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Retaining dermatology patients in primary care using dialogues with secondary care: A service evaluation

Summary

Background
Wait list sizes for specialist secondary care have soared in recent years. Dermatology is a good candidate service for retaining patients in primary care and avoiding unnecessary waits to see a specialist. A dermatology dialogue service between primary and secondary care (DDPS) was developed in Norfolk and Waveney, eastern England. The service involved primary care referrers uploading patient images of skin complaints for review by and dialogue with secondary specialists to see if the patient could be retained in primary care, or should be referred to secondary care routinely, urgently or on the two week wait cancer pathway.

Objectives
To evaluate service performance with respect to specific targets including reduction in secondary care wait list growth in the period March 2021–March 2022 inclusive.

Methods
Service activity was summarized with respect to speed of resolution, case counts and dispositions. Clinician and patient satisfaction were canvased with structured questionnaires. Actual new referral counts were compared to projections based on historical data. Wait list growth was compared to other specialisms and other areas. Wait times to receive first treatment at start and end of monitoring period were monitored.

Results
Over 3600 patients were enrolled in the DDPS system. Over 98% of cases were reported by the dermatologists within 36 hours. Clinician and patient satisfaction were high. Frequently asked questions and conditions were highlighted by dermatologists to design and deliver an educational event for primary care clinicians that was well received. Wait list growth to see dermatology in the commissioning area was smaller for dermatology than other large specialisms, and mostly smaller growth than dermatology wait lists commissioned by other NHS commissioners. Negative impact on the urgent priority (cancer pathway) wait list could not be observed.

Conclusions
The DDPS was satisfactory to clinicians and patients and coincided with smaller dermatology wait list growth than might otherwise have been expected.

Introduction

Skin conditions are among the most common reasons why people seek health care\(^1\). Most skin complaints can be identified and treated by primary care practitioners without need to consult specialists, but historically, about 1 in 15 primary consultations for skin diseases led to secondary care referral\(^2\). The COVID epidemic has exacerbated previously large delays in assessment and treatment...
Teledermatology has often been proposed as a way to make service delivery more efficient. Image and patient history exchange between primary and secondary care could potentially retain patients in primary care without need to see a specialist. All good quality telemedicine is reliant on accurate and relevant patient information alongside high quality and representative photographs. Such an innovative pathway management initiative was implemented in Norfolk and Waveney (N&W) in eastern England, as part of a whole-system pathway redesign that also aligned well with the NHSE ‘Transforming Elective Care’ programme. The service aspiration was to develop a ‘Transfer to Transform’ specification for dermatology. The intended outcome was a single system, clinically sustainable service with a centrally (Norwich) based specialist hub and a service firmly rooted in primary care. Other potential benefits of the Dermatology Dialogue service between Primary and Secondary care (DDPS) pathway were much faster diagnosis, faster treatment, upskilling of primary care generalists and shorter waiting lists for those who do need to see dermatology consultants. The DDPS integrated fully with other pathways and was planned upon commissioning to be evaluated with regard to patient-centred outcomes, service performance objectives, wider system effects (especially wait list sizes), and clinician satisfaction.

Materials and Methods

DDPS service description

National Health Service (NHS) health and social care in our study area is coordinated and commissioned by the Norfolk and Waveney (N&W) Integrated Care System (N&WICS). Non-emergency medical treatment in the UK is typically managed such that primary care surgeries operate as gateways to access specialist services. Patients see surgery staff (most typical general physician or advance nurse practitioners) who decide according to established clinical protocols if treatment can be delivered in the primary care setting or if specialist referral is warranted. This evaluation describes a service for patients who were otherwise eligible for routine priority referrals to in-person assessment by secondary care specialists. Primary care surgeries were supplied with suitable imaging equipment (dermatoscope) and a mobile phone application that integrated fully with the existing primary care referral management systems (either Systm One or EMIS). The dermatoscope products used by GP surgeries were either Schuco DermLite DL200 Hybrid or Illuco Dermatoscope IDS-1100 both supplied with Smartphone adaptors. The mobile phone interface was on the CINAPSIS platform. The service activity data were collected by an outsourcing company, Xyla Elective Care. The DDPS pathway meant the primary care clinician (a GP or ANP) taking a patient history, taking pictures of the affected skin areas, and uploading the information to a secure information sharing platform. Specialists reviewed the uploaded information to provide either a provisional diagnosis or ensure steps to securing more information or a more appropriate care pathway. Secondary care responses included the options to ask for more information, escalate the patient to a pathway that involves attendance to see the secondary health care worker in person, or discharge with a care plan to be implemented within primary care. Following a suitable course of dialogue between generalist and specialist, primary care contacted the patient to relay the provisional diagnosis and treatment plan and any follow up care or change in care pathway. Figure 1 shows the pathway and outcomes.
The DDPS was piloted from November 2020, and available as a routine service from mid February 2021 onwards. We focus reporting on service activity in the months March 2021 to March 2022 inclusive. The service was paused on 19 April 2021 when the initial contract was due for renewal, while a business case to continue the service was considered by the local NHS Integrated Care Board.

