

1 **Title:** *Virtual care use among older immigrant adults in Ontario, Canada during the COVID-19*
2 *pandemic: a repeated cross-sectional analysis*

3
4 **Authors:** Janette Brual, PhD¹ (**co-first author**); Cherry Chu, MSc¹ (**co-first author**); Jiming Fang,
5 PhD²; Cathleen Fleury, MSc¹; Vess Stamenova, PhD¹; Onil Bhattacharyya, MD PhD^{1,3,4}; Mina
6 Tadrous, PharmD PhD^{1,2,5}

7
8 **Affiliations:**

9 1 Women's College Hospital Institute for Health System Solutions and Virtual Care, Toronto ON,
10 Canada

11 2 ICES, Toronto ON, Canada

12 3 Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, Dalla Lana School of Public Health,
13 University of Toronto, Toronto ON, Canada

14 4 Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto ON, Canada

15 5 Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Toronto, Toronto ON, Canada

16
17 **Corresponding author:**

18 Cherry Chu
19 76 Grenville Street
20 Toronto, Ontario M5S 1B2
21 cherry.chu@wchospital.ca
22 Phone: 416-323-6400 x5944

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Abstract:**

34 The critical role of virtual care during the COVID-19 pandemic has raised concerns about the
35 widening disparities to access by vulnerable populations including older immigrants. This paper
36 aims to describe virtual care use in older immigrant populations residing in Ontario, Canada.

37
38 In this population-based, repeated cross-sectional study, we used linked administrative data to
39 describe virtual care and healthcare utilization among immigrants aged 65 years and older
40 before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. Visits were identified weekly from January 2018 to
41 March 2021 among various older adult immigrant populations.

42
43 Among older immigrants, over 75% were high users of virtual care (had two or more virtual
44 visits) during the pandemic. Rates of virtual care use increased for both older adult immigrant
45 and non-immigrant populations. At the start of the pandemic, virtual care use was lower among
46 immigrants compared to non-immigrants (weekly average of 77 vs 86 visits). As the pandemic
47 progressed, the rates between these groups became similar (80 vs 79 visits). Virtual care use
48 was consistently lower among immigrants in the family class (75 visits) compared to the
49 economic (82 visits) or refugee (89 visits) classes, and was lower among those who only spoke
50 French (69 visits) or neither French nor English (73 visits) compared to those who were fluent in
51 English (81 visits).

52
53 This study found that use of virtual care was comparable between older immigrants and non-
54 immigrants overall, though there may have been barriers to access for older immigrants early

55 on in the pandemic. However, within older immigrant populations, immigration category and
56 language ability were consistent differentiators in the rates of virtual care use throughout the
57 pandemic.

58

59 **Key Words:** immigrant, older adults, virtual care, COVID-19, pandemic

60

61 **Author Summary**

62 When the COVID-19 pandemic began, healthcare systems pivoted from in-person to virtual care
63 to maintain physical distancing. Studies have shown that virtual care use became much more
64 frequent during the pandemic as a result. What we do not know is whether virtual care is being
65 used equitably, that is, whether everybody has fair access to the resource. This can be a big
66 issue particularly amongst older adults, who are often battling several diseases and use
67 healthcare frequently. Many older adults are immigrants who may face challenges in accessing
68 healthcare due to reasons such as limited language fluency and resource support. Our study
69 found that older adult immigrants aged 65 and above living in Ontario, Canada had lower use of
70 virtual care initially, but their use eventually caught up with non-immigrants as the pandemic
71 progressed. We also found that older adult immigrants from the family class had lower virtual
72 care use compared to those from the economic, refugee, or other immigration classes.
73 Additionally, immigrants who were not fluent in English had lower use compared to those who
74 were fluent. These results show that virtual care access remains an issue for vulnerable
75 minorities and steps should be taken to ensure these groups are receiving adequate care.

76 **Introduction**

77 In March 2020, the World Health Organization declared the outbreak of the novel coronavirus
78 disease (COVID-19) a pandemic[1], and as a result, health systems around the world had to
79 adapt quickly in order to continue providing access to healthcare services. To accommodate
80 safety protocols of physical distancing and to reduce virus transmission, health care shifted
81 from predominantly in-person care to remote care using virtual modalities. In response, the
82 Ontario government issued temporary billing codes allowing physicians to bill for the use of
83 telephone and video visits[2]. A recent study examining the period before and during the
84 COVID-19 pandemic found that virtual care has been maintained at slightly above 50% of all
85 ambulatory visits in Ontario, Canada[3].

