Telehealth Utilization and Patient Experiences: The Role of Social Determinants of Health Among Individuals with Hypertension and Diabetes

Haoxin Chen, MS[1], Will Simmons, MPH[1], Malak Abu Hashish, MS[1], Jiancheng Ye, PhD[1*]

[1] Weill Cornell Medicine, Cornell University, New York, NY, USA

Corresponding author:

Jiancheng Ye, PhD

Weill Cornell Medicine, Cornell University, New York, NY, USA

jiancheng.ye@u.northwestern.edu

ABSTRACT
Objective:

To evaluate the utilization patterns, effectiveness, and patient satisfaction of telehealth services among individuals with hypertension and/or diabetes, and to investigate the influence of social determinants of health (SDOH) on telehealth access and utilization in this population.

Methods:
We conducted a cross-sectional analysis using data from the 2022 Health Information National Trends Survey (HINTS 6) by the National Cancer Institute. The study sample included 3,009 respondents with self-reported diabetes, hypertension, or both conditions. Telehealth usage was assessed through 14 survey questions, and participant characteristics were analyzed using sociodemographic, baseline health, and SDOH data.

Results:
Of the 6,252 HINTS 6 survey respondents, 3,009 met the inclusion criteria. Significant sociodemographic differences were observed across the diabetes and/or hypertension groups. No significant differences were found in telehealth usage among the groups, with 43.9% of respondents utilizing telehealth in the past year. Common reasons for telehealth use included provider recommendation, convenience, and infection avoidance. Social determinants of health, such as food insecurity and transportation issues, were more prevalent among individuals with both conditions, though no significant differences in telehealth experiences were noted across groups.

Conclusion:
Telehealth shows potential for managing chronic conditions like hypertension and diabetes, demonstrating substantial adoption and universal accessibility. However, disparities influenced by SDOH highlight the need for targeted interventions to ensure equitable access. Addressing privacy concerns, leveraging healthcare providers' recommendations, and tackling SDOH barriers are crucial for fostering wider telehealth adoption and improving outcomes. Future research should focus on the long-term impacts of telehealth and further investigate SDOH factors to develop tailored interventions that enhance engagement and equitable access across diverse patient populations.

Keywords: Telehealth, Technology utilization, Social determinants of health, Hypertension, Diabetes, Multiple chronic conditions

INTRODUCTION

Chronic diseases such as hypertension and diabetes are prevalent health concerns that significantly impact individuals' quality of life and pose substantial challenges to healthcare systems worldwide [1]. Hypertension, a leading cause of cardiovascular diseases, and diabetes, a major contributor to morbidity and mortality, often co-occur, exacerbating health complications and increasing the burden on affected individuals. Managing these conditions effectively requires comprehensive and continuous care, which can be complicated by various social determinants of health (SDOH) [2].

SDOH, including socioeconomic status, education, neighborhood and physical environment, employment, and social support networks, play a crucial role in shaping health outcomes. Individuals with lower socioeconomic status, limited education, and inadequate access to healthcare resources are more likely to experience poor health outcomes and have higher rates of chronic conditions. These determinants influence not only the prevalence of hypertension and diabetes but also the ability of individuals to manage these conditions effectively. Addressing SDOH is therefore essential for improving health outcomes and reducing health disparities among populations with chronic diseases [3]. In addition to understanding the impact of SDOH and the utilization of telehealth, it is crucial to consider patients' willingness to share information about their SDOH with healthcare providers. Sharing such information can significantly enhance care coordination and allow for more personalized and comprehensive treatment plans [4]. However, privacy concerns and the sensitivity of the information can influence patients' willingness to disclose these details. Understanding the factors that

affect patients' willingness to share SDOH information can help in designing interventions that address privacy concerns and foster trust between patients and healthcare providers [5].

Telehealth has emerged as a promising solution to enhance access to healthcare services, particularly for individuals managing multiple chronic conditions [6]. The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated the adoption of telehealth, demonstrating its potential to provide convenient and effective healthcare remotely [7]. Telehealth services offer several benefits, including increased accessibility, reduced travel time, and the ability to maintain regular monitoring and management of chronic conditions [8, 9]. However, the utilization and effectiveness of telehealth can be influenced by various factors, including technology access, digital literacy, and individual preferences.

This study aims to elucidate telehealth experiences and challenges in managing hypertension and diabetes by comparing statistical outcomes among telehealth participants with these conditions [9, 10]. Furthermore, we aim to examine the influence of SDOH on telehealth access and utilization in this population [11]. By investigating factors like income, education, housing stability, and transportation access, the study aims to identify disparities in telehealth usage based on socioeconomic factors. Understanding how SDOH impact telehealth engagement can inform targeted interventions to promote equitable access and reduce healthcare disparities among vulnerable populations [12].

METHODS

Study Design

We conducted a cross-sectional analysis of data from the 2022 Health Information National Trends Survey (HINTS 6) of the National Cancer Institute. HINTS surveys are conducted annually among noninstitutionalized US civilians ≥ 18 years and contain nationally representative data on awareness and use of health-related information [13]. This study used HINTS 6 data to evaluate differences in telehealth use and related SDOH among participants with diabetes, hypertension, or both conditions. The HINTS 6 sample comprises 6,252 respondents, with surveys conducted from March 7, 2022 to November 8, 2022. We excluded participants who did not report diabetes or hypertension status, as well as who reporting having neither condition.