**Evaluation**

Patient outcomes were audited on 5 May 2022, when service activity and referral outcomes-to-date were extracted. At commissioning, the service had specific performance objectives:

- To provide 100% of dialogue resolutions within 72 hours
- Of those enrolled in the DDPS, at least 60% reduction in the number of patients referred to attend hospital
- Any serious incidents (causing patients to experience serious harm or death) or complaints must be investigated and managed within timescales concurrently expected by national regulators (eg., 100% of complaints to be resolved within 20 days)
- Where patients were retained in primary care, 100% of diagnosis and management plan to be agreed within two days
- Good clinician and patient satisfaction
- To identify educational opportunities for generalists
- Reduction in waiting times for patients to secondary care

We use service activity records to report how well the service met the first four specific objectives. Primary and secondary care providers were asked for feedback soon after their registration and training in the software system about ease of use and quality of training. Subsequent questionnaires invited suggestions from health care workers about possible benefits or challenges related to using the DDPS.
Clinician feedback was solicited upon registration and at least twice a year afterwards; this was used to design and run an educational event which is described narratively here. Consenting patients were contacted by text or email a few days after resolution of their DDPS referral, to fill in a brief satisfaction survey with those results described here qualitatively.

The impact that the DDPS might have had on dermatology care in N&W was considered with respect to median wait times, counts of new additions to wait lists, total wait list sizes and existing waiting time targets. As comparators to N&W, we looked at commissioners in the Rest of England (not including N&W), and separately, a commissioning area in the adjacent county of Lincolnshire (CCG codes 71E, 03H and 03K). This area of Lincolnshire has similar demographic characteristics to patients served by the N&WICS: highly rural, high white ethnicity and older than national average. Rest-of-England services in practice can be any commissioning hub or clinical commissioning group.

A concurrent national target (key performance indicator, KPI) was that 95% of patients referred for secondary care should be treated within 18 weeks. Data on wait time KPI performance were available from NHS England. Exact URLs for this and other data sources are given in notes for each results table. We consider median wait times for N&W-commissioned dermatology against North East Lincolnshire and Rest-of-England commissioned services.

Actual wait duration and wait list sizes are subject to fluctuations for diverse reasons beyond the ability of the DDPS service to change, such as allocation of resources to secondary care and prioritisation of specific pathways (such as the 2 week wait priority pathway for patients with suspected cancer). It was desirable to evaluate the outcome that the DDPS service was intended to directly reduce: new referral starts. Counts of new referral clock starts to secondary care are described as ‘New Periods’. These data therefore are counts of new waiting periods rather than patients seen, and combine routine with urgent status referrals. These data are publicly available for calendar months from April 2016 onwards for all English NHS commissioners. We compared the estimated and actual new referral starts from N&W compared to projections derived from historical N&W data, and from the historical and pandemic-era relationship (established high correlation using Pearson’s correlation coefficient) between N&W new referral counts and the Rest-of-England counts.

Finally, we considered if the DDPS had had a harmful effect on another treatment pathway. The DDPS was designed with objective to reduce wait list size for persons on the routine referral pathway (non-urgent). It seemed possible that patients whose treatment priority was escalated via the DDPS service might have the unintended consequence of over-burdening the urgent care (cancer, two-week-wait: 2WW) pathway. If images weren’t sufficiently diagnostic, the safest decision by consultants could be to refer patients to the 2WW.

Movement to the 2WW pathway could pose both potential benefits and harms to the system and to patient themselves. Most patients would appreciate faster assessment and treatment, but they also could be unnecessarily alarmed that their care priority had been escalated. From a system perspective, there are potential harms, if specialists unnecessarily moved routine referrals to the urgent pathway. Without increased provider capacity, pathway movement could lead to greater wait times to being seen and greater delays to treatment for persons later diagnosed with cancer. A separate evaluation would be needed to comprehensively understand if these unintended escalations led to earlier diagnosis of cancers or were truly unnecessary, and how individual patients were affected. Our limited assessment here looked at only some possible impacts on treatment pathways (wait times and list sizes).
The data we used to assess possible impacts on the 2WW pathway in N&W relate to time waiting to be first seen by a specialist ("referral to treatment time", or RTT. The 2WW has a nationally set target (KPI) that 95% of patients should be seen by specialists within 14 days of referral initial.

We undertook descriptive and comparative statistical analysis using Stata v. 17. Approval to undertake this evaluation was granted by North Norfolk Primary Care (26 March 2021) and by the UEA Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Research Ethics Subcommittee on 26 Nov 2021 (their Ref. ETH21-22-0034).

Results

Activity summary

Table 1 below shows that in no month was DDPS used in most N&W surgeries (total = 105). In each surgery where the DDPS was tried, it typically generated about 7 resolved cases each month. By July 2021 the DDPS was consistently used by about 51 individual N&W surgeries at least once each month. Over the monitoring period, 337 individual callers (from primary care) tried the DDPS at least once: the median number of cases that each primary care caller ever managed on the DDPS was 5. Four specialists participated, of whom 2 specialists handled 89% (n=3246) of all 3659 cases resolved in the period 1 March 2021 through 19 April 2022 inclusive.

Table 1. Statistics about general practice (GP) surgeries and clinicians using the DDPS: March 2021-April 2022.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#GPS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#Refrs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg#</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: #GPS = count of unique surgeries. #Refrs = count of clinicians who initiated dialogues, Avg.# = count of completed cases in participating surgeries. R, L, O = counts of cases where skin condition respectively presented as a Rash, Lesion or Other.

Timeliness

The median time from case initiation to resolution was 8 hours 23 minutes; > 98.5% (n=3603) of cases were resolved within 36 hours. A small proportion (n=55, 1.5%) of cases were resolved > 3 days after case initiation. In addition to the 3659 resolved cases, there were 351 unresolved cases (with outstanding requests from secondary care for additional images or more information) at the audit date (5 May 2022). Median secondary response time for the individual dialogues (requesting more information) linked to these unresolved cases was 7 hours.
Retention in primary care or placement on secondary care pathway

As of 5 May 2022, 65% (n=2390) of 3659 resolved cases were retained in primary care following DDPS, 16% (n = 574) were referred for routine secondary care while 19% were moved to the two week (urgent) wait pathway. The percentages of cases that were retained in primary care or moved to the urgent pathway were fairly consistent throughout the monitoring period; see weekly case outcomes for the 12 weeks leading to and including week ending (we) 15 April 2022, see Figure 2. There was no significant change (increase or decrease) in the number of patients retained in primary care or moved to the 2WW pathway (linear regression data not shown).

