Pathways to optimize a pediatric telemedicine and medication delivery service: A multi-level qualitative study in Haiti

Authors
Frantz Emmanuel Garilus(BS)[1], Kerven Cassion(MPH)[1], Youseline Cajusma(BSN)[1], Katelyn E. Flaherty(PhD)[1,2], Jude Ronald Beausejour(MD)[1], Lerby Exantus(MD)[3], Valery M. Beau de Rochars(MD)[4], Chantale Baril(MD)[3], Torben K. Becker(MD, MBA, PhD)[2], Rochelle K. Rosen(PhD)[5], Eric J. Nelson(MD, PhD)[1] Molly B. Klarman(MPH)[1]*

Affiliations
[1]Departments of Pediatrics and Environmental and Global Health, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA
[2] Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA
[3] Université d'État d'Haiti- Faculté de Médecine et de Pharmacie, Port-au-Prince, Haiti
[4] Department of Health Services Research, Management and Policy, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA
[5]Center for Behavioral and Preventive Medicine, The Miriam Hospital, Providence, RI, USA

***Corresponding author**
Molly B Klarman, MPH
2055 Mowry Road, Emerging Pathogens Institute, University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611
Email: mklarman@ufl.edu

Key words: framework matrix analysis, telemedicine, pediatrics, scaling

ABSTRACT

Telemedicine has secured a permanent role in healthcare delivery worldwide; however, scaling novel telemedicine applications presents challenges. Among the many emerging initiatives is the telemedicine and medication delivery service (TMDS) that our team established in Haiti to enable early access to pediatric care. To gain deeper insights into the challenges associated with scaling a TMDS, we conducted focus group discussions and administered written questionaries to TMDS staff, including physicians, nurses, and medication delivery drivers. We employed framework matrix analysis to identify and summarize insights into the challenges and opportunities associated with the TMDS model. We found key areas for improvement relate to obtaining quality information from virtual exams, the reliability of technology and communication infrastructure, the conditions required for effective in-person exams, the limited scope of the workflow and clinical resources, and long-term sustainability. These findings led to the development of essential action items, categorized into three domains: conceptual, physical and mission oriented. These action items will guide our internal efforts to scale the TMDS and hopefully catalyze improvements among similar telemedicine initiatives.

INTRODUCTION

In the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, telemedicine became a central fixture in healthcare infrastructure (1). One post-pandemic analysis of the utilization of telehealth and telemedicine services found at least 77 countries had adopted the approach (2). Telemedicine, generally defined as '*the use of technology to provide healthcare services between parties that are geographically separated'* (3, 4), is rapidly diversifying in scope (5). One categorization of telemedicine uses five application types: tele-consultation, tele-diagnosis, tele-ambulance, tele-monitoring, and digital self-management. The perspective uses six additional descriptive components: personnel, target population, setting, technology, data provision and intended outcome (6). Permutations of these components create a broad range of possible telemedicine applications.

The benefits of telemedicine vary depending on the specific application or use case. One use case is a type of synchronous (real-time) teleconsultation between provider and patient known as 'triage and treat'. In this model, patients are remotely screened to determine the appropriate location and method of treatment (7, 8). In low-resource settings, the triage and treat approach can increase access to specialists, address shortages of healthcare workers, and reduce transportation related barriers, including time and cost (9-11). With these goals in mind, our team developed a pilot pediatric telemedicine and medication delivery service (TMDS) that has been deployed in Haiti and Ghana (12, 13). In the TMDS model, patients are triaged and assessed via a virtual exam and then receive treatment by medication delivery directly to their home. To the best of our knowledge, there are few other (if any) affordable, high-quality, evidence-based, pediatric TMDS interventions deployed in resource-limited settings, but like many aspects of telemedicine this is likely to change.