The Health Information National Trends Survey (HINTS) provides data on the American public's health-related behaviors, perceptions, and access to information. HINTS 6 sheds light on the utilization patterns, effectiveness, and patient satisfaction of telehealth services among individuals with hypertension and/or diabetes.[14, 15].

Measures

We divided the sample into three groups: individuals with diabetes only, those with hypertension only, and those with both diabetes and hypertension. Participants' diabetes and hypertension status was determined using two yes-or-no questions: “Has a doctor or other health professional ever told you that you had (1) diabetes or high blood sugar; (2) high blood pressure or hypertension?” We characterized the sample using participants’ self-reported sociodemographic data, including age, sex, occupational status, marital

status, level of education, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, household income, rural-urban residence status, and U.S. geographic region. Additionally, we summarized participants' health data, encompassing self-rated health, heart and lung conditions, depression/anxiety, and cigarette use, as well as social determinants of health such as food insecurity, housing, transportation, and their comfort with sharing related information with healthcare providers.

Statistical Analysis

HINTS utilized a complex sampling design, which we accounted for by incorporating sample weights using the Taylor Series (linear approximation) method. All analyses were performed on weighted data in R version 4.3.1, with the srvyr package used for complex sample weighting and the survey package used for survey-appropriate statistical tests. Summary tables were created using the tbl_svysummary function in the gtsummary package.

To assess differences in participant sociodemographic, baseline health, social determinants of health, and telehealth use by diabetes/hypertension category, we used the Wilcoxon rank-sum test adapted for complex survey samples [16] or the chi-squared test with Rao & Scott's second-order correction for continuous and categorical variables, respectively.[17]

All reported p-values and confidence intervals (CI) were two-sided and adjusted for multiple comparisons using the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure. The type I error rate was set to 0.05.

Study Approval

We solely used publicly available HINTS data for this study.

RESULTS

Of the total HINTS 6 sample comprising 6,252 individuals, 30 respondents (weighted 0.5%) were missing diabetes status, 22 (weighted 0.4%) were missing hypertension status, and 222 (weighted 3.6%) were missing both and were therefore excluded. Additionally, 2,969 respondents (weighted 47.5%) reported having neither condition. Thus, the final sample comprised 3,009 individuals with either diabetes, hypertension, or both.

Table 1 presents sociodemographic characteristics across diabetes-only, hypertension-only, and diabetes-hypertension groups. Variables such as sex, tobacco use, urban or rural residence, and census regions did not significantly differ among the groups, suggesting minimal impact on hypertension or diabetes status. Significant differences were observed in age ($p<0.001$); participants with both hypertension and diabetes had a mean (SD) age of 64.0 (16.3), the highest among the three groups. Regarding occupational status, respondents with only diabetes had a higher proportion of employment, while those with both conditions were more likely to be retired ($p<0.001$). For marital status, respondents with only diabetes had a higher proportion in divorced status, but fewer in widowed ($p=0.007$). In terms of education level, respondents with both diabetes and hypertension had more individuals with less than 8 years of education and fewer people with a college degree or higher ($p=0.001$). For race ($p<0.001$) and ethnicity ($p<0.001$), more participants with hypertension were White, and more with both conditions

were Black or African American. Participants with conditions had relatively lower household incomes ($p<0.001$). Overall, individuals with both conditions tended to be older, retired, non-Hispanic Black or African American, and had lower education and household incomes.

Health characteristics also varied across the three respondent groups. Significant differences were noted in BMI ($p=0.002$), self-rated health ($p<0.001$), presence of heart conditions ($p<0.001$), chronic lung disease ($p=0.014$), and mental health problems ($p=0.028$). Participants with both hypertension and diabetes had higher BMIs than the other groups, while a greater proportion of them rated their general health as good or fair, and had heart disease, chronic lung disease, and mental health problems compared to the other two groups.

Table 2 and **Figures 1** illustrate telehealth use across the three groups. In general, approximately 43% of respondents utilized telehealth in the past year, citing reasons such as provider recommendation, convenience, and infection avoidance. We found significantly different rates of receiving a telehealth visit over the past year among participants with hypertension only, diabetes only, and both conditions ($p=0.001$). Specifically, the breakdown of hypertension participants receiving telehealth is as follows: 298 (17.7%) received telehealth care by video, 248 (14.7%) by phone calls, 175 (10.4%) by both video and phone calls, and 961 (57.1%) not engaging in telehealth visits. For diabetes participants: 66 (21.4%) received telehealth care by video, 56 (18.1%) by phone calls, 28 (9.1%) by both video and phone calls, and 159 (51.5%) with no telehealth visit. For participants with both conditions: 160 (16.8%) by video, 204 (21.4%) by phone calls, 93 (9.8%) by both ways, and 496 (52.0%) with no telehealth visit.