Figure 2. Dispositions after enrolment on DDPS

![Dispositions: Completed Pathways (by date completed)](image)

Referrer satisfaction with the service

45 responses from primary care referrers were received, mostly in summer and autumn 2021. 75% reported that they initiated < 8 dialogues on the CINAPSIS platform in the preceding 4 weeks; 7 said they put more than 8 cases into CINAPSIS during the preceding 4 weeks and 4 said they had not used the service in the preceding 4 weeks. 75% of 37 respondents were very satisfied with the service, 25% were satisfied (no negative responses were received). 67% reported no problems using the service. Open-ended comments were solicited about service benefits or problems. Many of the negative comments were infrastructure related (such as poor WiFi within the practice) or that they didn’t find using a dermatoscope easy. The mostly commonly cited benefit was speed of response (n=15, 60%) in 25 comments; that the service was a learning opportunity was mentioned by 5/25 (20%). Appreciation about access to specialist knowledge and the high quality of replies received from specialists was praised in several responses.

Education for referrers
Incorporating feedback from referrers, an education event was run on 7 Dec 2021 for 34 primary care staff about ways to make the dialogue platform (CINAPSIS) work optimally, diagnosis of skin conditions in primary care (especially seborrheic keratoses) and use of imaging equipment (dermatoscopes). Feedback on this event was overwhelmingly positive in an anonymous-post-event survey; see Figure 3. The workshop was structured to support development of workforce diagnostic skills and more confident use of the CINAPSIS interface.

Figure 3. Primary care satisfaction with education and DDPS training session

Patient satisfaction

Nine patients completed the patient satisfaction questionnaire. They all reported a ‘very positive’ experience with DDPS, the highest rating possible. There were no patient complaints. Comments from the patient satisfaction survey included

- “very fast service”
- “excellent service”
- “fabulous service”
- “very pleased with the speed of response”
- “my level of anxiety has diminished completely”

Wait times to treatment

The median wait to be seen for dermatology cases in N&W was 20 weeks in March 2021. Table 2 lists the median number of weeks that had elapsed for referrals still waiting to be seen on any (routine or urgent) pathway. Only commissioners that had median waits of at least 18 weeks are listed, in each of March 2021 and March 2022. The increase in median wait times for N&W was 0.5 weeks between these two audit points. This compares to a typical increase of about 3.5 weeks in median time on treatment list for dermatology treatment in Rest-of-England and sometimes much more. These data help to show that incomplete dermatology waits in N&W had a slight increase, there was not a decrease in wait times in this monitoring period. However, importantly, the data show that waits in N&W did not increase by nearly as much as dermatology waits generally increased elsewhere in England.
Table 2: Median wait times for persons still waiting for first dermatology treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th># incomplete pathways</th>
<th>∑ within 18 weeks</th>
<th>% within 18 weeks</th>
<th>Average (median) waiting time (in weeks)</th>
<th>92nd percentile waiting time (in weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 2021 audit below</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E OF E - H&amp;J COMM’G HUB</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>52+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. STAFFORDSHIRE CCG</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINCOLNSHIRE CCG</td>
<td>2870</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW - H&amp;J COMM’G HUB</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARWICKSHIRE NORTH CCG</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE HAMPSHIRE &amp; FARNHAM CCG</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORFOLK AND WAVENEY CCG</strong></td>
<td>7606</td>
<td>3485</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>52+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVENTRY AND RUGBY CCG</td>
<td>4148</td>
<td>suppressed</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARRINGTON CCG</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 2022 audit below</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. LEICESTERSHIRE CCG</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;N HERTS CCG</td>
<td>2940</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. LEICS &amp; RUTLAND CCG</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE STAFFS &amp; SEISDON PEN. CCG</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH TYNESIDE CCG</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFORD CCG</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANCHESTER CCG</td>
<td>2926</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALFORD CCG</td>
<td>2252</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THURROCK CCG</td>
<td>1422</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORFOLK AND WAVENEY CCG</strong></td>
<td>8888</td>
<td>4111</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINCOLNSHIRE CCG</td>
<td>6592</td>
<td>3025</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH EAST ESSEX CCG</td>
<td>3972</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDLANDS - H&amp;J COMM’G HUB</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWCASTLE GATESHEAD CCG</td>
<td>4320</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. STAFFORDSHIRE CCG</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRMINGHAM &amp; SOLIHULL CCG</td>
<td>8199</td>
<td>3630</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVENTRY &amp; WARWS CCG</td>
<td>8941</td>
<td>3842</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW - H&amp;J COMM’G HUB</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOCKPORT CCG</td>
<td>4729</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEICESTER CITY CCG</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIGAN BOROUGH CCG</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E OF E - H&amp;J COMM’G HUB</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Only commissioners with median waits > 18 weeks are shown at each audit point. EoE = East of England. COMM’G = Commissioning. CCG = Clinical Commissioning Group. Source: Table 3 (Incomplete waits by commissioner) at https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/rtt-waiting-times/rtt-data-2021-22/
Table 3. Additional KPIs for the DDPS were specified as stated below with target thresholds and achievement %s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Indicator, 2021-2022</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious incidents to be reported, investigated and managed within agreed time-scales</td>
<td>No serious incidents were identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint management: to be reported, investigated and managed within 20 days, target = 100%</td>
<td>No complaints were received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis and management plan (Report) provided to the GP practice within 2 Operational Days from submission of Referral. Target = 100%</td>
<td>100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 83% 98% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Consultant response and guidance completed: target = 100% within 72 hours</td>
<td>100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 98% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other KPIs
Additional service KPI performance, especially related to complaints, serious incidents and speed of resolution, is reported in Table 3.

