Instruments and Measures**

108 The online survey questionnaire consisted of items on key socio-demographic characteristics
109 and health-related expenditures, and questions from two validated instruments: 15 questions from
110 Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (CAHPS) Clinician & Group Adult Visit
111 Survey 4.0 (beta) and 11 questions from Telehealth Usability Questionnaire (TUQ) (14,15). CAHPS
112 is a registered trademark of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) with the
113 purpose of advancing our scientific understanding of patient experience with healthcare. TUQ was
114 designed to be a comprehensive questionnaire that covers all usability factors, including usefulness,
115 ease of use, effectiveness, reliability, and satisfaction. The TUQ has acceptable construct validity and
116 internal consistency (16–18). Levels of patient satisfaction were measured for six components
117 (convenience, communication, patient-physician relationship, cost, access, overall satisfaction) using
118 a 5-point Likert scale to rate responses (1: strongly disagree; 2: disagree; 3: neutral; 4: disagree; 5:
119 strongly agree). Participants were asked how they found out about telemedicine: advertising/paid
120 promotions/endorsements, news, personal research, recommendations by friends or a health
121 professional, social media, or through other means. Participants were also asked on the telemedicine
122 platforms used: SMS (text message), messaging applications (e.g., Facebook Messenger, Viber,
123 email, video call, voice call), telemedicine-specific platforms (e.g., KonsultaMD, SeeYouDoc, Aide

124 mobile app, ClinicKo, Kitika, KonsultaMD, Medgate, SeeYouDoc, SeriousMD), and others not in the
125 options. Comparisons of the quality of services delivered through telemedicine and in-person were
126 measured using a 5-point Likert scale of agreement to the following statements: “Telemedicine
127 services are the same as in-person consultations” and “Telemedicine services are better than in-person
128 consultations”. A more in-depth response was obtained in the interviews, probing on their
129 telemedicine use and experience, reasons for preferring or not preferring telemedicine over face-to-
130 face, and the factors influencing their telemedicine use and satisfaction.

131 **Data Collection Procedures**

132 We collected data through an online survey and online interviews from July to November
133 2021. We used Google Forms for the online survey, while Zoom and Google Meet were used for the
134 interviews. We pre-tested the questionnaire and interview guide in English and Filipino among 15
135 participants who were similar in characteristics to our study population. The pre-test was conducted
136 online in the same manner as a full-scale survey and assessed administration, organization, and
137 content. The survey was improved based on the comments during the pre-testing phase. All survey
138 participants were asked if they were interested in participating in the interview. Among those who
139 consented, we invited participants for an interview through a video call platform (i.e., Zoom, Google
140 Meet) chosen by the respondents. Each interview lasted anywhere from 30 to 120 minutes. Each
141 interview participant was given approximately USD 3 (USD 1 = PhP 52 as of 11 May 2022) worth of
142 token for participation. Interviews were conducted until data saturation was reached (19). All
143 participants consented to the interview being recorded.

144 **Data Analysis**

145 *Quantitative Analysis*

146 We analyzed our quantitative data using descriptive statistics: percentage for categorical
147 variables, and median for continuous variables using SPSS Statistics version 25.0 (20). We described
148 participants according to their age in years, sex (male or female), setting of residence (urban or rural),
149 residence by island group (Luzon, Visayas, Mindanao), educational attainment (secondary or lower,
150 college, post-graduate), employment status (full-time employment, part-time employment,
151 unemployed, student, retired), monthly household income, monthly household health expenditure, and

152 monthly individual health expenditure, membership to any health insurance (yes, no), overall health
153 rating measured as a 5-point Likert scale. Levels of patient satisfaction were measured by computing
154 the frequency and percentage for each item. This analysis is consistent with a study by Ackerman (21)
155 that used TUQ to assess patients' utilization of and satisfaction with telemental health in the perinatal
156 period. For comparisons between telemedicine services and in-person consultations, we computed the
157 frequency and percentage for both questions with respect to those who answered 'agree' and 'strongly
158 agree'. We classified those disagreed or strongly disagreed that telemedicine is better than in-person
159 under the theme, "Telemedicine services are inferior to in-person visits".

160 *Qualitative Analysis*

161 All interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and translated from Filipino to
162 English. The researchers are native and/or fluent speakers of the two languages. Each participant was
163 assigned a code to maintain anonymity. Inductive analysis was used to identify emergent themes and
164 patterns from the qualitative data focusing on experiences and satisfaction with telemedicine services ,
165 guided by the principles of grounded theory (22). Transcripts of the interviews were read to identify
166 themes and two research members independently coded the interviews according to themes. Each
167 interview was coded according to general themes: facilitators or barriers to telemedicine use and
168 satisfaction. Patterns from codes were used to further generate themes, which are central organizing
169 concepts. The research team reviewed and finalized the themes. Any disagreements were resolved
170 through a consensus. The quotes presented in this paper are either in the original English or translated
171 from Filipino.

172 **Ethics Statement**

173 This research was given ethical approval by the Ateneo University Research Ethics
174 Committee (SMPH 2021 Group 15). Only those who consented to participate accomplished the online
175 survey. Digital written informed consent was obtained from participants prior to the interview.