Regarding being offered a telehealth visit option, feedback from the three groups was also significantly diverse (p=0.034). Only 161 (17.4%) participants with hypertension, 20 (13.2%) with diabetes and 101 (21.5%) with both conditions were suggested the option of telehealth when they schedule medical care, which indicates that telehealth does not seem to be widespread in current days yet. For the primary reasons of recent telehealth visit, the statistic was significantly different among the groups (p=0.002). For participants with hypertension, 206 (30.1%) were for managing chronic health, followed by 161 (23.5%) for annual visits, 148 (21.6%) for minor illness, 88 (12.9%) for other reasons, 68 (9.9%) for mental health, and 13 (1.9%) for medical emergency. For participants with diabetes, 50 (34.5%) were for managing chronic health, followed by 29 (20.0%) for annual visits, 23 (15.9%) for minor illness, 20 (13.8%) for mental health and other reasons, and 3 (2.1%) for medical emergency. For participants with two conditions, 171 (40.7%) were for managing chronic health, 100 (23.8%) for annual visits, 59 (14.0%) for other reasons, 53 (12.6%) for minor illness, 28 (6.7%) for mental health, and 9 (2.1%) for medical emergency. Apparently, most patients utilize telehealth for their long-term health conditions and chronic diseases, instead of emergencies requiring urgent and in-person treatment. **(Table 2)**

We also noted that most individuals who experienced telehealth visit had little technical obstacles, with overall 62.0% strongly disagreed with having troubles and 13.9% somewhat disagreed. 35.0% of them strongly agreed and 38.9% somewhat agreed that the care from telehealth was as good as in-person visit. 67.1% of them did not have severe privacy concerns.**(Figure 1)** However, no statistically significant difference among the groups on their thoughts and experiences with telehealth visit were found, particularly,

having technical problems with telehealth (p=0.102), regarding telehealth as good as regular visit (p=0.839), and having privacy concerns with telehealth (p=0.157). **(Table 2)**

Similarly, we performed a descriptive analysis of the reasons for not selecting and selecting a telehealth visit. From the result, many individuals did not specify their answers, and there were no statistically significant differences among the groups. With respect to the reasons for not choosing a telehealth visit, over 90% of people in general reflected that they preferred an in-person visit, whereas for nearly 80% of people, privacy concerns were not their main consideration. Additionally, about 27% of people thought telehealth would be difficult to use.

Table 3 demonstrates the participants' reasons for choosing telehealth, over 70% of people agreed that they chose to have a telehealth visit because of the recommendation by their healthcare provider. Only about 25% of people were asking for advice on whether in-person care is needed. About half of them admitted that they wanted to avoid potential infection in hospital, and 57% of them believed that it was more convenient than going to the doctor, saving travelling and waiting time. However, these statistics are not significantly different among the three groups. They held different opinions only on the reason that they could include family or other caregivers in the appointment (p=0.022), with 25.9% of participants with both hypertension and diabetes considering more in this factor.

Figure 2 and **Figure 3** depict the social determinants of health across groups. Concerns such as food insecurity, affordability of balanced meals, worries about relocation, and transportation issues were prevalent across all groups. **Figure 2** shows that 86.5% of people in total did not need to compromise on meals, 84.2% could afford

balanced nutrition, and 87.5% did not face challenges in accessing reliable transportation for their daily needs, although the situation of participants with both hypertension and diabetes was slightly worse than the other two groups. 89.2% of people in general experienced concerns about relocation, while those with only diabetes tended to worry more. Overall, people with only hypertension have the best situation among the groups, while people with both hypertension and diabetes faced more difficulties.

Figure 3 illustrates the Opinions on whether participants would be willing to allow health care providers to share each other their related information on food, transportation and housing for treatment purposes, which were relatively evenly distributed and had little difference among three groups. Concerning the food issues, 32.7% of people were very supportive and 29.0% felt comfortable about it, while the rest felt a bit offensive. For the transportation issue, people were slightly more comfortable sharing the information, with 37.8% felt completely comfortable and 26.9% comfortable. However, 22.6% of people felt strongly uncomfortable and 18.6% felt uncomfortable if their housing issues were shared. In general, people tended to be more concerned about the privacy of their housing conditions.

DISCUSSION

The findings from our analysis provide valuable insights into the utilization of telehealth among individuals managing hypertension and/or diabetes. By examining how factors like age, health status, and social determinants of health (SDOH) influence their experiences with telehealth, we uncovered important patterns. Notably, we found no significant differences in telehealth experiences across groups with varying health

conditions, including hypertension, diabetes, or both. This underscores telehealth's potential as a universally accessible and acceptable mode of health care delivery.

Privacy and equity in telehealth adoption

Concerns about privacy were noted among a minority of participants, highlighting the importance of addressing privacy and security issues in telehealth platforms to ensure patient trust [18, 19]. To address these concerns, healthcare organizations and telehealth providers should implement robust security measures, such as end-to-end encryption, secure data storage, and strict access controls [20].

Conducting telehealth services should also be transparent about the privacy policies and procedures, clearly communicating to patients how their personal information will be protected and how it will be used [21]. Providing patients with the ability to control the sharing of their data and offering options for anonymous consultations can further enhance their sense of privacy and security [22]. By prioritizing patient privacy and addressing any concerns in this area, telehealth providers can foster greater trust and confidence among users, ultimately encouraging more widespread and effective utilization of these valuable healthcare services [18, 23].

Additionally, the reasons for choosing telehealth varied among respondents, with convenience and infection avoidance being primary factors. Interestingly, healthcare provider recommendation emerged as a significant influencer of telehealth utilization, suggesting the pivotal role of healthcare professionals in promoting and facilitating telehealth adoption among patients [24, 25]. While convenience and healthcare provider

recommendations are significant drivers of telehealth adoption, efforts should also be directed towards addressing systemic barriers and disparities in access [26]. Initiatives to improve digital literacy, expand broadband infrastructure, and enhance reimbursement policies for telehealth services can help mitigate these barriers and ensure equitable access to care [12, 27, 28].