86

87 As virtual care becomes more common and innovations in digital health continue to be
88 developed post-pandemic, there is growing concern that the digital divide will widen and
89 disadvantage the most vulnerable populations[4, 5], particularly older immigrants. Older adults
90 have complex health needs, higher rates of chronic disease, disabilities, and comorbidities, and
91 are among the highest users of the healthcare system[6, 7]. Older immigrants in Canada are
92 even more vulnerable to breakdowns in the system, and may face additional challenges when
93 accessing healthcare, including cultural differences, discrimination, language barriers, literacy,
94 health beliefs, and spatial isolation[8-11]. In addition, some barriers to access for older adult
95 populations, such as physical or mental disabilities, inexperience or discomfort with technology,
96 or lack of digital equipment[12-14] may be even more pronounced among immigrants who
97 migrated at an older age and have poor social determinants of health upon arriving in Canada.

98 Furthermore, some recent immigrants may face further health decline with increasing years of
99 residency in Canada and poor access to health care[15]. While early reports during the
100 pandemic showed that the rates of virtual care visits were highest among older adults
101 compared to younger groups[16], it remains unclear how immigration status affected virtual
102 care use.

103
104 This paper aims to describe virtual care use in older immigrant populations in Ontario overall,
105 as well as across various immigrant sub-groups.

106
107 **Methods**

108 *Data Sources*

109 We used linked and coded population-based health databases from ICES (formerly the Institute
110 for Clinical Evaluative Sciences) to examine the utilization of virtual care among the older adult
111 patient population. ICES is an independent, non-profit research institute whose legal status
112 under Ontario's health information privacy law allows it to collect and analyze health care and
113 demographic data, without consent, for health system evaluation and improvement.

114
115 The databases used for our study included: (1) The Immigration, Refugee, and Citizenship
116 Canada (IRCC) Permanent Residents Database, which has demographic data of all immigrants to
117 Canada who become permanent residents including information on country of birth, citizenship
118 and country of residence, admission category and landing date or age at landing; (2) Registered
119 Persons Database (RPDB), which contains demographic information of all patients covered

120 under the Ontario Health Insurance Plan; (3) Ontario Health Insurance Plan (OHIP), which
121 includes information on all health services delivered by physicians to Ontario patients who are
122 eligible for coverage; (4) various ICES-derived cohorts. Databases were linked using unique
123 encoded identifiers and analyzed at ICES.

124

125 *Study design and setting*

126 This analysis reports on virtual care use among older immigrant populations and is part of a
127 larger study of virtual care use among older adults before and during the COVID-19 pandemic.
128 The results of the broader study are reported elsewhere[16]. We conducted a population-
129 based, repeated cross-sectional study of virtual ambulatory visits among older immigrants (age
130 65 years and older) residing in Ontario, Canada with valid Ontario Health Insurance Plan (OHIP)
131 healthcare coverage. Individuals who were non-Ontario residents, had an invalid health card
132 number or were residing in long-term care were excluded from analysis. Visits were identified
133 using OHIP administrative claims data before and during the COVID-19 pandemic, from January
134 1, 2018 to March 29, 2021. All OHIP billing codes used to identify and calculate the rates of
135 virtual visits are available in the Appendix.

136

137 *Patient characteristics*

138 Various subgroups of patients were identified using the relevant databases, including patient
139 demographics and immigration records. ‘Immigrant’ refers to those who immigrated to Canada
140 during or after 1985. ‘Non-immigrant’ subgroups refer to any individual not recorded in the
141 immigration database and includes both Canadian-born residents and immigrants who arrived

142 in Canada before 1985. ‘Recent immigrant’ includes immigrants who arrived during or after
143 2016 and ‘Earlier immigrant’ includes immigrants who arrived between 1985 and 2015. Among
144 the immigration classes, the family category involves reunification of Canadian citizens or
145 permanent residents with close family members such as spouses, common-law or conjugal
146 partners, and dependent children[17]. Economic immigrants are selected based on the National
147 Occupational Classification according to skills and ability to contribute to the Canadian
148 economy. This category may include immigrants in the business category (entrepreneurs,
149 investors and self-employed), as well as skilled and unskilled workers. The refugee category
150 refers to immigrants who received status for refugee and asylum protection. Finally, the ‘other’
151 category refers to immigrants and permanent residents who do not belong to the other
152 immigration categories, and may include immigration by humanitarian and compassionate
153 reasons.

154
155 We used the Rurality Index of Ontario (RIO)[18] to determine rurality among the study
156 population, comparing urban (RIO score < 40) versus rural (RIO score \geq 40) residence. The
157 Postal Code Conversion File (PCCF) was used to convert all patient postal codes to
158 neighborhood income quintiles. A number of ambulatory care sensitive conditions (ACSC) were
159 also reported and included chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), heart failure,
160 asthma, hypertension, angina, and diabetes. Hospitalizations due to ACSC conditions are often
161 used as an indicator of health system performance. ACSC can be managed through timely and
162 effective disease management within primary care[19] and greater comorbidity of these
163 conditions could increase the risk of hospitalization if not well managed.