Scaling novel healthcare interventions, such as telemedicine interventions, is challenging particularly in low-resource settings (14-16). A broadly used definition of 'scaling up' a health innovation is, '*deliberate efforts to increase the impact of successfully tested health innovations, so as to benefit more people and to foster policy and program development on a lasting basis'* (17). Scaling is unlikely to occur organically, even with the most promising innovations (14). Barriers to scale can be numerous and present across various implementation domains(18).

One common approach to identify these barriers is through frameworks such as the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) (19). CFIR covers five domains: innovation characteristics, outer setting, inner setting, characteristics of individuals, and implementation process. These domains can help assess barriers to implementing telemedicine interventions. Within the 'innovation domain', issues with poor interoperability are common (20, 21). Within the 'outer setting' many low-resource countries lack nationwide policies and regulatory standards for telemedicine (22-24). Within the 'inner setting' challenges to obtain and maintain information and communication technology infrastructure (ICT) are often cited (23, 25). Within the 'individuals' domain both providers and patients have expressed hesitancy to accept telemedicine(26, 27). Finally, within the 'implementation process' domain many telemedicine programs were rapidly implemented in response to COVID-19 and did not undergo the necessary planning stages to support sustained success (28). In addition to identifying barriers, stakeholders are also committed to identifying facilitators that contribute to successful, and scaled implementation.

Qualitative methods play a critical role in implementation science, allowing implementors to systematically identify barriers and facilitators to implementation success.(29, 30). Among the many qualitative data analysis methods, framework matrix analysis is

particularly useful for producing rapid, streamlined summaries for deductive learning that can be generated and shared among different stakeholders (31).

Herein, we employ framework data matrix analysis to evaluate barriers and facilitators to a novel telemedicine service model: a pediatric Telemedicine and Medication Delivery Service (TMDS). Our team developed a nighttime pediatric telemedicine and medication delivery service (TMDS) in Haiti with the objective of prioritizing early access to pre-emergent healthcare to prevent the need for more costly and complex emergency care. The service is evolving within the Improving Nighttime Access to Care and Treatment- Haiti (INACT-H) study series. The TMDS model was designed to overcome the healthcare access barriers of distance and nighttime (32). From 2019 to 2021, we validated this innovative healthcare delivery model, finding that it was clinically safe, feasible to implement, and supported by reliable clinical resources (12, 33). From 2021 to 2023, we focused on positioning the TMDS to scale by modifying the workflow. The resulting scalable model maintained strong clinical and operational outcomes (34). A cost-effectiveness analysis confirmed that a scaled TMDS was a cost-effective alternative to hospital emergency care for pre-emergency pediatric conditions at night in Haiti (35). In this context, we sought to qualitatively identify challenges and opportunities that could improve both cognitive and physical factors to optimize the TMDS for large-scale implementation.

METHODS

Ethics statement. This study was reviewed and approved by the University of Florida Institutional Review Board (202002693) as well as the Comité National de Bioéthique (National Bioethics Committee of Haiti; Ref2021-11). Consent process described below.

Setting. A TMDS called MotoMeds was launched in the semi-urban and rural region of Gressier, Haiti in September 2019. The workflow of the TMDS is as follows (Figure 1): a parent calls the

call center regarding their sick child. A TMDS nurse (registered nurse or family nurse practitioner) collects demographic and clinical findings from the parent to complete a virtual exam by phone. Nurses use TMDS specific clinical resources to generate an assessment and treatment plan that includes illness severity, disposition, medication/fluid recommendations, and advice for follow-up care. Illnesses triaged as severe are referred directly to emergency services. Among children who reside within a delivery zone, those with higher clinical uncertainty are offered an in-person household exam with delivery and patients with low clinical uncertainty are offered a delivery of medications/fluids. Children who reside outside of a delivery zone are provided advice and guidance alone. All children receive a follow-up call at 10-days and patients with severe illness also receive a call at 24-hours. On-call physicians are available by phone to consult on cases beyond the scope of the TMDS clinical resources.