Participants' willingness to share information on food, transportation, and housing with healthcare providers varied, with the most concern expressed about sharing housing information. This reluctance to share personal information could be attributed to privacy concerns and the sensitive nature of housing issues. Healthcare providers should ensure that data sharing is conducted transparently and securely to build trust with patients and encourage information sharing that can enhance care coordination and support [29]. However, our study found no statistically significant differences among the groups regarding their willingness to share information about food and transportation. This suggests a general apprehension towards disclosing SDOH information, which could hinder the effectiveness of interventions targeting these social factors. Strategies to address these concerns and educate patients on the benefits of sharing SDOH information are necessary for improving care coordination and outcomes.[30]

Patients managing comorbidities

The study's findings highlight a significant uptake of telehealth services, with 43.9% of respondents utilizing them over the past year [14]. This emphasizes the

growing importance of telehealth in healthcare, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, where remote care has become crucial due to safety measures [31].

The effective management of multiple chronic conditions through telehealth presents a promising avenue for enhancing patient outcomes. Our results indicate that telehealth services are frequently used for managing long-term health conditions and chronic diseases rather than for urgent care needs. This is particularly important for individuals with both hypertension and diabetes, who require continuous monitoring and management of their conditions.[32] Telehealth stands to transform hypertension and diabetes management by facilitating regular monitoring and remote consultations, reducing the need for in-person visits, and easing travel burdens, especially for rural or underserved populations [23, 33]. Improved accessibility through telehealth can enhance treatment adherence and overall disease management [34]. However, accessing and adopting telehealth services may be more challenging for patients managing multiple chronic conditions [35]. The difference in telehealth use among these groups stems from various factors. Individuals managing a single chronic condition, like hypertension or diabetes, may find telehealth convenient for tasks such as monitoring health metrics and managing medications [11, 12, 36]. They face fewer competing healthcare needs and logistical hurdles, making it easier to integrate telehealth into their care routine [37].

On the other hand, patients with both diabetes and hypertension face a heavier care burden, requiring more frequent interactions with healthcare providers and specialized treatments [38, 39]. The complexity of their healthcare needs may hinder the effective incorporation of telehealth into their care plan, with challenges like

accessing necessary technology and coordinating virtual appointments with multiple providers.[40] Additionally, those contending with multiple chronic conditions may encounter barriers related to digital literacy or socioeconomic status, such as limited access to reliable internet or devices [41, 42]. These disparities in technology access disproportionately affect certain patient groups, exacerbating telehealth utilization inequalities [43].

To tackle these disparities, healthcare systems and policymakers should implement targeted interventions to support patients managing multiple chronic conditions in accessing and utilizing telehealth services effectively [12, 44]. This may involve providing digital literacy training,[45] offering loaner devices or internet connectivity solutions, and collaborating with community organizations to address social determinants of health impacting telehealth access [46, 47]. By addressing these systemic barriers, healthcare providers can ensure equitable access to the convenience and accessibility of telehealth services for all patients, regardless of their health status or socioeconomic circumstances [12, 31].

Addressing social determinants of health challenges

Our study explored how social determinants of health (SDOH) influence access to and use of telehealth services. We found that individuals managing both diabetes and hypertension often face more challenges, such as food insecurity and transportation limitations, compared to other demographic groups [14]. This highlights the significance of considering broader social and economic factors that can affect access to healthcare

services, including telehealth. Factors like income, education, housing stability, transportation, and food security all play a significant role in a person's ability to use telehealth effectively [11, 31].

By addressing these underlying social determinants of health, healthcare providers and policymakers can take significant strides towards ensuring equitable access to telehealth services for all individuals, regardless of their socio-economic circumstances [12, 44]. This may involve implementing targeted interventions such as providing subsidies for internet access, offering transportation assistance,[48] or partnering with community organizations to address food insecurity. Addressing these disparities is crucial to ensuring equitable access to telehealth services and reducing healthcare inequities [49].

Limitations

This study has several limitations. The cross-sectional design limits the ability to establish causality between the observed characteristics and health outcomes. The data in this study relies on participants' self-reported responses, which could introduce biases. Recall bias may occur if participants do not accurately remember or report their behaviors and experiences. Social desirability bias is also a concern, as participants might provide responses they think are more socially acceptable, rather than reflecting their true experiences [50]. Additionally, the study sample might not fully represent the broader population, potentially limiting how widely we can apply our findings [51-53].

Moving forward, it is important for research to investigate the long-term effects of using telehealth on healthcare outcomes for people managing hypertension and diabetes[54]. Additionally, further investigation into the social determinants of health factors driving the observed disparities is warranted [55]. This includes developing tailored interventions to enhance telehealth engagement and improve outcomes across diverse patient demographics. [12].

CONCLUSION

This study highlights the substantial adoption of telehealth among individuals managing hypertension and diabetes, underscoring its potential to revolutionize chronic disease management. Our findings reveal no significant differences in telehealth experiences across different health condition groups, emphasizing its universal accessibility. However, disparities influenced by SDOH underscore the need for targeted interventions to ensure equitable access. Addressing privacy concerns and leveraging healthcare provider recommendations are crucial for fostering wider telehealth adoption. Future research should focus on the long-term impacts of telehealth and further investigate SDOH factors to develop tailored interventions that enhance engagement and improve outcomes across diverse patient populations. By prioritizing these areas, we can maximize telehealth's benefits, ensuring it serves as a transformative tool in healthcare delivery.

FUNDING

None.

CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

JY designed the study, contributed to the data analyses, and the writing of the manuscript. HC, WS, and MAH contributed to data analyses and the writing of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

All data are available at the National Cancer Institute Website. The relevant code and analyses are available at: https://github.com/ConstanzaChen/Hyper_telehealth.git

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

None.

References

1. Ye, J., et al., *Characteristics and Patterns of Retention in Hypertension Care in Primary Care Settings From the Hypertension Treatment in Nigeria Program.* JAMA Network Open, 2022. **5**(9): p. e2230025-e2230025.
2. Marmot, M. and J.J. Allen, *Social determinants of health equity*. 2014, American Public Health Association.
3. Ye, J. and Q. Ma. *The effects and patterns among mobile health, social determinants, and physical activity: a nationally representative cross-sectional study*. in *AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings*. 2021. American Medical Informatics Association.
4. Ye, J., Z. Wang, and J. Hai, *Social Networking Service, Patient-Generated Health Data, and Population Health Informatics: National Cross-sectional Study of Patterns and Implications of Leveraging Digital Technologies to Support Mental Health and Well-being.* Journal of medical Internet research, 2022. **24**(4): p. e30898.
5. Ye, J., et al., *The role of artificial intelligence in the application of the integrated electronic health records and patient-generated health data.* medRxiv, 2024: p. 2024.05. 01.24306690.
6. Kim, J.A., *Telehealth in the Developing World.* Healthcare Informatics Research, 2010. **16**(2): p. 140.
7. Ye, J., *The role of health technology and informatics in a global public health emergency: practices and implications from the COVID-19 pandemic.* JMIR Medical Informatics, 2020. **8**(7): p. e19866.
8. Pare, G., M. Jaana, and C. Sicotte, *Systematic Review of Home Telemonitoring for Chronic Diseases: The Evidence Base.* Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 2007. **14**(3): p. 269-277.
9. Totten, A.M., et al. *Telehealth: Mapping the Evidence for Patient Outcomes From Systematic Reviews*. 2016.
10. Davis, R.M., et al., *TeleHealth Improves Diabetes Self-Management in an Underserved Community.* Diabetes Care, 2010. **33**(8): p. 1712-1717.
11. Phuong, J., et al., *Telehealth and digital health innovations: A mixed landscape of access.* PLOS Digital Health, 2023. **2**(12): p. e0000401.
12. Pierce, R.P. and J.J. Stevermer, *Disparities in the use of telehealth at the onset of the COVID-19 public health emergency.* Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare, 2023. **29**(1): p. 3-9.
13. Nelson, D., et al., *The health information national trends survey (HINTS): development, design, and dissemination.* Journal of health communication, 2004. **9**(5): p. 443-460.
14. National Institutes of Health *Health Information National Trends Survey (HINTS)*. 2022.
15. National Cancer Institute *Health Information National Trends*

Survey 6 (HINTS 6) HINTS 6 Methodology Report. 2023.

16. Lumley, T. and A.J. Scott, *Two-sample rank tests under complex sampling.* Biometrika, 2013. **100**(4): p. 831-842.
17. Rao, J.N. and A.J. Scott, *On chi-squared tests for multiway contingency tables with cell proportions estimated from survey data.* The Annals of statistics, 1984: p. 46-60.
18. Watzlaf, V.J.M., et al., *A Systematic Review of Research Studies Examining Telehealth Privacy and Security Practices Used By Healthcare Providers.* International Journal of Telerehabilitation, 2017. **9**(2): p. 39-58.
19. Hall, J.L. and D. McGraw, *For Telehealth To Succeed, Privacy And Security Risks Must Be Identified And Addressed.* Health Affairs, 2014. **33**(2): p. 216-221.
20. Ye, J., *Health Information System's Responses to COVID-19 Pandemic in China: A National Cross-sectional Study.* Applied Clinical Informatics, 2021. **12**(02): p. 399-406.