176 **RESULTS**

177 **Participant Characteristics**

178 Our survey participants had a median age of 31.50 years (IQR 23.5-46.0 years). More than
179 half of our study population were female (64.0%) and college graduates (65.0%). A total of 62

180 participants worked full-time (31.0%) and 162 resided in Luzon (81.0%). The median monthly
181 household income of participants was USD 577, median monthly household health expenditure was
182 USD 69, and median monthly individual health expenditure was USD 38. Only half availed of any
183 health insurance (51.5%). The median overall health rating of participants was 4 out of 5 (**Table 1**).

184 The median age in years of the 16 interview participants was 29. More than half (62.5%) were
185 female. Thirteen (81.25%) participants were from Luzon, two (12.5%) were from Visayas, and one
186 (6.25%) was from Mindanao. More than half (68.75%) of the participants availed of health insurance.
187 Only seven (43.75%) participants disclosed their monthly household income with a median of USD
188 577.

189 **Overall Patient Satisfaction**

190 Across all statements, most participants strongly agreed that they are satisfied with
191 telemedicine services in terms of convenience, communication, patient-physician relationship, cost,
192 and access (**Table 2**). Of these reasons, convenience was identified by majority of the participants
193 (75.5%) to positively influence their satisfaction with telemedicine, saving them time from traveling
194 to a hospital or specialist clinic. On the other hand, only 2 in 5 perceived telemedicine to be
195 affordable. A total of 116 survey participants (58.0%) strongly agreed that they would use
196 telemedicine services again.

197 **Comparisons between telemedicine and in-person consultations**

198 *Telemedicine services are the same as in-person consultations*

199 A total of 88 survey participants agreed (44.0%) that the service provided through
200 telemedicine was the same as in-person consultations (**Table 2**). This is supported by our qualitative
201 findings that just like face-to-face consultations, telemedicine allows patients to access services
202 provided by physicians, express their medical concerns, and have their concerns addressed. This
203 perception of adequacy of care provided via telemedicine promotes its use:

204 “[In a way,] telemedicine is the same [as face-to-face consultation] because I still get to talk
205 to a doctor. You get to voice out your problems or your medical history, and then get a
206 prescription or diagnosis.” (, 16-20, female)

207 *Telemedicine services are better than in-person consultations*

208 A total of 72 survey participants (36.0%) perceived telemedicine services to be better than in-
209 person consultations. One participant who used KonsultaMD for a skin condition mentioned
210 convenience and experiencing better quality of service:

211 “[Telemedicine is] just so much more efficient and convenient, and I feel like the doctor’s not
212 in a rush to get to the next patient, and they really try to [serve] you better over telehealth as
213 compared to face to face consultations.” (21-25, female)

214 *Telemedicine services are inferior to in-person visits*

215 A total of 60 survey participants (30.0%) perceived telemedicine services to be inferior to in-
216 person consultations. Interview participants elaborated and expressed that telemedicine is lacking in
217 multiple functions of care including laboratory tests and diagnostics, physical assessment, and
218 rapport-building. Their preference for telemedicine or in-person visit depended on the health
219 condition. A participant with an atypical presentation of her illness and needed multiple laboratory
220 tests for her diagnosis: “I would never use telehealth consultation again for other matters besides
221 follow-up care.” (21-25, female). She explained that the telemedicine consultation was not useful
222 because she still needed to do an in-person consultation to have her concerns addressed. She also
223 mentioned that whether or not she did telemedicine or an in-person consultation, she still had to be at
224 the hospital for laboratory results.

225 Several respondents noted that some diseases cannot be assessed through telemedicine due to
226 the necessity for certain equipment or physical assessment, leading to the preference for face-to-face
227 consultations:

228 “But for those illnesses that cannot be diagnosed by video call, like those that need additional
229 equipment to check, then it’s better to do it face-to-face.” (26-30, female)

230 “I used to have skin asthma. So for me, it’s really necessary to go and see a dermatologist so
231 that he/she can physically see what rashes I have.” (41-45, female)

232 **Factors influencing telemedicine use and satisfaction**

233 *Facilitators*

234 *Safety of telemedicine during the pandemic*

235 All 16 interviewees cited COVID-19-related reasons for their telemedicine consultations.
236 Many participants used telemedicine because of the possibility of being exposed to the virus on the
237 way or at the place of face-to-face consultation itself:

238 “Telemedicine has less exposure [to the coronavirus], less travel time and it’s also related to
239 my mental health wherein I really don’t want to leave the house.” (26-30, female)

240 “With the pandemic, of course you’d choose to not expose yourself further. If you’re already
241 sick, you don’t want to expose yourself to an additional kind of virus that’s more deadly.”
242 (26-30, female)

243 Telemedicine offers options that maintain privacy

244 A number of interviewees preferred telemedicine because privacy could be maintained. Being
245 able to be discuss their chief complaints and questions in history taking pertaining to their private
246 areas were some of the reasons they chose telemedicine:

247 “Telemedicine is convenient for me. You’re still one–on–one with the doctor. For example,
248 either I’m in the living room or in my bedroom. Pre-pandemic wise, before, in the clinic, sometimes
249 there are other doctors who share a cubicle, especially if, let’s say, the doctor is asking something
250 regarding your private area, sometimes you are ashamed to mention it because others might hear.”36-
251 40, female)

252 “In my case, I couldn’t go out [because] it’s a sexual concern.” (21-25, female)