164

165 We further categorized patients based on their use of virtual care (high vs low) to compare
166 health status, immigrant status, and health services utilization. High users were defined as
167 patients who received two or more virtual visits after March 14, 2020 until end of study period,
168 while low users were defined as patients who received one or no virtual visits after March 14,
169 2020 until end of study period.

170

171 *Analysis*

172 Rates of virtual visits were calculated for each week (from Sunday to Saturday) from January
173 1st, 2018 to March 29th, 2021. The denominator for each week's rate calculation included all
174 residents of Ontario who were age 65 and above during the week and eligible for healthcare
175 services in Ontario (i.e., OHIP-insured). We summarized the overall rates of virtual visits within
176 the older immigrant population, comparing rates to the non-immigrant population and across
177 the following subgroups: recent versus non-recent immigrant status, immigration category
178 (economic, family, refugee and 'other' category), and Canadian language ability (English and
179 French). For this analysis, March 14, 2020 was considered the start date of the COVID-19
180 pandemic as it was the day that new temporary billing codes were introduced by the Ontario
181 government which expanded physician reimbursement of telemedicine services (including
182 telephone calls) in response to the pandemic. All analyses were performed in SAS 9.4 (SAS
183 Institute)[20].

184

185 *Ethics Approval*

186 We received approval from the Women’s College Hospital Research Ethics Board for use of the
187 IRCC – Permanent Residents Database. Ethics review through a research ethics board was not
188 required for use of the other administrative databases for the purposes of this study as
189 authorized under section 45 of Ontario’s Personal Health Information Protection Act[21].

190

191 **Results**

192 *Overall patient characteristics by immigration status*

193 Baseline patient characteristics are summarized in **Table 1** comparing older adult immigrants
194 and non-immigrants. Overall, a greater proportion of older adults were women compared to
195 men (54.2% versus 45.8%). Immigrants were younger with 73.7% compared to 66.6% of non-
196 immigrants in the youngest-old category (65-74 years). A higher proportion of older immigrants
197 lived in urban areas compared to non-immigrants (99.0% versus 89.1%), and they had lower
198 incomes, with 26.3% of older immigrants compared to 18.0% of non-immigrant older adults in
199 the lowest income quintile. For both immigrant and non-immigrant patient populations, the top
200 previously diagnosed disease conditions were hypertension, diabetes, and mental health. The
201 number of patients with hypertension and mental health was similar between these two
202 groups, however, more immigrants had diabetes compared to non-immigrants (42% versus
203 30%).

204

205

206

207

208

209 **Table 1. Patient characteristics for older immigrant and non-immigrant adults in Ontario,**
 210 **Canada**

Characteristic	Total N=2,282,798	Immigrant n=271,075	Non-Immigrant n=2,011,723	Standardized Difference ^a
Age, n(%)				
65-74	1,539,340 (67.4)	199,780 (73.7)	1,339,560 (66.6)	0.156
75-84	567,625 (24.9)	57,168 (21.1)	510,457 (25.4)	0.102
85+	175,833 (7.7)	14,127 (5.2)	161,706 (8.0)	0.114
Sex, n(%)				
Female	1,233,462 (54.0)	146,974 (54.2)	1,086,488 (54.0)	0.004
Male	1,049,336 (46.0)	124,101 (45.8)	925,235 (46.0)	0.004
Neighbourhood income quintile, n(%)				
1	432,945 (19.0)	71,331 (26.3)	361,614 (18.0)	0.202
2	469,631 (20.6)	61,869 (22.8)	407,762 (20.3)	0.062
3	458,824 (20.1)	56,250 (20.8)	402,574 (20.0)	0.018
4	439,791 (19.3)	46,581 (17.2)	393,210 (19.5)	0.061
5	476,247 (20.9)	34,560 (12.7)	441,687 (22.0)	0.245
Rurality, n(%)				
Urban	2,060,282 (90.3)	268,240 (99.0)	1,792,042 (89.1)	0.426
Rural	200,182 (8.8)	2,203 (0.8)	197,979 (9.8)	0.41
Region, n(%)				
Central	690,994 (30.3)	154,034 (56.8)	536,960 (26.7)	0.642
East	599,098 (26.2)	56,981 (21.0)	542,117 (26.9)	0.139
North	144,377 (6.3)	1,119 (0.4)	143,258 (7.1)	0.358
Toronto	174,752 (7.7)	26,179 (9.7)	148,573 (7.4)	0.081
West	673,577 (29.5)	32,762 (12.1)	640,815 (31.9)	0.492
Chronic conditions, n(%)				
Hypertension	1,583,965 (69.4)	194,053 (71.6)	1,389,912 (69.1)	0.055
Diabetes	721,699 (31.6)	114,210 (42.1)	607,489 (30.2)	0.25
Mental Health	751,608 (32.9)	79,545 (29.3)	672,063 (33.4)	0.088
Asthma	223,451 (9.8)	23,670 (8.7)	199,781 (9.9)	0.041
Angina	166,430 (7.3)	20,158 (7.4)	146,272 (7.3)	0.006
CHF	202,396 (8.9)	17,881 (6.6)	184,515 (9.2)	0.096
COPD	188,974 (8.3)	11,536 (4.3)	177,438 (8.8)	0.185
Dementia	68,528 (3.0)	6,934 (2.6)	61,594 (3.1)	0.03

211 ^a Standardized difference greater than 0.1 is considered statistically significant.