21. Jalali, M.S., A. Landman, and W.J. Gordon, *Telemedicine, privacy, and information security in the age of COVID-19.* Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 2021. **28**(3): p. 671-672.
22. Shen, N., et al., *Understanding the patient privacy perspective on health information exchange: A systematic review.* International Journal of Medical Informatics, 2019. **125**: p. 1-12.
23. Orlando, J.F., M. Beard, and S. Kumar, *Systematic review of patient and caregivers' satisfaction with telehealth videoconferencing as a mode of service delivery in managing patients' health.* PLOS ONE, 2019. **14**(8): p. e0221848.
24. Kyle, M.A., et al., *Telehealth use and Satisfaction among U.S. Households: Results of a National Survey.* Journal of Patient Experience, 2021. **8**: p. 237437352110527.
25. Wosik, J., et al., *Telehealth transformation: COVID-19 and the rise of virtual care.* Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 2020. **27**(6): p. 957-962.
26. Tilhou, A.S., A. Jain, and T. Deleire, *Telehealth Expansion, Internet Speed, and Primary Care Access Before and During COVID-19.* JAMA Network Open, 2024. **7**(1): p. e2347686.
27. Ye, J., et al., *Identifying Practice Facilitation Delays and Barriers in Primary Care Quality Improvement.* The Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine, 2020. **33**(5): p. 655-664.
28. Ye, J., *Advancing mental health and psychological support for health care workers using digital technologies and platforms.* JMIR Formative Research, 2021. **5**(6): p. e22075.
29. Ye, J., et al., *The role of artificial intelligence for the application of integrating electronic health records and patient-generated data in clinical decision support.* AMIA Summits on Translational Science Proceedings, 2024. **2024**: p. 459.
30. Ye, J., et al., *Interventions and contextual factors to improve retention in care for patients with hypertension in primary care: Hermeneutic systematic review.* Preventive Medicine, 2024: p. 107880.
31. Zhai, Y., *A Call for Addressing Barriers to Telemedicine: Health Disparities during the COVID-19 Pandemic.* Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, 2021. **90**(1): p. 64-66.
32. Ye, J., et al., *Predicting mortality in critically ill patients with diabetes using machine learning and clinical notes.* BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making, 2020. **20**(11): p. 1-7.
33. Ye, J., L. He, and M. Beestrum, *Implications for implementation and adoption of telehealth in developing countries: a systematic review of China's practices and experiences.* npj Digital Medicine, 2023. **6**(1): p. 174.
34. Hovey, L., et al., *Community-Based Telemonitoring for Hypertension Management: Practical Challenges and Potential Solutions.* Telemedicine and e-Health, 2011. **17**(8): p. 645-651.
35. Rush, K.L., et al., *The efficacy of telehealth delivered educational approaches for patients with chronic diseases: A systematic review.* Patient Education and Counseling, 2018. **101**(8): p. 1310-1321.
36. Ye, J., et al., *The Roles of Electronic Health Records for Clinical Trials in Low-and Middle-Income Countries: Scoping Review.* JMIR Medical Informatics, 2023. **11**: p. e47052.
37. Parekh, A.K., et al., *Managing Multiple Chronic Conditions: A Strategic Framework for Improving Health Outcomes and Quality of Life.* Public Health Reports, 2011. **126**(4): p. 460-471.
38. Piette, J.D. and E.A. Kerr, *The Impact of Comorbid Chronic Conditions on Diabetes Care.* Diabetes Care, 2006. **29**(3): p. 725-731.

39. Safford, M.M., J.J. Allison, and C.I. Kiefe, *Patient Complexity: More Than Comorbidity. The Vector Model of Complexity.* Journal of General Internal Medicine, 2007. **22**(S3): p. 382-390.
40. Ye, J., *Transforming and facilitating health care delivery through social networking platforms: evidences and implications from WeChat.* JAMIA open, 2024. **7**(2): p. ooae047.
41. Hall, A.K., et al., *The Digital Health Divide.* Health Education & Behavior, 2015. **42**(2): p. 202-209.
42. Crawford, A. and E. Serhal, *Digital Health Equity and COVID-19: The Innovation Curve Cannot Reinforce the Social Gradient of Health.* Journal of Medical Internet Research, 2020. **22**(6): p. e19361.
43. Ye, J., *The impact of electronic health record–integrated patient-generated health data on clinician burnout.* Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 2021. **28**(5): p. 1051-1056.
44. Ortega, G., et al., *Telemedicine, COVID-19, and disparities: Policy implications.* Health Policy and Technology, 2020. **9**(3): p. 368-371.
45. Ye, J. *Design and development of an informatics-driven implementation research framework for primary care studies*. in *AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings*. 2021. American Medical Informatics Association.
46. Ye, J. and Z. Ren, *Examining the impact of sex differences and the COVID-19 pandemic on health and health care: findings from a national cross-sectional study.* JAMIA Open, 2022.
47. Ye, J., et al., *A portable urine analyzer based on colorimetric detection.* Analytical Methods, 2017. **9**(16): p. 2464-2471.
48. Ye, J., et al., *Optimizing Longitudinal Retention in Care Among Patients With Hypertension in Primary Healthcare Settings: Findings From the Hypertension Treatment in Nigeria Program.* Circulation, 2022. **146**(Suppl_1): p. A13217-A13217.
49. Hill-Briggs, F., et al., *Social Determinants of Health and Diabetes: A Scientific Review.* Diabetes Care, 2021. **44**(1): p. 258-279.
50. Gonyea, R.M., *Self-reported data in institutional research: Review and recommendations.* New Directions for Institutional Research, 2005. **2005**(127): p. 73-89.
51. Martínez-Mesa, J., et al., *Sample size: how many participants do I need in my research?* Anais Brasileiros de Dermatologia, 2014. **89**(4): p. 609-615.
52. Andrade, C., *Sample Size and its Importance in Research.* Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine, 2020. **42**(1): p. 102-103.
53. Faber, J. and L.M. Fonseca, *How sample size influences research outcomes.* Dental Press Journal of Orthodontics, 2014. **19**(4): p. 27-29.
54. Ye, J., et al., *Development and Application of Natural Language Processing on Unstructured Data in Hypertension: A Scoping Review.* medRxiv, 2024: p. 2024.02.27.24303468.
55. Ye, J., et al., *Identifying Contextual Factors and Strategies for Practice Facilitation in Primary Care Quality Improvement Using an Informatics-Driven Model: Framework Development and Mixed Methods Case Study.* JMIR Human Factors, 2022. **9**(2): p. e32174.

Table 1. Characteristics of participants.