Dermatology activity data: New periods by commissioner

In Figures 3 and 4, the rest-England (or NE Lincolnshire) referral counts are aligned with the left axis. N&W data appear on the same charts plotted against the right axis. Putting the N&W numbers on the same charts albeit at different scales, shows how the N&W data tend to synchronise with national or Lincolnshire data. This suggests that it is valid to evaluate the DDPS with respect to total new period generation from N&W relative to new period generation in the other areas (Rest-of-England or NE Lincolnshire).

These visualisations (Figures 3 and 4) suggest that compared to April as base data, N&W consistently generated relatively fewer referrals from June 2021 to March 2022 than the adjacent comparator area in NE Lincolnshire (LINCS). In contrast, visual examination of new period generation from N&W and Rest-of-England data suggest fairly similar rates of new referral creation.

The synchronisation can be formally evidenced by Pearson correlation coefficients between the national and N&W monthly totals for 12 month periods, during the peak pandemic restrictions period (April 2020 to March 2021 inclusive) and the late pandemic period (April 2021-March 2022 inclusive). The Pearson correlation coefficients during these periods, for N&W against Rest-of-England new period counts are high, at 0.9565 (peak pandemic) and 0.7832 (late pandemic). We expect that initiatives to reduce wait list sizes and new referrals must also be in operation throughout the Rest-of-England, which means that the comparison between actual and expected new referral generation in N&W can be interpreted as comparing how well the DDPS and other pathway management efforts in N&W may have reduced plausible expected demand for specialist dermatology compared to a synthetic ‘usual care’ alternative which is the combined concurrent efforts of Rest-of-England commissioners to minimize wait list growth.
Figure 3. Norfolk and Waveney and Rest of England New Dermatology Periods
The comparisons of new period count data show that historically N&W routine referrals have tended to mirror the rest of England referrals, at a ratio of about 1:50 (for every 1 new referral in N&W there were 50 from the rest of England). Given the strong historical correspondence between Rest-of-England and N&W commissioners, the counts of new periods in N&W may be reasonably predicted from Rest-of-England data. Table 4 below makes this forecast, considering the variable ratio between N&W:Rest-of-England new period counts as observed pre-pandemic and during the peak pandemic period. In the period coincident with operation of the DDPS, the actual N&W new period counts were always lower than the expected counts using the pre-pandemic relationship, and sometimes lower using the pandemic-era relationship. These data cannot confirm that the DDPS has led to many fewer N&W referrals, but together they suggest that new period generation from N&W for dermatology services is lower than could reasonably have been forecast.
Table 4. Projected new period generation from N&WICS in absence of DDPS type service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter \ Month</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Period average counts, including April 2016-Feb 2020</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N&amp;W</td>
<td>2088</td>
<td>2236</td>
<td>2137</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>2088</td>
<td>2130</td>
<td>2099</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1483</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>1821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of England</td>
<td>87420</td>
<td>95742</td>
<td>97765</td>
<td>101686</td>
<td>96822</td>
<td>93343</td>
<td>95490</td>
<td>90230</td>
<td>72215</td>
<td>90422</td>
<td>84579</td>
<td>92640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N&amp;W as % of Rest of England until February 2020</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Period counts, peak pandemic, March 2020 – Feb 2021</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N&amp;W</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>1232</td>
<td>1219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of England</td>
<td>25313</td>
<td>39207</td>
<td>60460</td>
<td>74043</td>
<td>72046</td>
<td>82430</td>
<td>80669</td>
<td>77090</td>
<td>69262</td>
<td>64022</td>
<td>74666</td>
<td>63874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected N&amp;W as % of Rest of England in pandemic conditions</strong></td>
<td>1.99%**</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
<td>1.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Period counts from April 2021 to March 2022 inclusive (expected counts are in green font)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Rest of England</td>
<td>94587</td>
<td>92711</td>
<td>110407</td>
<td>103199</td>
<td>95826</td>
<td>102357</td>
<td>94412</td>
<td>95765</td>
<td>75553</td>
<td>87431</td>
<td>91030</td>
<td>102237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected N&amp;W period counts per historical %</td>
<td>2261</td>
<td>2169</td>
<td>2418</td>
<td>2177</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>2334</td>
<td>2077</td>
<td>2107</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected N&amp;W period counts per pandemic %</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2363</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>2118</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual N&amp;W New Period counts</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>2399</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>2243</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1458</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>2165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Counts of routine status Dermatology New Periods for N&W and rest of England commissioners. Expected N&W counts are calculated from the %s shown here as observed during pre- and active COVID epidemic periods. Notes: ** Because April 2020 was so unusual (in N&W ratio to national referral counts), the preferred forecast % for April 2021 was changed to the mean of other pandemic months, i.e., 1.99%.**
Wait List sizes: Dermatology and other specialisms

From nationally published data we can observe and compare wait list sizes to receive specialist dermatology services from N&W and Rest-of-England commissioners. Table 5 below shows how wait lists grew for each group of commissioners. Figure 5 below shows the same information graphically. Wait lists for N&W grew initially followed by list size reduction from October 2021-March 2022 inclusive. A different growth trajectory was seen in Rest-of-England, where there was steady growth or plateau in the month-to-month counts of waiting cases between April 2021 and March 2022. Due to unobserved multi-factorial other management and system factors, these results cannot verify that the DDPS caused a fall in wait list size in N&W, but it was encouraging that N&W-commissioned dermatology defied the national trend coincident with the later period of DDPS operation.