212

213

214 *Immigrant characteristics by high vs low virtual care user group*

215 Among immigrants residing in Ontario, most arrived under the family immigration category
216 (50.4%), followed by immigrants under the economic category (32.7%) with the fewest in the
217 refugee and 'other' immigration categories (13.7% and 3.1%, respectively) (**Table 2**). In terms of
218 Canadian language ability (English and French), more than half of immigrants reported being
219 able to speak English (53.3%), followed by immigrants who spoke neither English nor French
220 (44.3%). Few immigrants were able to speak both English and French (1.6%) or French only
221 (0.8%). Most immigrants arrived before January 1st, 2016 (97.8%) with few recent immigrants
222 (2.2%). 78% of the immigrant population were high users of virtual care during the COVID-19
223 pandemic. The mean number of ACSC was 1.50 ± 0.98 and 1.09 ± 0.91 in high and low users of
224 virtual care, respectively. The average number of outpatient visits was higher among high users
225 (3.81 ± 4.37) compared to low users (1.42 ± 3.18). Similarly, more high virtual care users had at
226 least one ED visit (13.5% vs 8.2%) and hospitalization (4.8% vs 2.8%) than low users.

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243 **Table 2: Patient characteristics and healthcare utilization among older immigrant adults only,**
 244 **by virtual care use in Ontario, Canada**
 245

Virtual Care Group ^a	Total N=271,075	High User N=211,304	Low User N=59,771	Standardized Difference ^c
Immigration Category, n (%)				
Family	136,755 (50.4)	108,926 (51.5)	27,829 (46.6)	0.1
Economic	88,608 (32.7)	67,672 (32.0)	20,936 (35.0)	0.064
Refugee	37,144 (13.7)	28,109 (13.3)	9,035 (15.1)	0.052
Other	8,568 (3.2)	6,597 (3.1)	1,971 (3.3)	0.01
Immigrant Language Ability, n (%)				
Both French and English	4,377 (1.6)	3,375 (1.6)	1,002 (1.7)	0.006
English	144,479 (53.3)	113,001 (53.5)	31,478 (52.7)	0.016
French	2,034 (0.8)	1,480 (0.7)	554 (0.9)	0.025
Neither French nor English	120,019 (44.3)	93,304 (44.2)	26,715 (44.7)	0.011
Not Stated	166 (0.1)	144 (0.1)	22 (0.0)	0.014
Time of Arrival in Canada ^b , n (%)				
Earlier immigrant	265,233 (97.8)	206,674 (97.8)	58,559 (98.0)	0.011
Recent immigrant	5,842 (2.2)	4,630 (2.2)	1,212 (2.0)	0.011
Number of ACSC, mean (SD)	1.41 (0.98)	1.50 (0.98)	1.09 (0.91)	0.425
Number of virtual care visits, mean (SD)	5.94 (6.30)	7.45 (6.37)	0.6 (0.49)	1.518
Number of outpatient visits in 6 months prior, mean (SD)	3.28 (4.25)	3.81 (4.37)	1.42 (3.18)	0.625
Visited ED in 6 months prior, n(%)	33,456 (12.3%)	28,561 (13.5%)	4,895 (8.2%)	0.172
Hospitalized in 6 months prior, n(%)	11,831 (4.4%)	10,180 (4.8%)	1,651 (2.8%)	0.108

246 ^a High virtual care use is defined as two or more virtual visits after March 14, 2020, and low users,
 247 defined as zero or one virtual visits after March 14, 2020.

248 ^b “Recent immigrant” refers to immigrants who arrived in Canada after Jan 1, 2016.

249 ^c Standardized difference greater than 0.1 is considered statistically significant.

250

251


252

253

254 *Virtual Care Use: Immigrants versus Non-Immigrants*

255 **Fig 1** compares weekly rates of virtual care use between older immigrant and non-immigrant
256 populations. Both reported a significant increase in the rates of virtual care visits at the start of
257 the COVID-19 pandemic, but the rates in non-immigrants were greater than those for
258 immigrants, with average weekly rates (per 1000) of 86 and 77, respectively. However, as the
259 pandemic continued onward, virtual care use between both groups became similar, with
260 average rates (per 1000) of 79 and 80, respectively.