253 Telemedicine is affordable due to reduced costs

254 Around 128 survey participants (64.0%) identified cost as the reason they chose telemedicine.
255 Interviewees supported this and mentioned being able to save on transportations costs and that the
256 doctor’s fees were much more affordable than before:

257 “For me, I was able to save with telemedicine. Transportation wise, I didn’t need to travel]
258 I’m not sure if it depends on the doctor’s fee, but so far it seems that the doctor’s fee is cheap
259 and only costs around USD 7-11 per consultation.” (36-40, female)

260 Telemedicine is convenient due to reduced time and travel requirements

261 Most of the survey participants identified convenience as a facilitator to telemedicine use and
262 satisfaction. Most interviewees also recognized that telemedicine is more convenient compared to

263 face-to-face consultations for the following reasons: reduced (or absent) waiting line which
264 additionally removes the necessity to file a leave of absence to go to the doctor, the absence of traffic,
265 and the elimination of niceties when going outside such as taking a bath and dressing up:

266 You don't have to get dressed, and drive or take a Grab." (16-20, female)

267 "There are more chances that the video chat will definitely save a lot more time. There's no
268 travel time, there's no waiting time." (26-30, male)

269 "With telemedicine generally at least in my experience, the waiting time is reduced so I think
270 in that regard it's nice." (16-20, female)

271 Telemedicine is easily accessible and readily available

272 Another facilitator to telemedicine use and satisfaction was accessibility in availing the
273 services, which was identified by 160 survey participants (80.0%). The interviewees explained that
274 telemedicine services were available at any time and did not require them to see their doctor
275 physically:

276 "Access [was one of the reasons why I chose to use telemedicine] because you just wait in the
277 house and/or the doctor's availability." (51-55, male)

278 "I like telemedicine because when you need it and you're far from your doctor, you can just
279 call and describe and maybe send pictures or information. You can still get your medicine and
280 advice from the doctor." (41-45, female)

281 Telemedicine offers more avenues of communication

282 Telemedicine offers more avenues for communication as its scope includes text-based
283 messaging, voice calls, and video calls across different platforms. In the interviews, several platforms
284 were identified including KonsultaMD, SeriousMD, and Aide. Messenger and Viber were noted by
285 some participants to be convenient applications for communication because they can reach out
286 anytime. Hospital hotlines and school medical services were also platforms mentioned by
287 interviewees. This was perceived as a benefit of telemedicine in itself:

288 "If you are out of the WiFi zone, it is hard to connect with video call. You have the option to
289 email, text, or call." (56-60, female).

290 Survey respondents used one or more of the following: SMS, messaging applications, email,
291 video call, voice call, and telemedicine-specific platforms. About half have used messaging
292 applications (50.0%) and video call (45.5%) for telemedicine. Email (11.5%) is least used for
293 telemedicine (**Table 3**).

294 **Barriers**

295 Perceived poor service quality due to limited to no prior patient-physician relationship

296 This limited to no previous physician-patient relationship results in dissatisfaction with the
297 services because of perceptions on poor service quality:

298 “That’s also the weakness of that telemedicine platform [redacted]. It’s because you’re
299 queueing for doctors, for GP doctors, right? What happens is that you don’t get to choose.
300 Whoever is available, that’s who you’re getting.” (21-25, female)

301 Perceived lack of experience among telemedicine providers

302 Depending on the telemedicine service and platform used, some interview participants were
303 unable to choose a physician and were only able to consult with whoever was available during their
304 telemedicine consult:

305 “But for emergency cases, it’s mostly resident doctors who would answer [the telemedicine
306 hotline], not really a doctor [consultant/attending]. I experienced that in [redacted hospital 1],
307 when they weren’t sure if they should ask their superior, or rather the department head of
308 dermatology, what should be done to me. This means they couldn’t make decisions on the
309 spot about what should be done to the patient, unlike in [redacted hospital 2], decision making
310 is automatic because it’s really a doctor answering.” (31-35, male)

311 Inherent limitations of telemedicine

312 A number of participants expressed concerns on service quality of telemedicine due to its
313 limitations, especially for conditions that require diagnostic tests and physical check-ups. Doctors ask
314 several questions and seek validation from patients. There is also perceived poorer service quality
315 because patients feel that they are not being checked thoroughly by the doctor:

316 “I don't think the consultation can provide enough accuracy compared to an in-person
317 consultation for the prescribing doctor. I don't think an over-the-phone conversation can truly
318 give her an accurate evaluation of myself.” (26-30, male)

319 “It's really different when the doctor looks at you, puts his stethoscope on you, feels your
320 body you know. Unlike in the past, the doctors will immediately touch the part of your body
321 that is painful.” (51-55, male)

322 Perceived high costs

323 The cost of telemedicine was perceived as a barrier to the use and satisfaction of telemedicine
324 services with participants expecting that costs are lower. As one interviewee remarked: “I really
325 expected it [telemedicine] to be cheaper than the physical so if I'm going to pay the same price for
326 face to face and telemedicine, then I'll go to the physical one since same price.” (16-20male)