From end April 2021 to end March 2022, wait list size increases were respectively Rest-of-England: 42.8%, N&W: 13.2%. The increase in wait list size in N&W for specialist Dermatology, during the monitoring period, was much smaller in N&W than in Rest-of-England, and declined between end October 2021 and end March 2022.

Table 5. Month to month increase in wait list size, N&WICS vs. Rest-of-England commissioners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th>Cases waiting Rest England</th>
<th>Rest % incr monthly</th>
<th>Cases waiting N&amp;W</th>
<th>N&amp;W % incr monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar-21</td>
<td>199426</td>
<td>7606</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-21</td>
<td>215320</td>
<td>7850</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-21</td>
<td>230070</td>
<td>7998</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-21</td>
<td>250008</td>
<td>8157</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-21</td>
<td>268605</td>
<td>8415</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-21</td>
<td>279454</td>
<td>8908</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-21</td>
<td>291802</td>
<td>9439</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-21</td>
<td>297896</td>
<td>9658</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-21</td>
<td>297070</td>
<td>9638</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-21</td>
<td>293693</td>
<td>9302</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-22</td>
<td>295640</td>
<td>9236</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-22</td>
<td>301077</td>
<td>8888</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Waits are for combined pathways (urgent and routine)
2. incr = increase
3. (audit point = last day of each calendar month)
Figure 5. Wait list sizes for dermatology services commissioned by Rest-of-England and N&W.

Notes: Rest-of-England data are plotted against the left axis; N&W data are plotted against the right axis. Data were aligned to visually coincide at start (end March 2021) while the vertical axes were equally proportioned (i.e., the top value on each vertical axis is twice the bottom value). The counts are a combined total of patients on urgent and routine priority pathways.

Table 6 below displays wait list sizes for other large commissioners (at least 1000 incomplete pathways at either end April 2021 or end March 2022, n = 77) in England. 13 of the 77 had wait list growth that was ≤ 13.2%, as low or better than Norfolk & Waveney. Falls in wait list size (denoted with green font) were unusual. Average wait list size growth for dermatology during this period for all Rest-of-England commissioners was increase of 47.4%.
Table 6 Wait list sizes at end April 2021 and end March 2022 for large English NHS commissioners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NHS CCG</th>
<th>End Apr-21</th>
<th>End Mar-22</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASILDON AND BRENTWOOD</td>
<td>1231</td>
<td>2167</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET, SWINDON AND WILTSHIRE</td>
<td>2697</td>
<td>3672</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEDFORDSHIRE, LUTON AND MILTON KEYNES</td>
<td>2508</td>
<td>5834</td>
<td>132.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERKSHIRE WEST</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRMINGHAM AND SOLIHULL</td>
<td>9223</td>
<td>8199</td>
<td>-11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK COUNTRY AND WEST BIRMINGHAM</td>
<td>4769</td>
<td>5735</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOLTON</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRADFORD DISTRICT AND CRAVEN</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIGHTON AND HOVE</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>2896</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRISTOL, NORTH SOMERSET AND SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE</td>
<td>2506</td>
<td>2606</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUCKINGHAMSHIRE</td>
<td>2193</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURY</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>2522</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH</td>
<td>2693</td>
<td>4792</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASTLE POINT AND ROCHEFORD</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHESHIRE</td>
<td>3025</td>
<td>6172</td>
<td>104.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY DURHAM</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>2080</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVENTRY AND WARWICKSHIRE</td>
<td>6864</td>
<td>8941</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DERBY AND DERBYSHIRE</td>
<td>3429</td>
<td>6924</td>
<td>101.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVON</td>
<td>7150</td>
<td>8949</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORSET</td>
<td>2864</td>
<td>3770</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST AND NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE</td>
<td>1368</td>
<td>2940</td>
<td>114.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST STAFFORDSHIRE</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIMLEY</td>
<td>2895</td>
<td>4502</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOUCESTERSHIRE</td>
<td>2160</td>
<td>2155</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMPSHIRE, SOUTHAMPTON AND ISLE OF WIGHT</td>
<td>5680</td>
<td>7974</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEREFORDSHIRE AND WORCESTERSHIRE</td>
<td>2517</td>
<td>3251</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERTS VALLEYS</td>
<td>2927</td>
<td>5445</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HULL</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPSWICH AND EAST SUFFOLK</td>
<td>2895</td>
<td>4502</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENT AND MEDWAY</td>
<td>7638</td>
<td>8882</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KERNOW</td>
<td>2162</td>
<td>2976</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKLEES</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWSLEY</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEEDS</td>
<td>2959</td>
<td>4404</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEICESTER CITY</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINCOLNSHIRE</td>
<td>3377</td>
<td>6592</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVERPOOL</td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>2770</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANCHESTER</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>2926</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID ESSEX</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>4138</td>
<td>174.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORECAMBE BAY</td>
<td>1341</td>
<td>1112</td>
<td>-17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWCASTLE GATESHEAD</td>
<td>3096</td>
<td>4320</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CENTRAL LONDON</td>
<td>7843</td>
<td>9769</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CUMBRIA</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH EAST ESSEX</td>
<td>2259</td>
<td>3972</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH EAST LONDON</td>
<td>6997</td>
<td>9885</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS CCG</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-21</td>
<td>Mar-22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH TYNESIDE</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH WEST LONDON</td>
<td>6878</td>
<td>10890</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH YORKSHIRE</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHAMPTONSHIRE</td>
<td>2204</td>
<td>4115</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHUMBERLAND</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTTINGHAM AND NOTTINGHAMSHIRE</td>
<td>3193</td>
<td>5082</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXFORDSHIRE</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>3457</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALFORD</td>
<td>2133</td>
<td>2252</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEFFIELD</td>
<td>2160</td>
<td>3721</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHROPSHIRE, TELFORD AND WREKIN</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>2847</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMERSET</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>2062</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH EAST LONDON</td>
<td>6832</td>
<td>9452</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH EAST STAFFORDSHIRE AND SEISDON PENINSULA</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH WEST LONDON</td>
<td>7843</td>
<td>9527</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH TYNESIDE</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHEND</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOCKPORT</td>
<td>2795</td>
<td>4729</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURREY HEARTLANDS</td>
<td>3831</td>
<td>5016</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMESIDE AND GLOSSOP</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEES VALLEY</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THURROCK</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1422</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFORD</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>125.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAKEFIELD</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARRINGTON</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST ESSEX</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST LEICESTERSHIRE</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST SUFFOLK</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST SUSSEX</td>
<td>3621</td>
<td>6961</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIGAN BOROUGH</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIRRAL</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Waits are for combined pathways (urgent and routine)
2. (audit point = last day of each calendar month)
According to national data March 2022, the nine largest non-surgical wait lists for specialist care in England during the 2021-22 financial year were: Trauma & Orthopaedic 730,930; Opthalmology 632,817; Ear Nose and Throat 498,397; Gynaecology 481,083; Urology 351,203; Paediatric 340,240; Gastroenterology 340,131, Dermatology 316,383 and Cardiology 298,304. The average increase in wait list size for each treatment specialism was 23.3%. The Table below shows wait list sizes for each of the non-Dermatology specialisms in N&W in the period April 2021-March 2022 inclusive. Wait lists for all these specialisms grew. Three specialisms (gastroenterology, ophthalmology and trauma and orthopedics) had wait list gains that were better (smaller in percentage terms) than the dermatology wait list size change over the same period. List peak points are in red font on Table 7 below. Most specialisms reached their peak size in this period in the first quarter of 2022. Only trauma and orthopedics (T&O) also had a net fall in wait list size during the period October 2021 to end March 2022.