Variables	Hypertension only (N=1714)	Diabetes only (N=317)	Hypertension+ Diabetes (N=978)	P value
Age, mean (SD), years	61.5 (17.1)	57.2 (16.6)	64.0 (16.3)	<0.001
Sex, n (%)				0.476
Male	688 (41.1)	117 (38.9)	404 (42.7)	
Female	987 (58.9)	184 (61.1)	543 (57.3)	
Occupational status, n (%)				<0.001
Employed	655 (39.0)	135 (44.9)	253 (26.5)	
Unemployed for 1 year or more	36 (2.1)	15 (5.0)	16 (1.7)	
Unemployed for less than 1 year	23 (1.4)	3 (1.0)	9 (0.9)	
Homemaker	39 (2.3)	11 (3.7)	30 (3.1)	
Student	10 (0.6)	2 (0.7)	3 (0.3)	
Retired	679 (40.5)	81 (26.9)	429 (45.0)	
Disabled	95 (5.7)	27 (9.0)	98 (10.3)	
Other	11 (0.7)	1 (0.3)	7 (0.7)	
Multiple Occupation statuses selected	130 (7.7)	26 (8.6)	108 (11.3)	
Marital status, n (%)				0.007
Married	749 (44.8)	129 (43.3)	407 (42.8)	
Living as married or with a romantic partner	85 (5.1)	17 (5.7)	31 (3.3)	
Divorced	311 (18.6)	68 (22.8)	177 (18.6)	
Widowed	251 (15.0)	26 (8.7)	164 (17.3)	
Separated	37 (2.2)	12 (4.0)	31 (3.3)	
Single	240 (14.3)	46 (15.4)	140 (14.7)	
Education, n (%)				0.001
Less than 8 years	27 (1.6)	5 (1.7)	32 (3.4)	
8-11 years	92 (5.5)	16 (5.3)	57 (6.0)	
12 years or completed high school	311 (18.6)	62 (20.6)	228 (24.0)	
Post high school other than college	149 (8.9)	22 (7.3)	83 (8.7)	
Some college	374 (22.3)	62 (20.6)	223 (23.4)	
College graduate	425 (25.4)	86 (28.6)	204 (21.5)	
Postgraduate	296 (17.7)	48 (15.9)	124 (13.0)	
Ethnicity, n (%)				<0.001
Non-Hispanic White	981 (62.2)	126 (45.5)	415 (47.1)	
Non-Hispanic Black or African American	296 (18.8)	45 (16.2)	217 (24.6)	
Hispanic	196 (12.4)	80 (28.9)	178 (20.2)	
Non-Hispanic Asian	56 (3.6)	14 (5.1)	41 (4.6)	
Non-Hispanic Other	47 (3.0)	12 (4.3)	31 (3.5)	

Race, n (%)				<0.001
White only	1162 (71.3)	193 (67.7)	543 (59.8)	
Black only	336 (20.6)	55 (19.3)	257 (28.3)	
American Indian or Alaska Native only	16 (1.0)	4 (1.4)	11 (1.2)	
Multiple races	47 (2.9)	14 (4.9)	37 (4.1)	
Asian Indian only	14 (0.9)	1 (0.4)	9 (1.0)	
Chinese only	13 (0.8)	7 (2.5)	8 (0.9)	
Filipino only	12 (0.7)	4 (1.4)	16 (1.8)	
Vietnamese only	5 (0.3)	2 (0.7)	6 (0.7)	
Other Asian only	18 (1.1)	1 (0.4)	7 (0.8)	
Other Pacific Islander only	6 (0.4)	4 (1.4)	14 (1.5)	
Sexual orientation, n (%)				0.219
Heterosexual	1543 (94.4)	268 (93.7)	850 (93.1)	
Homosexual	40 (2.4)	7 (2.4)	17 (1.9)	
Bisexual	29 (1.8)	4 (1.4)	23 (2.5)	
Else	22 (1.3)	7 (2.4)	23 (2.5)	
Income, n (%)				<0.001
$0 to $9,999	114 (7.3)	23 (8.0)	100 (11.3)	
$10,000 to $14,999	85 (5.5)	23 (8.0)	82 (9.2)	
$15,000 to $19,999	84 (5.4)	11 (3.8)	47 (5.3)	
$20,000 to $34,999	209 (13.5)	47 (16.4)	135 (15.2)	
$35,000 to $49,999	209 (13.5)	40 (14.0)	149 (16.8)	
$50,000 to $74,999	270 (17.4)	51 (17.8)	141 (15.9)	
$75,000 to $99,999	208 (13.4)	27 (9.4)	99 (11.2)	
$100,000 to $199,999	278 (17.9)	44 (15.4)	99 (11.2)	
$200,000 or more	96 (6.2)	20 (7.0)	35 (3.9)	
Body Mass Index (BMI), mean (SD), kg/m^2	28.9 (9.0)	29.3 (9.3)	30.2 (10.1)	0.002
General health, n (%)				<0.001
Excellent	88 (5.2)	14 (4.4)	27 (2.8)	
Very good	526 (30.9)	101 (32.1)	176 (18.2)	
Good	752 (44.2)	113 (35.9)	422 (43.6)	
Fair	288 (16.9)	76 (24.1)	279 (28.9)	
Poor	48 (2.8)	11 (3.5)	63 (6.5)	
Heart condition, n (%)	240 (14.0)	28 (8.9)	234 (24.0)	<0.001
Chronic lung disease, n (%)	282 (16.5)	53 (16.8)	204 (20.9)	0.014
Mental health problem, n (%)	448 (26.2)	98 (31.0)	298 (30.5)	0.028
Tobacco user, n (%)				0.998
Current (Everyday)	142 (8.5)	27 (8.8)	82 (8.6)	
Former (Some days)	60 (3.6)	10 (3.3)	33 (3.5)	
Never (Not at all)	1475 (88.0)	269 (87.9)	841 (88.0)	
Rural/Urban, n (%)				0.111

Metropolitan	1435 (83.7)	278 (87.7)	832 (85.1)	
Micropolitan	155 (9.0)	24 (7.6)	72 (7.4)	
Small town	91 (5.3)	9 (2.8)	44 (4.5)	
Rural	33 (1.9)	6 (1.9)	30 (3.1)	
Census, n (%)				0.289
Northeast	238 (13.9)	38 (12.0)	127 (13.0)	
Midwest	289 (16.9)	48 (15.1)	151 (15.4)	
South	831 (48.5)	147 (46.4)	496 (50.7)	
West	356 (20.8)	84 (26.5)	204 (20.9)	

Table 2. Characteristics of telehealth utilization and patient experiences.