327 In the survey, the cost of telemedicine ranged from USD 0 to USD 192 with a median of USD
328 7.5. Nearly half (42.5%) of the survey participants had consultations for free with some relying on
329 promotions to avail telemedicine. There were also participants perceived the price to be expensive for
330 others: “I was just thinking in general, how would Filipinos—from all demographics, all social classes
331 – how would they find it? So I said it [the cost] might be a barrier for some.” (16-20, female)

332 Poor network connectivity resulting to ineffective communication

333 Ineffective communication as a result of poor network connectivity was identified by 5
334 (2.5%) survey participants as a barrier. One interview participant noted: “Even if you're connected
335 and you're talking, sometimes the other person doesn't hear what you're saying, or vice versa. They
336 hear you, but they don't understand because it keeps cutting off [because of poor connectivity].” (51-
337 55, male). Others also mentioned that their satisfaction with telemedicine depended on how smoothly
338 the telemedicine consultation goes, which in turn is significantly influenced by internet connectivity,
339 the platform's data usage, and the gadgets used for the consultation: “If we're in the middle of a
340 serious discussion, then suddenly it [the internet connection] will cut off? It's awkward and
341 embarrassing, especially if I don't know the doctor.” (41-45, female)

342 Inaccessibility of required technology interferes with telemedicine use and satisfaction

343 Participants cited inaccessibility to technology as a factor influencing its disuse and
344 dissatisfaction. They identified access to technology required for the consultation to be an important
345 consideration: "People don't have mobile load. Some don't have good cameras for their phones or
346 gadgets, or some don't have it. I think that's the disadvantage of using telemedicine." (41-45, female)

347 **DISCUSSION**

348 Our study showed that patients are generally satisfied with the services provided through
349 telemedicine applications and platforms. This is consistent with previous studies that report high
350 levels of patient satisfaction (23–25). Telemedicine was perceived to be similar to in-person
351 consultations in that the participants were able to obtain medical advice and have their health concerns
352 addressed regardless of the mode of delivery. Some perceived it to be better primarily because of
353 convenience and accessibility. However, the inherent limitations of telemedicine restrict its utility,
354 especially for health conditions that require physical assessments and laboratory tests.

355 We found that telemedicine use and satisfaction are influenced by a number of factors
356 including: safety during the pandemic, privacy, affordability, convenience and accessibility, and
357 availability of more avenues of communication. Safety was a major concern that prompted
358 participants to use telemedicine. Telemedicine enables patients to avoid situations that would expose
359 them to SARS-CoV-2, the causative agent of COVID-19, such as traveling and staying for long
360 periods in high-risk environments. These safety concerns, together with lockdown restrictions,
361 resulted to significant declines in hospital admissions for non-urgent procedures (2). Innovative
362 solutions through telemedicine have been introduced including video visits (25). Participants also
363 mentioned that telemedicine assisted in maintaining privacy. The benefits of anonymity are especially
364 important with regards to sensitive and potentially stigmatizing health issues such as mental or sexual
365 health conditions (29). Because telemedicine removes the need to travel, participants also viewed it as
366 more affordable and convenient. This was noted by participants as an enabling factor to use
367 telemedicine, especially since a third of our participants are full-time employees, while a quarter are
368 students. Traveling for healthcare purposes could mean missing work or school (26), and telemedicine
369 therefore gives them greater ability to manage their time around consultations. Similarly, the variety

370 of communication modes and platforms available contributed to patient use and satisfaction (27). This
371 enables patients to continuously communicate with physicians should technical difficulties arise.

372 Meanwhile, barriers identified were perceptions on poor service quality arising from lack of
373 prior physician-patient relationship, lack of experience, and inherent limitations; perceived
374 unreasonable costs; and poor internet connectivity and other technological barriers (e.g., gadget
375 availability and specification). Reduced trust in the physician can leave the patient unsatisfied with the
376 service provided and affects patient compliance with the doctor's advice (28). Established
377 relationships are an important factor in telemedicine use, as patients are less willing to use
378 telemedicine to see a provider that they do not know (29,30). While some participants in our study, as
379 well as published literature, noted cost as a factor contributing to patient satisfaction (25,31,32), we
380 also found cost to be a reason for dissatisfaction among our participants. This may be due to the
381 significant proportion of participants in our sample who were not employed with almost a half not
382 enrolled in any health insurance plan. The Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) of the
383 Universal Health Care (UHC) Act stipulates that the Philippine Health Insurance Corporation or
384 PhilHealth shall use its contracts to incentivize the integration and use of telemedicine (33). The
385 PhilHealth Konsulta package is a comprehensive outpatient benefit that integrates telemedicine to
386 ensure access to services (34). According to a PhilHealth circular released in 2021 (35), home
387 isolation services including telemedicine will be incentivized as long as Konsulta providers have
388 accomplished all necessary documents. In addition, several health maintenance organizations in the
389 Philippines reimburse telemedicine consultations which lessens the burden on patients (36–38). This
390 statement is supported by Polinski et al. (39), stating that medical insurance provides care at lower
391 costs. However, because of the pandemic, the rollout of the Konsulta package has been significantly
392 delayed and therefore, patients are unable to avail of the services at a lesser cost. In addition to issues
393 of cost, poor network connectivity and technological barriers decrease levels of patient satisfaction
394 (40). These barriers are especially significant in the Philippines, where service delivery and resources
395 are inequitably distributed (41). Because the country is archipelagic, there are communities with
396 limited access to the Internet and technology. As a result, telemedicine is not widely adopted in these

397 resource-limited communities and these barriers need to be addressed to provide services to patients
398 where physicians and/or specialists are few (26).