Table 7. Wait list sizes for secondary care specialisms commissioned by N&WICS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th>Cardiology</th>
<th>ENT</th>
<th>Gastroenterology</th>
<th>Gynaecology</th>
<th>Ophthalmology</th>
<th>Paediatric</th>
<th>T&amp;O</th>
<th>Urology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar-21</td>
<td>3731</td>
<td>8088</td>
<td>3738</td>
<td>8552</td>
<td>11186</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>14098</td>
<td>5002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-21</td>
<td>3819</td>
<td>8480</td>
<td>3996</td>
<td>8787</td>
<td>11386</td>
<td>5235</td>
<td>14921</td>
<td>4994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-21</td>
<td>4056</td>
<td>8939</td>
<td>3999</td>
<td>9013</td>
<td>11924</td>
<td>5778</td>
<td>15184</td>
<td>5012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-21</td>
<td>4191</td>
<td>9579</td>
<td>3985</td>
<td>9320</td>
<td>12355</td>
<td>6152</td>
<td>15025</td>
<td>5100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-21</td>
<td>4248</td>
<td>9887</td>
<td>4011</td>
<td>9433</td>
<td>12455</td>
<td>6388</td>
<td>15522</td>
<td>5256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-21</td>
<td>4261</td>
<td>10243</td>
<td>3895</td>
<td>9775</td>
<td>12444</td>
<td>6465</td>
<td>15888</td>
<td>5448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-21</td>
<td>4308</td>
<td>10587</td>
<td>3992</td>
<td>10325</td>
<td>12379</td>
<td>6242</td>
<td>15967</td>
<td>5563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-21</td>
<td>4452</td>
<td>10934</td>
<td>4120</td>
<td>10615</td>
<td>12626</td>
<td>6253</td>
<td>16475</td>
<td>5788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-21</td>
<td>4584</td>
<td>11038</td>
<td>4098</td>
<td>10486</td>
<td>12336</td>
<td>6353</td>
<td>16314</td>
<td>5829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-21</td>
<td>4777</td>
<td>11207</td>
<td>4122</td>
<td>10643</td>
<td>12428</td>
<td>6662</td>
<td>16517</td>
<td>5977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-22</td>
<td>4677</td>
<td>11248</td>
<td>4166</td>
<td>10852</td>
<td>12350</td>
<td>6999</td>
<td>16241</td>
<td>6153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-22</td>
<td>4773</td>
<td>11182</td>
<td>4399</td>
<td>11036</td>
<td>12327</td>
<td>7099</td>
<td>15993</td>
<td>6429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-22</td>
<td>4967</td>
<td>11064</td>
<td>4379</td>
<td>11034</td>
<td>12731</td>
<td>7278</td>
<td>16438</td>
<td>6470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % increase | 30.1% | 30.5% | 9.6% | 25.6% | 11.8% | 39.0% | 10.2% | 29.6% |

Notes: ENT = Ear Nose and Throat; T&O = Trauma and Orthopedics. The Paediatric category did not exist in March 2021 audit. %increase refers to end April 2021 to end March 2022 period. Waits are for combined pathways (urgent and routine). Source: Incomplete waits by commissioner at https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/rtt-waiting-times/rtt-data-2021-22/

Effects of DDPS on two week pathway (urgent, suspected cancer)