Variables	Hypertension only (N=1714)	Diabetes only (N=317)	Hypertension+ Diabetes (N=978)	P value
Received telehealth care, n (%)				0.001
Yes, by video	298 (17.7)	66 (21.4)	160 (16.8)	
Yes, by phone call (no video)	248 (14.7)	56 (18.1)	204 (21.4)	
Yes, some video some phone call	175 (10.4)	28 (9.1)	93 (9.8)	
No telehealth visits	961 (57.1)	159 (51.5)	496 (52.0)	
Offered telehealth option, n (%)				0.034
Yes	161 (17.4)	20 (13.2)	101 (21.5)	
No	636 (68.8)	114 (75.0)	323 (68.9)	
Did not try	127 (13.7)	18 (11.8)	45 (9.6)	
Primary reason for telehealth, n (%)				0.002
Annual visit	161 (23.5)	29 (20.0)	100 (23.8)	
Minor illness	148 (21.6)	23 (15.9)	53 (12.6)	
Manage chronic health	206 (30.1)	50 (34.5)	171 (40.7)	
Medical emergency	13 (1.9)	3 (2.1)	9 (2.1)	
Mental health	68 (9.9)	20 (13.8)	28 (6.7)	
Other	88 (12.9)	20 (13.8)	59 (14.0)	
Regarding telehealth visits, how much do you agree or disagree n (%)				
a. I had technical problems with telehealth				0.102
Strongly agree	49 (7.4)	9 (6.4)	28 (7.0)	
Somewhat agree	93 (14.0)	29 (20.7)	82 (20.5)	
Somewhat disagree	95 (14.3)	15 (10.7)	58 (14.5)	
Strongly disagree	428 (64.4)	87 (62.1)	232 (58.0)	
b. Telehealth was as good care as in-person visits				0.839
Strongly agree	234 (34.4)	48 (33.6)	153 (36.5)	
Somewhat agree	270 (39.7)	56 (39.2)	157 (37.5)	
Somewhat disagree	112 (16.5)	27 (18.9)	63 (15.0)	
Strongly disagree	64 (9.4)	12 (8.4)	46 (11.0)	
c. I had privacy concerns about telehealth				0.157
Strongly agree	30 (4.5)	7 (5.0)	19 (4.8)	
Somewhat agree	64 (9.6)	17 (12.1)	52 (13.2)	
Somewhat disagree	116 (17.5)	33 (23.4)	57 (14.4)	
Strongly disagree	454 (68.4)	84 (59.6)	267 (67.6)	

Table 3: Reasons for not choosing or choosing a telehealth visits.

Variables	Hypertension only (N=1714)	Diabetes only (N=317)	Hypertension+ Diabetes (N=978)	P value
Did you choose not to participate in a telehealth visit because you...				
a. Preferred to have the appointment(s) in person?				0.298
Yes	147 (89.6)	21 (100.0)	94 (89.5)	
No	17 (10.4)	0 (0.0)	11 (10.5)	
b. Were concerned about the privacy of telehealth visits?				0.766
Yes	30 (18.3)	4 (19.0)	23 (21.9)	
No	134 (81.7)	17 (81.0)	82 (78.1)	
c. Thought the technology would be difficult to use?				0.414
Yes	41 (25.3)	5 (23.8)	34 (32.4)	
No	121 (74.7)	16 (76.2)	71 (67.6)	
Why did you choose a telehealth visit(s)?				
a. The healthcare provider recommended or required the use of telehealth for the visit.				0.051
Yes	518 (75.8)	108 (73.0)	294 (69.2)	
No	165 (24.2)	40 (27.0)	131 (30.8)	
b. You wanted advice about whether you needed in-person medical care.				0.187
Yes	168 (24.7)	46 (31.7)	114 (27.3)	
No	513 (75.3)	99 (68.3)	303 (72.7)	
c. You wanted to avoid possible infection at the doctor's office or hospital (e.g., COVID-19 or flu).				0.337
Yes	334 (48.7)	66 (44.9)	220 (51.6)	
No	352 (51.3)	81 (55.1)	206 (48.4)	
d. It was more convenient than going to the doctor (e.g., less travel or waiting time).				0.345
Yes	404 (59.2)	86 (58.9)	231 (54.9)	
No	278 (40.8)	60 (41.1)	190 (45.1)	
e. You could include family or other caregivers in your appointment.				0.022
Yes	133 (19.5)	26 (17.8)	109 (25.9)	
No	549 (80.5)	120 (82.2)	312 (74.1)	



Figure 1. Experiences with using telehealth across the three groups.

Figure 2. Characteristics of social determinants of health across the three groups.



Figure 3. Willingness to share social determinants of health information with health care providers across the three groups.