399 A number of limitations need to be considered when interpreting our findings. First, the
400 results of the study are influenced by the social context and implications of the COVID-19 pandemic
401 during the time the study was conducted. Because of this, scores provided by the participants are not
402 indicative of telemedicine alone, but rather, indicative of patient satisfaction when using telemedicine
403 in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. Further, patient telemedicine satisfaction studies generally
404 report high ratings reflective of their experiences with health care and service delivery (40). However,
405 we addressed this issue by including a measure on preference between telemedicine and face-to-face
406 consultation (40). A considerable proportion of participants reporting the same level of satisfaction for
407 both modes of service delivery and a few interview participants reporting less satisfaction for
408 telemedicine. This confirms in part that telemedicine satisfaction is high in our study because of their
409 experience with telemedicine itself, and not only because of the general care they receive from the
410 health system. Second, our use of convenience sampling and online data collection methods
411 potentially excluded participants from low-resource and remote communities. Patients from these
412 areas may have other experiences, particularly barriers, in their use of telemedicine services. While
413 we attempted to interview participants with different backgrounds and experiences, majority of those
414 who were willing and consented were mainly from urban areas. But we were still able to capture
415 issues of cost and technology. Third, we asked their general experience and satisfaction to
416 telemedicine regardless of platforms. We are therefore unable to disentangle the effect of specific
417 telemedicine platforms on satisfaction and use. Despite these limitations, our study provides a rich
418 source of data, building on the evidence that telemedicine can be integrated into routine care during
419 and beyond the pandemic while offering insights into use and satisfaction through the lens of patients
420 in a low-and-middle income country.

421 **CONCLUSION**

422 This study showed that Filipino patients are generally satisfied with telemedicine services provided
423 during the COVID-19 pandemic. Telemedicine use and satisfaction are influenced by individual,
424 health provider and system, and external factors such as technology. Our findings also suggest that

425 participants have varying reasons for perceiving telemedicine to be equal, inferior, or better than in-
426 person consultations. Telemedicine was viewed as safe, efficient, and effective when technological
427 barriers are removed. However, expectations of patients on the costs, as well as the conditions that can
428 be addressed through telemedicine, need to be managed by providers to increase satisfaction.
429 Continued adoption of telemedicine will require improvements in technology and better patient
430 communication related to their telemedicine provider and the associated costs. Our study points to the
431 following recommendations: (a) Integration of telemedicine services in geographically remote areas
432 that lack access to medical services; (b) Strengthening of infrastructure to allow the use of devices and
433 Internet; (c) Training and performance evaluation of telehealth providers to ensure quality
434 telemedicine services; (d) Patient communication on telemedicine and its limitations; (e) Patient
435 support for those with technological difficulties; and (f) Future research to include stakeholder
436 perspectives and patient experiences from remote communities.

437 **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

438 The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or
439 publication of this article.

440 **Funding**

441 The authors received financial support for this research from the Ateneo Center of Research and
442 Innovation (ACRI). The funder had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to
443 publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