The 2WW has a target (key performance indicator, KPI) that 95% of patients should be seen by specialists within 14 days of referral initial. Over 99% of N&W commissioned services are delivered by three acute providers in the same geographic area, and whose case counts provide data in Table 8 below. National data were provisional and showed that the 2WW target was not met at any time during the period that the DDPS was operating: either by providers that take 99% of N&W patients or nationally. Both N&W and Rest-of-England had a surge in service users on the 2WW pathway in the period June-November 2021. The surge in N&W was about 33% higher than the number of service users...
seen in the combined 6 months before and after June-November 2021. Counts of cases moved from the DDPS to the 2WW are shown in the table below. In June-November 2021, moved cases from DDPS contributed about one fifth of the surge in referrals. This means that the vast majority of the 2021 surge in demand in N&W was not due to cases moved from DDPS. For both N&W and Rest-of-England, this surge seems likely to related to decisions to delay presentation to primary care during Covid lockdown periods. Delays in seeking treatment were common during the pandemic. Staff shortages due to Covid sickness and/or isolation requirements may have also contributed to poor RTT KPI performance at any time in the pandemic period.

Table 8. Waits to be seen on urgent (cancer) dermatology pathway, Rest-of-England and N&W

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>KPI N&amp;W</th>
<th>Count moved DDPS to 2WW</th>
<th>Cases seen in N&amp;W</th>
<th>Moved count as % of seen</th>
<th>KPI England</th>
<th>Seen Rest Eng</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar-21</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>47316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-21</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>43500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-21</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>45074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-21</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>52988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-21</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>51954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-21</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>48992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-21</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>52784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-21</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>49348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-21</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>50517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-21</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>40797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-22</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>38828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-22</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>43995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-22</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>51218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Counts and %s of cases seen are provisional data for April 2021 onwards.
2. KPI refers to performance of the 3 secondary care providers in the N&W region; these receive > 99% of N&W commissioned referrals. Two of these providers often met or nearly met the KPI in this monitoring period, but the largest single provider (NNUH) had especially poor KPI performance during the surge period.
3. Rest Eng = all other providers in England not including the 3 secondary care providers in N&W.
4. Surge period is June-November 2021 inclusive, pale green shading.

Discussion

Trettel and Augustin (2018) provided a comprehensive overview updated to October 2015 of different types of telemedicine applications in dermatology, including 59 triage-style services. Previous similar studies reported on diverse evaluation metrics and use of smart-phone apps is a relatively recent development. Shorter wait times to treatment for specialist care (where this was the patient...
disposition) are a long and commonly reported benefit for individual cases. Among patients not retained in primary care, Whited et al (2002) found that wait times to first treatment were shorter by 86 days; Bianchi et al 2019 reported a wait time reduction of 78%. Börve et al (2015) said that patients (with squamous cell carcinoma) had median wait times to first secondary care consultation that were 83 days sooner than patients on the usual referral pathway. Our analysis may be unusual in that we prefer to assess not individual but rather whole system impacts, as this is how the greatest benefits may be achieved for the most patients. We cannot confirm that the DDPS caused shorter system-wide wait times, but there is strong circumstantial evidence that they may have happened.

Skin cancer is among the most common cancers in the UK. More referrals for suspected cancer are made to dermatology than any other specialty. About 50% of the one million dermatology referrals in the UK are on the two week wait pathway. The vast majority of cases on the 2WW pathway are later determined to have benign not malignant skin conditions. Upskilling primary care referrers to better distinguish likely cancers from benign lesions could have considerable consequential benefits with regard to reducing specialist work loads and ensuring faster treatment for patients with cancer. The DDPS service provided opportunities to collect data about training needs and enabled design of a training session to help generalists distinguish likely benign from malignant lesions. Assessing this skill gain was not a primary focus of the service evaluation, but could be incorporated into future service evaluation designs.

Before 2020, digitally-enabled customised dermatology triage had been piloted in some primary care practices in England, including in N&W. Where such services involve regular communication between generalists and specialists they may be considered as forms of Advice and Guidance. A dermatology Advice and Guidance service was routinely available to all clinicians in N&W and the rest of England since before 2021, the NHS e-Referral service (e-RS), which enabled generalists to ask for specialist advice based on patient clinical presentation and history. Use of the e-RS increased during the Covid-19 pandemic era, including for dermatology cases in N&W (see Table 9). Total N&W case counts in the e-RS did not fall when the DDPS was introduced, which suggests that the DDPS did not supplant the e-RS pathway. The eRS is similar to the DDPS in that it allows generalists to ask for specialist advice based on patient clinical presentation and history. The DDPS and supporting CINAPSIS platform were meant to have enhanced functionality and shared decision-making potential beyond e-RS capabilities that would enhance likelihood that patients could be safely retained in primary care. Subjectively perceived service lead and developer benefits of using the CINAPSIS platform over e-RS are listed in Appendix Table A1. Desirable features cited in Table A1 include better user interface, faster data input, better image generation and handling utilities, reminders to ensure timely communication, facilitated collaboration between generalists and specialists, collection of and reporting tools for activity, educational, disposition and other performance monitoring.