261



262

263 **Fig 1. Rate of virtual visits per 1000 eligible older adult patients in Ontario: Immigrant versus**
264 **non-immigrant subgroups, 2018-2021**


265 *Note: Non-immigrants may include immigrants who arrived in Canada before 1985*

266

267 *Virtual Care Use by Immigration Status*

268 As shown in **Fig 2**, during the first wave of the pandemic, earlier immigrants had slightly higher
269 rates of virtual care use compared to recent immigrants (arrived after January 1, 2016), with
270 average weekly rates (per 1000) of 78 and 71, respectively, although both groups had lower
271 rates compared to non-immigrants (86 visits per 1000). By the summer of 2020 and onwards
272 into the pandemic, rates for both earlier and recent immigrants increased to similar rates as
273 non-immigrants, with average weekly rates (per 1000) of 80, 78, and 79, respectively.

274




275
276 **Fig 2. Rate of virtual visits per 1000 eligible older immigrant patients in Ontario by recency of**
277 **immigration, 2018-2021**

278 *Note: Recent=immigrated after Jan 1, 2016; Non-immigrants may include immigrants who*
279 *arrived in Canada before 1985*

280 *Virtual Care Use by Canadian Language Ability*

281 **Fig 3** shows weekly rates of virtual care use according to Canadian language ability among non-
282 immigrant and immigrant subgroups. All groups reported a significant increase in weekly rates
283 of virtual care visits at the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. From the first wave onwards into
284 the pandemic, virtual care use was highest among non-immigrants, immigrants with English
285 language ability, and immigrants who speak both French and English, with average weekly rates
286 (per 1000) of 81, 86, and 79, respectively. However, those who speak neither English nor French
287 or only speak French had lower virtual care use, with average weekly rates (per 1000) of 69 and
288 73, respectively.




289
290 **Fig 3. Rate of virtual visits per 1000 eligible older immigrant patients in Ontario by Canadian**
291 **language ability, 2018-2021**

292 *Note: Non-immigrants may include immigrants who arrived in Canada before 1985*

293 *Virtual Care Use by Immigration Category*

294 All immigration categories reported a significant increase in weekly rates of virtual care visits
295 during the COVID-19 pandemic as shown in **Fig 4**. From the first wave onwards, virtual care use
296 was highest among refugees and those in the ‘other’ immigration categories, with average
297 weekly rates (per 1000) of 89 for both. These rates were followed by non-immigrants and
298 immigrants in the economic immigration category (e.g., skilled and unskilled workers), with
299 average weekly rates (per 1000) of 81 and 82, respectively. Older immigrants in the family
300 category used virtual care the least, with average weekly rates (per 1000) of 75.



301

302 **Fig 4. Rate of virtual visits per 1000 eligible older immigrant patients in Ontario by**
303 **immigration category, 2018-2021**

304 *Note: Non-immigrants may include immigrants who arrived in Canada before 1985*

305 **Discussion**

306 Overall, this study showed that virtual care use was lower among older immigrant populations
307 when the pandemic began compared to non-immigrant populations - however, as the
308 pandemic progressed the rates between these groups converged and became similar. Among
309 older immigrant populations, immigration admission category and language ability were found
310 to be consistent differentiators in the rates of virtual care use throughout the pandemic in
311 Ontario. Despite the consistent finding of increased virtual care uptake across all demographic
312 groups assessed, there remains potential equity issues with adoption within the older adult
313 immigrant population.

314

315 While there was an overall reduction in health service use at the start of the pandemic as
316 health systems shifted to virtual methods, there was a lag in virtual care adoption among older
317 immigrant populations. Of particular concern are older immigrants who had more chronic or
318 severe health issues, where having limited access to care at the start of the pandemic may have
319 had detrimental effects on their health resulting in greater use of care as the pandemic
320 progressed. Reasons for this apparent lagged difference in virtual care uptake for immigrants is
321 unknown, however these findings suggest that although there are increasing healthcare needs
322 among older immigrant populations, there may be significant barriers when accessing virtual
323 care services. Some of these barriers may be related to language, socioeconomic status, and
324 other immigrant-related experiences.[8-11]

325

326 Within the immigrant cohort, virtual care use was lowest among those in the family
327 immigration category when compared to other categories, while virtual care use was higher

328 among the refugee and economic classes of older immigrants. Lower rates of virtual care use
329 among older immigrants of the family class was a surprising finding, as individuals in this group,
330 by definition, would likely have family members or strong social support to assist them with
331 attending virtual visits. However, shifts in family dynamics over time (death of spouse, children
332 moving with the labour market, transitional care from home-setting, etc.), particularly among
333 earlier immigrants, can impact the availability of economic and social resources in later life,
334 resulting in poorer access to care[22]. Another possible explanation is that many newer
335 immigrant families may be of lower socioeconomic status[23], which could present as a barrier
336 to accessing virtual care, particularly with limited access to internet or digital tools (i.e. digital
337 device), in addition to non-technical barriers such as digital health literacy, comfort with digital
338 technology, and lack of trust towards digital devices[24]. Economic class immigrants reported
339 the second lowest rates of virtual care use – although the reason for this finding is unclear, it
340 may be related to these individuals being younger and healthier than other immigrants.
341 Canadian immigration and settlement are not monolithic experiences, and the intersectionality
342 of realities experienced by immigrants during the pandemic and onward can greatly impact
343 their access to health care services overall, including virtual care.