444 **ORCID**

445 Alicia Victoria G. Noceda: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6793-0024>

446 Lianne Margot M. Acierto: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0845-0578>

447 Morvenn Chaimek C. Bertiz: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1051-1405>

448 David Emmanuel H. Dionisio: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4683-1235>

449 Chelsea Beatrice L. Laurito: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7600-1059>

450 Girrard Alphonse T. Sanchez: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9953-6141>

451 Arianna Maever L. Amit: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4571-400X>

452 **REFERENCES**

- 453 1. World Health Organization. Second round of the national pulse survey on continuity of essential
454 health services during the COVID-19 pandemic: January-March 2021. 2021 Apr.
- 455 2. Uy J, Siy Van VT, Ulep VG, Bayani DB, Walker D. The Impact of COVID-19 on Hospital
456 Admissions for Twelve High-Burden Diseases and Five Common Procedures in the Philippines:
457 A National Health Insurance Database Study 2019-2020. *Lancet Reg Health - West Pac*. 2022
458 Jan;18:100310.
- 459 3. Kichloo A, Albosta M, Dettloff K, Wani F, El-Amir Z, Singh J, et al. Telemedicine, the current
460 COVID-19 pandemic and the future: a narrative review and perspectives moving forward in the
461 USA. *Fam Med Community Health*. 2020 Aug;8(3):e000530.
- 462 4. Mann DM, Chen J, Chunara R, Testa PA, Nov O. COVID-19 transforms health care through
463 telemedicine: Evidence from the field. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2020 Jul 1;27(7):1132–5.
- 464 5. Bindra V. Telemedicine for Women’s Health During COVID-19 Pandemic in India: A Short
465 Commentary and Important Practice Points for Obstetricians and Gynaecologists. *J Obstet
466 Gynecol India*. 2020 Aug;70(4):279–82.
- 467 6. D. Leochico CF. Adoption of telerehabilitation in a developing country before and during the
468 COVID-19 pandemic. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med*. 2020 Nov;63(6):563–4.
- 469 7. Ting FI, Benedict Saccalan D, Sarita Abarquez H, Uson AJ. Treatment of cancer patients during
470 the COVID-19 pandemic in the Philippines. *ecancermedicalscience* [Internet]. 2020 May 8 [cited
471 2022 Mar 31];14. Available from: [https://ecancer.org/en/journal/article/1040-treatment-of-cancer-
472 patients-during-the-covid-19-pandemic-in-the-philippines](https://ecancer.org/en/journal/article/1040-treatment-of-cancer-patients-during-the-covid-19-pandemic-in-the-philippines)
- 473 8. Al-Abri R, Al-Balushi A. Patient Satisfaction Survey as a Tool Towards Quality Improvement.
474 *Oman Med J*. 2014 Jan 15;29(1):3–7.
- 475 9. Xesfingi S, Vozikis A. Patient satisfaction with the healthcare system: Assessing the impact of
476 socio-economic and healthcare provision factors. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2016 Dec;16(1):94.
- 477 10. Cantos PL, Chua NJ, Florentin MJ, Gomez TG, Hapan MF, Salmon S. Perceived Level of
478 Satisfaction of Filipino Patients Residing in Metro Manila towards Teleconsultation as New
479 Means of Healthcare Delivery. *Int J Progress Res Sci Eng*. 2021 Aug 18;2(8):229–43.
- 480 11. Eboña AE, Fangonilo JJ, Fidel KGC, Flores JEG, Flores LDG, Pagud ALT, et al. Comparative
481 Analysis of Patient Satisfaction on Pre-Pandemic Conventional Outpatient Consultations and
482 Teleconsultations during the COVID-19 Health Crisis among Patients in Metro Manila. *Int J
483 Progress Res Sci Eng*. 2021 Nov 17;2(11):33–41.
- 484 12. Jaudian MM, Babaran ART, Deza RPP, Duran KGM, Enriquez RKC, So TC, et al. Relationship
485 of the Overall Perception of Middle-aged Patients from a Secondary Hospital in Tuguegarao,
486 Cagayan and their Intention of Use towards Telemedicine during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Int J
487 Progress Res Sci Eng*. 2021 Aug 24;2(8):442–65.
- 488 13. Charmaz K, Belgrave LL. Qualitative Interviewing and Grounded Theory Analysis. In: *The
489 SAGE Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft* [Internet]. 2455 Teller
490 Road, Thousand Oaks California 91320 United States: SAGE Publications, Inc.; 2012 [cited 2022
491 Mar 31]. p. 347–66. Available from: [http://methods.sagepub.com/book/handbook-of-interview-
492 research-2e/n25.xml](http://methods.sagepub.com/book/handbook-of-interview-research-2e/n25.xml)

- 493 14. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. CAHPS Clinician & Group Survey [Internet]. 2020.
494 Available from: [https://www.ahrq.gov/sites/default/files/wysiwyg/cahps/surveys-](https://www.ahrq.gov/sites/default/files/wysiwyg/cahps/surveys-guidance/cg/adult-eng-cg40-3351a.pdf)
495 [guidance/cg/adult-eng-cg40-3351a.pdf](https://www.ahrq.gov/sites/default/files/wysiwyg/cahps/surveys-guidance/cg/adult-eng-cg40-3351a.pdf)
- 496 15. Parmanto B, Lewis, Jr. AN, Graham KM, Bertolet MH. Development of the Telehealth Usability
497 Questionnaire (TUQ). *Int J Telerehabilitation*. 2016 Jul 1;8(1):3–10.
- 498 16. Bakken S, Grullon-Figueroa L, Izquierdo R, Lee NJ, Morin P, Palmas W, et al. Development,
499 Validation, and Use of English and Spanish Versions of the Telemedicine Satisfaction and
500 Usefulness Questionnaire. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2006 Nov 1;13(6):660–7.
- 501 17. Özkeskin M, Özden F, Ekmekçi Ö, Yüceyar N. The reliability and validity of the Turkish version
502 of the Telemedicine Satisfaction and Usefulness Questionnaire (TSUQ) and Telemedicine Patient
503 Questionnaire (TPQ) in individuals with multiple sclerosis. *Neurol Sci*. 2022 Mar;43(3):1921–7.
- 504 18. Yip MP, Chang AM, Chan J, MacKenzie AE. Development of the Telemedicine Satisfaction
505 Questionnaire to evaluate patient satisfaction with telemedicine: a preliminary study. *J Telemed*
506 *Telecare*. 2003 Feb 1;9(1):46–50.
- 507 19. Fusch P, Ness L. Are We There Yet? Data Saturation in Qualitative Research. *Qual Rep*
508 [Internet]. 2015 Sep 8 [cited 2022 Mar 31]; Available from:
509 <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol20/iss9/3/>
- 510 20. IBM Corp. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.; 2017.
- 511 21. Ackerman M, Greenwald E, Noulas P, Ahn C. Patient Satisfaction with and Use of Telemental
512 Health Services in the Perinatal Period: a Survey Study. *Psychiatr Q*. 2021 Sep;92(3):925–33.
- 513 22. Chun Tie Y, Birks M, Francis K. Grounded theory research: A design framework for novice
514 researchers. *SAGE Open Med*. 2019 Jan;7:205031211882292.
- 515 23. Kanc K, Komel J, Kos M, Wagner J. H(ome)BA1c testing and telemedicine: High satisfaction of
516 people with diabetes for diabetes management during COVID-19 lockdown. *Diabetes Res Clin*
517 *Pract*. 2020 Aug;166:108285.
- 518 24. Othman E, Giampietro V, Mohamad M. Patient satisfaction with teleconsultation during Covid-
519 19 pandemic: a descriptive study for mental health care in Malaysia. *Malays J Public Health Med*.
520 2021 Aug 28;21(2):243–51.
- 521 25. Ramaswamy A, Yu M, Drangsholt S, Ng E, Culligan PJ, Schlegel PN, et al. Patient Satisfaction
522 With Telemedicine During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Retrospective Cohort Study. *J Med Internet*
523 *Res*. 2020 Sep 9;22(9):e20786.
- 524 26. Fleischhacker CL. Patient Satisfaction with Telehealth Services Compared to In-Office Visits: A
525 Systematic Literature Review. :48.
- 526 27. Weinstein RS, Lopez AM, Joseph BA, Erps KA, Holcomb M, Barker GP, et al. Telemedicine,
527 Telehealth, and Mobile Health Applications That Work: Opportunities and Barriers. *Am J Med*.
528 2014 Mar;127(3):183–7.
- 529 28. Orrange S, Patel A, Mack WJ, Cassetta J. Patient Satisfaction and Trust in Telemedicine During
530 the COVID-19 Pandemic: Retrospective Observational Study. *JMIR Hum Factors*. 2021 Apr
531 22;8(2):e28589.