We did not set out to compare the e-RS with the CINAPSIS/DDPS services, and indeed e-RS activity data are not available that would enable such a comparison to be robust. There are not multi-year historical data for N&W or any service performance data for the e-RS to compare with. We have found only limited evidence that could be used to compare our evaluation of DDPS to e-RS (all in other NHS commissioning areas). For instance, in York in 2018, use of the e-RS system with addition of dermatoscope equipment and primary referrer training was thought to have improved retention of patients in primary care by about 50%, specifically for patients who were already placed on the 2WW pathway. The e-RS was linked to sharp reductions in wait list sizes early in 2020. However, this outcome may have been skewed by generally lower demand for all specialist services in this period. At least one acute NHS centre imposed a trial period (in 2021) of requiring that secondary care referrals must be processed through A&G; we are not aware of an evaluation of the outcomes of this experiment. Our own impact assessment is more comprehensive than these other efforts.
Table 9. Counts of advice and guidance service (e-RS) cases in N&W acute secondary care, returned with advice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acute Trust</th>
<th>JPUH</th>
<th>NNUH</th>
<th>QEHKL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct-20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Source: N&W Integrated Care Board. Comparable e-RS activity data for rest of England are not available but also widely recognized to have generally increased in the concurrent period.

The introduction of any new treatment pathway has the potential to cause unintended consequences, including distorting clinician decisions. Increased access to specialist advice could cause generalists to put patients into the DDPS that might have been placed directly on the 2WW without the DDPS existence, or that the clinician might have felt on balance could probably be treated in primary care without enrolment on the DDPS. It is challenging to understand much less reliably measure this kind of distortion in clinical decision making even under a randomized controlled trial study design. We did specifically consider whether the DDPS might have led to large increases in demand for the 2WW pathway. If photos aren't diagnostic the safest recommended outcome advised by the reporting clinician was for face to face review on the urgent pathway. Although more patients were moved from DDPS to 2WW than envisioned by service designers, at this level of deployment, the DDPS was not responsible for most of the concurrent increase in cases on the 2WW in N&W. Further evaluation would be needed to understand what proportion of these referrals did turn out to be skin cancer.
Many previous “tele dermatology” programme evaluations described elsewhere\textsuperscript{9, 15, 16} seem to have not been as seamlessly integrated into existing electronic referral generation systems as the CINAPSID platform was for the physicians in this study. This integration was vital to making the service easy and appealing for clinicians to use and to support good continuity of care. A dialogue system between primary carers using specialist equipment (dermatoscopes) and secondary care may be more universally accessible to patients than other forms of “telemedicine” triage that lack a primary care facilitator, and thus might rely on patient’s own ability to supply appropriate images and clinical history\textsuperscript{22}. The design of any such service needs to be compatible with other existing ways of creating access to specialist care. Thus, the DDPS was designed for a UK-style setting where most specialist dermatology is generally accessed only after consultation with primary care.

Although we describe here a dialogue service for dermatology, the model is suitable to be deployed for other specialisms where it might achieve similar or better outcomes. Among the most suitable other specialisms that seem suitable to shared primary/secondary management and dialogue are cardiology, gynaecology and respiratory medicine.

**Limitations**

The benefits of programmes like the DDPS would be more confidently determined under a randomized controlled trial study design. The success of a DDPS-type service would be more robustly assessed if adopted by a larger number of surgeries. Some types of service evaluation were not undertaken here but would be informative. Cost benefit analysis and clinical audits may be undertaken in future by coauthors and colleagues to determine several aspects of service performance. We did not try to assess changes in activity in the concurrently operating e-RS advice and guidance service, or whether the e-RS could be improved to provide similar benefits as the DDPS. Patient safety assessment is not part of our evaluation. That could consider among other outcomes, comparison to cancer diagnosis rate for persons placed on the 2WW pathway with and without DDPS enrolment first, and waiting times for first treatment among those cases determined to have a skin cancer.

**Conclusion**

The DDPS was broadly successful. DDPS was tried by over 300 primary care referrers in Norfolk and Waveney in 2021-2022. Over 98% of cases had a quick resolution, with conventional pathway assignment or retention in primary care within 36 hours. Patient and clinician feedback was overwhelmingly positive. The service helped identify diagnostic skill gaps and informed an educational and training event for primary care staff which was mostly described as useful. Service KPI targets were broadly met.

For resolved cases put on the DDPS pathway, over 60% were retained in primary care and did not enter the wait lists for specialist care. The period when the DDPS was operational coincided with smaller counts of new referral generation than might have been plausibly forecast from historical demand data. Performance on the two week wait (“cancer”) pathway did not obviously correlate (positively or negatively) to DDPS activity. The period when the DDPS was operational coincided with a much smaller increase in wait list size than was typically experienced concurrently by other English commissioners for dermatology and indeed most other specialist services sought by N&W commissioners. Together these findings suggest the DDPS has resulted in intelligent pathway management that achieved lower service demand and smaller dermatology waiting lists than might otherwise have occurred in absence of the DDPS.
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### Table A1. Perceived benefits of using CINAPSIS over typical experience of e-RS during DDPS evaluation period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeliness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Service level agreements in place meaning commitment by specialists to provide timely response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Notifications and reminders to drive timeliness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No limit to size of images that can be shared, no need for resizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faster image upload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direct upload, no need to transfer between devices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Images held on secure “in the cloud” servers, no copies held on local devices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Images are mandatory to include (facilitate diagnosis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Guarantee that referrer will find preferred secondary clinician</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility and mobility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did not require smart card to operate, meant faster to input information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dialogues could be answered at home (useful for clinician work life balance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not dependent on other NHS systems (useful in case of disaster or IT outage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to transcribe data into fields</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quickly and automatically generated decision letters to both primary and secondary care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faster, more automatic recording of decisions into individual patient records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting evaluation and education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data collected to support trend analysis and activity monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information available on commonly diagnosed conditions (outcomes of secondary care decisions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other features: CINAPSIS can integrate with eRS where appropriate.

**Sources**: CINAPSIS staff and NHS Service Leader, North Norfolk Primary Care.