344
345 Our analyses also found that the lowest rates of virtual care visits during the pandemic were
346 among immigrants who only spoke French, and immigrants who had neither English nor
347 French-language proficiencies. Immigrants who are unable to communicate in the dominant
348 language can experience several issues relating to patient safety, appropriate treatment, and
349 quality of care[25]. The provision of healthcare services in French (outside of Quebec) and non-

350 official or minority languages is a significant resource challenge, and many immigrants
351 experience difficulties understanding their healthcare providers, and may find the quality of
352 translation services inconsistent or availability of services unreliable[26]. Ad hoc interpreters
353 and use of digital translation tools such as Google translate, while helpful, may not be adequate
354 for patients to receive the same quality of care. A few studies have cited the impact of language
355 barriers in impeding the uptake of virtual care.[27-29] Many of the communication challenges
356 faced by patients who are unable to speak the dominant language in healthcare during in-
357 person encounters likely translate to or worsen with virtual care, regardless of modality, i.e.
358 telephone or video. However, if used optimally, virtual care could alternatively provide a means
359 to connect patients with a healthcare provider who are proficient in their language. Findings
360 from this study show that virtual care provided comparable access to healthcare for many
361 immigrant groups and should be continued as an option for care, but efforts should be made to
362 leverage virtual modalities to decrease the equity gap in access rather than widen it.

363

364 ***Limitations***

365 There are a few limitations that should be addressed. First, the lack of clinical information that
366 accompanies the use of administrative data requires acknowledgment. Lack of patient-level
367 medical history or previous healthcare use limits our ability to contextualize patients' use of
368 virtual care as it relates to their health care needs. Second, with the introduction of new COVID-
369 19 virtual care billing codes in Ontario, reimbursement was permitted for both telephone and
370 video visits but did not allow for distinguishing modality used during the visits. As such, we
371 were unable to determine whether the virtual visits identified from the database were

372 delivered via telephone or video. Third, our single factor analyses were unable to examine the
373 intersectionality of the immigrant experience and its association with virtual care access.
374 Therefore, while there may be significant barriers for individuals who are a recent immigrant,
375 non-English speaker, and have low socioeconomic status, we were unable to show how these
376 intersecting identities may impact their use of virtual care. Fourth, we linked to the IRCC
377 Permanent Residents database to identify immigrant status, however this database only
378 includes immigrant data from 1985 onward. Any persons who immigrated to Ontario prior to
379 1985 would be excluded from the database and as such, we acknowledge that the use of the
380 term “non-immigrant” may also include people who arrived in Ontario before 1985[30].
381 Similarly, our definition of “recent immigrant” as arriving after Jan 1, 2016 at the time of
382 analysis, may not be an accurate representation of landing experiences in Canada, particularly
383 for immigrants who migrated at an older age. However, the literature supports the notion that
384 immigrants living in Canada for at least 15 to 20 years have similar health statuses and
385 behaviours as Canadian-born residents.[31, 32] Fifth, we were unable to account for inter-
386 provincial migration of immigrants, as the IRCC Permanent Residents database excludes records
387 of immigrants who first landed in a province other than Ontario. Inter-provincial migration can
388 be influenced by different regional economic, political and social factors, as well as being a
389 function of age, behavioural, and lifestyle preferences.[33] However, older immigrants –
390 particularly family class immigrants – are least likely to migrate after arrival in Canada[34], and
391 we can assume inter-provincial migration would be relatively low among this cohort, since
392 selective internal migration often occurs among immigrants of working age. Lastly, the analyses
393 here looked at the short-term shift in virtual care use among older immigrant populations as a

394 result of the COVID-19 pandemic, however future evaluations should continue to monitor
395 virtual care use in older immigrants post-pandemic.