- 532 29. Elliott T, Tong I, Sheridan A, Lown BA. Beyond Convenience: Patients' Perceptions of Physician
533 Interactional Skills and Compassion via Telemedicine. *Mayo Clin Proc Innov Qual Outcomes*.
534 2020 Jun;4(3):305–14.
- 535 30. Welch BM, Harvey J, O'Connell NS, McElligott JT. Patient preferences for direct-to-consumer
536 telemedicine services: a nationwide survey. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2017 Dec;17(1):784.
- 537 31. Kruse CS, Krowski N, Rodriguez B, Tran L, Vela J, Brooks M. Telehealth and patient
538 satisfaction: a systematic review and narrative analysis. *BMJ Open*. 2017 Aug;7(8):e016242.
- 539 32. Orlando JF, Beard M, Kumar S. Systematic review of patient and caregivers' satisfaction with
540 telehealth videoconferencing as a mode of service delivery in managing patients' health. Borsci
541 S, editor. *PLOS ONE*. 2019 Aug 30;14(8):e0221848.
- 542 33. Ejercito JV. IMPLEMENTING RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE UNIVERSAL
543 HEALTH CARE ACT (REPUBLIC ACT NO. 11223) [Internet]. Sect. Senate Feb 20, 2019.
544 Available from: https://www.philhealth.gov.ph/about_us/UHC-IRR_Signed.pdf
- 545 34. PhilHealth. Implementing Guidelines for the PhiiHealth Konsultasyong Sulit at Tama (PhiiHealth
546 Konsulta) Package [Internet]. 2020. Available from:
547 <https://www.philhealth.gov.ph/circulars/2020/circ2020-0022.pdf>
- 548 35. PhilHealth. COVID-19 Home Isolation Benefit Package (CHIBP) [Internet]. 2021. Available
549 from: <https://www.philhealth.gov.ph/circulars/2021/circ2021-0014.pdf>
- 550 36. Alviar V. Medicaid Telemedicine saves lives, relieves health-care system amid pandemic
551 [Internet]. *INQUIRER.net*. 2021 [cited 2022 Mar 31]. Available from:
552 [https://business.inquirer.net/330260/mcicaid-telemedicine-saves-lives-relieves-health-care-](https://business.inquirer.net/330260/mcicaid-telemedicine-saves-lives-relieves-health-care-system-amid-pandemic)
553 [system-amid-pandemic](https://business.inquirer.net/330260/mcicaid-telemedicine-saves-lives-relieves-health-care-system-amid-pandemic)
- 554 37. AXA offers teleconsultation service to support pandemic response efforts | AXA Philippines
555 [Internet]. [cited 2022 Mar 31]. Available from:
556 [https://www.axa.com.ph/multimedia/newsroom/axa-offers-teleconsultation-service-to-support-](https://www.axa.com.ph/multimedia/newsroom/axa-offers-teleconsultation-service-to-support-pandemic)
557 [pandemic](https://www.axa.com.ph/multimedia/newsroom/axa-offers-teleconsultation-service-to-support-pandemic)
- 558 38. Maxicare Telemedicine: 24/7 Teleconsult Voice Call | Maxicare [Internet]. . 2021 [cited 2022
559 Mar 31]. Available from: [https://www.maxicare.com.ph/news-announcements/maxicare-](https://www.maxicare.com.ph/news-announcements/maxicare-telemedicine-24-7-teleconsult-voice-call/)
560 [telemedicine-24-7-teleconsult-voice-call/](https://www.maxicare.com.ph/news-announcements/maxicare-telemedicine-24-7-teleconsult-voice-call/)
- 561 39. Polinski JM, Barker T, Gagliano N, Sussman A, Brennan TA, Shrank WH. Patients' Satisfaction
562 with and Preference for Telehealth Visits. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2016 Mar;31(3):269–75.
- 563 40. Williams TL, May CR, Esmail A. Limitations of Patient Satisfaction Studies in Telehealthcare: A
564 Systematic Review of the Literature. *Telemed J E Health*. 2001 Dec;7(4):293–316.
- 565 41. Dayrit M, Lagrada L, Picazo O, Pons M, Villaverde M. The Philippines Health System Review.
566 *Health Systems in Transition* [Internet]. 2018;8(2). Available from:
567 [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/274579/9789290226734-](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/274579/9789290226734-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)
568 [eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/274579/9789290226734-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)