396

397 **Conclusion**

398 To our knowledge, this is the first study that examines virtual care use among older immigrant
399 populations, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic. Our results suggest that there is a
400 clear link between immigration status and virtual care use. In response to the pandemic, public
401 health measures facilitated the rapid uptake of virtual care among the total older adult
402 population, and while there was a lagged difference in use between immigrant and non-
403 immigrant populations in the early months of the pandemic, these rates converged as time
404 progressed. These results suggest that virtual care was able to address gaps in access for older
405 adults broadly, but that the adjustment period from in-person to virtual care, and the learning
406 curve among older immigrant groups, may be longer. Future research should focus on the early
407 access barriers to virtual care that are experienced by vulnerable subgroups such as recent
408 immigrants, as this has important policy implications in a country with many immigrants such as
409 Canada. Additionally, the impact of language barriers and opportunities on the uptake of virtual
410 care should be further researched.

411

412 **Acknowledgements:** This study was supported by ICES, which is funded by an annual grant
413 from the Ontario Ministry of Health (MOH) and the Ministry of Long-Term Care (MLTC). Parts of
414 this material are based on data and information compiled and provided by MOH and the
415 Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI). Parts or whole of this material are based on

416 data and/or information compiled and provided by Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship
417 Canada (IRCC). The analyses, conclusions, opinions and statements expressed herein are solely
418 those of the authors and do not reflect those of the funding or data sources; no endorsement is
419 intended or should be inferred.

420

421 **Conflict of interest:** None.

422

423 **References**

- 424 1. World Health O. WHO Director-General's Opening Remarks at the Media Briefing on
425 Covid-19 - 11 March 2020. 2020.
- 426 2. Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. OHIP – Bulletins – Health Care
427 Professionals – MOHLTC.
- 428 3. Stamenova V, Chu C, Pang A, Fang J, Shakeri A, Cram P, et al. Virtual care use during
429 the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on healthcare utilization in patients with chronic disease:
430 A population-based repeated cross-sectional study. *PloS one*. 2022;17(4):e0267218.
- 431 4. Ramsetty A, Adams C. Impact of the digital divide in the age of COVID-19. *Journal of*
432 *the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2020;27(7):1147-8.
- 433 5. Gray DM, Joseph JJ, Olayiwola JN. Strategies for digital care of vulnerable patients in a
434 COVID-19 world—keeping in touch. 2020;1:e200734-e.
- 435 6. Smith B, Magnani JW. New technologies, new disparities: The intersection of electronic
436 health and digital health literacy. *Int J Cardiol*. 2019;292:280-2. Epub 2019/06/07. doi:
437 10.1016/j.ijcard.2019.05.066. PubMed PMID: 31171391; PubMed Central PMCID:
438 PMC6660987.
- 439 7. Kim EH, Stolyar A, Lober WB, Herbaugh AL, Shinstrom SE, Zierler BK, et al.
440 Challenges to using an electronic personal health record by a low-income elderly population. *J*
441 *Med Internet Res*. 2009;11(4):e44. Epub 2009/10/29. doi: 10.2196/jmir.1256. PubMed PMID:
442 19861298; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6660987.
- 443 8. Wang L, Guruge S, Montana G. Older Immigrants' Access to Primary Health Care in
444 Canada: A Scoping Review. *Canadian Journal on Aging/La Revue Canadienne Du*
445 *Vieillessement*. 2019;38(2):193-209.
- 446 9. Christensen LF, Moller AM, Hansen JP, Nielsen CT, Gildberg FA. Patients' and
447 providers' experiences with video consultations used in the treatment of older patients with
448 unipolar depression: A systematic review. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*.
449 2020;27(3):258-71. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpm.12574>.
- 450 10. Ware P, Bartlett SJ, Paré G, Symeonidis I, Tannenbaum C, Bartlett G, et al. Using
451 eHealth Technologies: Interests, Preferences, and Concerns of Older Adults. *Interact J Med Res*.
452 2017;6(1):e3. Epub 2017/03/25. doi: 10.2196/ijmr.4447. PubMed PMID: 28336506; PubMed
453 Central PMCID: PMC6660987.

- 454 11. Kruse C, Fohn J, Wilson N, Nunez Patlan E, Zipp S, Mileski M. Utilization Barriers and
455 Medical Outcomes Commensurate With the Use of Telehealth Among Older Adults: Systematic
456 Review. *JMIR Med Inform.* 2020;8(8):e20359. Epub 2020/08/14. doi: 10.2196/20359. PubMed
457 PMID: 32784177; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7450384.
- 458 12. Hyman A, Stacy E, Mohsin H, Atkinson K, Stewart K, Lauscher HN, et al. Barriers and
459 Facilitators to Accessing Digital Health Tools Faced by South Asian Canadians in Surrey, British
460 Columbia: Community-Based Participatory Action Exploration Using Photovoice. *Journal of*
461 *Medical Internet Research.* 2022;24(1):e25863.
- 462 13. Jang Y, Chiriboga DA, Molinari V, Roh S, Park Y, Kwon S, et al. Telecounseling for the
463 Linguistically Isolated: A Pilot Study with Older Korean Immigrants. *The Gerontologist.*
464 2014;54(2):290-6.
- 465 14. Pham Q, El-Dassouki N, Lohani R, Jebanesan A, Young K. The Future of Virtual Care
466 for Older Ethnic Adults Beyond the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of medical Internet research.*
467 2022;24(1):e29876.
- 468 15. Subedi RP, Rosenberg MW. Determinants of the Variations in Self-Reported Health
469 Status Among Recent and More Established Immigrants in Canada. *Social Science & Medicine.*
470 2014;115:103-10.
- 471 16. Chu C, Brual J, Fang J, Fleury C, Stamenova V, Bhattacharyya O, et al. The Use of
472 Telemedicine in Older-Adults During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Weekly Cross-sectional
473 Analysis in Ontario, Canada. *Canadian Geriatrics Journal.* 2022.
- 474 17. Immigration Refugees and Citizenship Canada. Non-Economic Classes. 2018.
- 475 18. Kralj B. Measuring Rurality - Rio2008 Basic: Methodology and Results. 2009.
- 476 19. Wallar LE, Rosella LC. Risk Factors for Avoidable Hospitalizations in Canada Using
477 National Linked Data: A Retrospective Cohort Study. *Plos One.* 2020;15(3):e0229465.
- 478 20. SAS Statistical Software. 9.4 ed. Cary, NC.: SAS Institute Inc.; 2013.
- 479 21. Government of Ontario. Personal Health Information Protection Act, 2004, SO 2004, c.
480 3, Sched. A. 2014.
- 481 22. Leigh JP. Skilled immigrants and the negotiation of family relations during settlement in
482 Calgary, Alberta. *Journal of International Migration and Integration.* 2016;17(4):1065-83.
- 483 23. Ng E, Wilkins R, Gendron F, Berthelot J. Healthy today, healthy tomorrow? Findings
484 from the national population health survey. *Dynamics of Immigrants' Health in Canada:*
485 *Evidence from the National Population Health Survey, Statistics Canada.* 2005.
- 486 24. Scott Kruse C, Karem P, Shifflett K, Vegi L, Ravi K, Brooks M. Evaluating barriers to
487 adopting telemedicine worldwide: a systematic review. *Journal of telemedicine and telecare.*
488 2018;24(1):4-12.
- 489 25. Bowen S. The Impact of Language Barriers on Patient Safety and Quality of Care.
490 *Société Santé En Français.* 2015:603-23.
- 491 26. Ariste R, di Matteo L. Non-Official Language Concordance in Urban Canadian Medical
492 Practice: Implications for Care during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Healthcare Policy= Politiques*
493 *de Sante.* 2021;16(4):84-96.
- 494 27. Liang S-Y, Richardson M, Chen T, Colocci N, Kurian A, de Briun M, et al. Widening
495 cancer care disparities in the adoption of telemedicine during COVID 19: who is left behind?
496 *Gynecologic Oncology.* 2021;162:S23. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-8258\(21\)00690-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-8258(21)00690-9).
- 497 28. Abdel-Rahman O. Patient-related barriers to some virtual healthcare services among
498 cancer patients in the USA: a population-based study. *Journal of Comparative Effectiveness*
499 *Research.* 2021;10(2):119-26. doi: 10.2217/cer-2020-0187.

- 500 29. Blackstone SR, Hauck FR. Telemedicine Use in Refugee Primary Care: Implications for
501 Care Beyond the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of immigrant and minority health*. 2022. doi:
502 10.1007/s10903-022-01360-6.
- 503 30. Chiu M, Lebenbaum M, Lam K, Chong N, Azimae M, Iron K, et al. Describing the
504 linkages of the immigration, refugees and citizenship Canada permanent resident data and vital
505 statistics death registry to Ontario's administrative health database. *BMC Med Inform Decis*
506 *Mak*. 2016;16(1):135-. doi: 10.1186/s12911-016-0375-3. PubMed PMID: 27769227.
- 507 31. Chiu M, Austin PC, Manuel DG, Tu JV. Cardiovascular Risk Factor Profiles of Recent
508 Immigrants Vs Long-Term Residents of Ontario: A Multi-Ethnic Study. *Canadian Journal of*
509 *Cardiology*. 2012;28(1):20-6.
- 510 32. Perez CE. Health Status and Health Behaviour Among Immigrants [Canadian Community
511 Health Survey-2002 Annual Report]. *Health Reports*. 2002;13:89.
- 512 33. Moore EG, Rosenberg MW. Modelling migration flows of immigrant groups in Canada.
513 *Environment and planning A*. 1995;27(5):699-714.
- 514 34. Newbold B. Secondary migration of immigrants to Canada: an analysis of LSIC wave 1
515 data. *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe canadien*. 2007;51(1):58-71.

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530




Fig 3




Fig 2




Fig 1




Fig 4