569
570
571
572
573

574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588

Table 1. Characteristics of survey respondents (n=200)

Characteristic	N (%) ^a
Median age (in years (IQR))	31.50 (23.5 – 46.0)
Sex	
Female	128 (64.0)
Male	72 (36.0)
Location by urbanicity	
Urban	170 (85.0)
Rural	30 (15.0)
Residence by island group	
Luzon	162 (81.0)
Visayas	28 (14.0)
Mindanao	10 (5.0)
Highest Educational Attainment	
Secondary or lower	35 (17.5)
College	130 (65.0)
Post-graduate	35 (17.5)
Employment Status	
Full-time employment	62 (31.0)
Part-time employment	15 (7.5)
Unemployed	36 (18.0)
Student	48 (24.0)
Retired	8 (4.0)
Median Monthly Household Income in USD (IQR)	577 (231 – 1,923)

Characteristic	N (%) ^a
Median Monthly Household Health Expenditure in USD (IQR)	69 (38 – 115)
Median Monthly Individual Health Expenditure in USD (IQR)	38 (19 – 77)
Avails Any Health Insurance	
Yes	103 (51.5)
No	97 (48.5)
Median Overall Health Rating (IQR)	4 (3 – 4)

^aMay not total to 100% because of missing data

589
590
591
592

Table 2. Levels of patient satisfaction with telemedicine services during the COVID-19 pandemic (n=200)

	Strongly Disagree N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Neutral N (%)	Agree N (%)	Strongly Agree N (%)
Convenience					
1. The platform was easy to use.	3 (1.5)	2 (1.0)	15 (7.5)	72 (36.0)	108 (54.0)
2. Telemedicine saves me time traveling to a hospital or specialist clinic.	0 (0.0)	1 (0.5)	17 (8.5)	31 (15.5)	151 (75.5)
Communication					
3. During my most recent visit, the healthcare provider and I were able to hear/communicate with each other clearly.	0 (0.0)	1 (0.5)	25 (12.5)	57 (28.5)	117 (58.5)
4. My most recent visit started on time.	6 (3.0)	17 (8.5)	22 (11.0)	62 (31.0)	93 (46.5)
5. Telemedicine provides for my healthcare needs.	2 (1.0)	13 (6.5)	42 (21.0)	57 (28.5)	86 (43.0)
6. Telemedicine is an acceptable way to receive healthcare services.	3 (1.5)	12 (6.0)	42 (21.0)	70 (35.0)	73 (36.5)
7. During my most recent visit, the provider explained things in a way that was easy to understand.	0 (0.0)	1 (0.5)	11 (5.5)	56 (28.0)	132 (66.0)
8. I feel comfortable communicating with the clinician using the telemedicine platform.	2 (1.0)	12 (6.0)	38 (19.0)	65 (32.5)	83 (41.5)
Patient-Physician Relationship					

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
9. During my most recent visit, the provider listened carefully to me.	1 (0.5)	2 (1.0)	12 (6.0)	51 (25.5)	134 (67.0)
10. During my most recent visit, the provider showed respect for what I had to say.	0 (0.0)	3 (1.5)	8 (4.0)	48 (24.0)	141 (70.5)
11. During my most recent visit, the provider spent enough time with me.	1 (0.5)	1 (0.5)	20 (10.0)	58 (29.0)	120 (60.0)
12. During my most recent visit, the provider already had the medical information they needed about me.	8 (4.0)	8 (4.0)	22 (11.0)	52 (26.0)	110 (55.0)
Cost					
13. Telemedicine is affordable.	10 (5.0)	15 (7.5)	47 (23.5)	50 (25.0)	78 (39.0)
Access					
14. It is not difficult for me to avail telemedicine services.	7 (3.5)	9 (4.5)	24 (12.0)	55 (27.5)	105 (52.5)
15. My connectivity allows me to easily use telemedicine.	0 (0.0)	5 (2.5)	28 (14.0)	46 (23.0)	121 (60.5)
Overall Satisfaction					
16. I would use telemedicine services again.	0 (0.0)	7 (3.5)	31 (15.5)	46 (23.0)	116 (58.0)
17. Overall, I am satisfied with my telemedicine experience.	1 (0.5)	6 (3.0)	29 (14.5)	65 (32.5)	99 (49.5)

593
594
595

Table 3. Applications and platforms of telemedicine (n=200)

Telemedicine applications and platforms	N (%)^a
SMS	54 (27.0)
Messaging applications (Messenger, Viber)	100 (50.0)
Email	23 (11.5)
Video call	91 (45.5)
Voice call	63 (31.5)
Telemedicine-specific platforms (e.g., SeriousMD, Konsulta MD)	46 (23.0)

596
597
598

^a N does not total to 200 since each participant was permitted to select all methods of telemedicine they have used.