In October 2021, a second delivery zone was established in the urban center of Les Cayes, located 175 Km west of Gressier. The workflow of this delivery zone differs in that treatment plans generated at the central call center in Gressier are relayed to on-call nurses in Les Cayes who either dispatch motorcycle delivery drivers to transport medications/fluids or conduct in-person household exams. Once proofs of concept were established through three years of evaluation, iteration, and growth, our team pivoted towards positioning the TMDS for scale. We sought qualitative feedback from TMDS staff as a critical component of this process. The research team consisted of EJN, the PI who is a pediatrician and scientist with qualitative research experience (31, 36), MBK, the study director who is an international public health expert, and two bilingual Haitian American facilitators, FG and KC. Each team member was coached in qualitative methods by RKR, an expert in qualitative methods including matrix

analyses applied in global health settings challenged by technological and situational limitations (31, 37).

Study design

Focus groups. EJN, MBK, FG, and KG developed a written agenda (Supplemental Text 1) to guide focus group discussions for each of four types of TMDS staff/participants. Participant types included: i) call center nurses, who conduct virtual exams at the call center and relay treatment plans, ii) delivery nurses, who receive and enact virtual treatment plans by conducting in-person household exams or dispatching a motorcycle delivery driver, iii) on-call physicians, who offer consultations by phone, and iv) motorcycle delivery drivers, who transport nurses and deliver medications/fluids to households. Most questions/discussion prompts were specific to participant type, but a subset was shared across all participants. Topic areas were identified *a priori* as either factors that could enable or impede scaling (clinical, technical, and logistical challenges and solutions) or that qualitatively assess impact (user expectations and satisfaction, value to TMDS staff and community). The agenda was translated to Haitian Creole by FG and KC. MBK reviewed the agenda questions with a staff member to ensure the questions were relevant to the staff experience.

In June and July 2022, FG and KC conducted nine focus group discussions using video conferencing software (Zoom) with the facilitators located in the United States and the participants located in Haiti. All active staff members were offered participation and were placed in groups of 3-4 based on participant type and location. At the beginning of each session a facilitator read a waiver of documentation of written consent statement to each person individually. After expressing verbal agreement, participants were given a study ID. The video sessions were recorded.

Questionnaires. Two versions of a nurse questionnaire were developed by MBK with 26 short answer questions for call center nurses and 15 for delivery nurses (Supplemental Text 2). The questionnaire focused on identifying ways to improve the clinical resources and procedures that guide virtual and in-person exams and queried interest in incorporating electronic clinical decision support into the TMDS workflow.

Data analysis

Data preparation. FG and KC translated (Haitian Kreyol to English) and transcribed the focus group video recordings in a single step. One facilitator completed a focus group in its entirety and the other reviewed it for accuracy. Discrepancies were discussed between the facilitators and if necessary, a third team member (MBK) was consulted. The questionnaire responses were translated into English following the same process.

Matrix analysis. Four matrices were deductively constructed in Microsoft Excel. The column headers were drawn from the focus group and nurse questionnaire questions and the rows corresponded to each participant. To populate the matrices, one facilitator read a transcription or questionnaire question by question and summarized the response by each participant into the corresponding cell, separating unique ideas with bullet points. The opposite facilitator reviewed the transcript or questionnaire and the matrix for completeness and a third team member reviewed the matrices for clarity. At the bottom of the matrix 4 additional 'summary rows' were created; in the 1st row, MBK summarized the responses from all participants for each question, in the 2nd, 3rd and 4th rows FG, KC, and MBK suggested possible action items to address ideas presented by participants. Through Zoom the four-member team then reviewed the 'summary row' cells question by question and through discussion established a 'consensus of summary' and a 'consensus of action items' which were entered into two additional rows of the matrix

spreadsheets. Common themes relating to barriers and facilitators for scaling, and potential action items to improve the service were identified. FG and KC reviewed focus group transcripts and pulled quotes that supported the identified themes.

RESULTS

Study overview. All active staff members agreed to participate including fourteen nurses, 13 drivers and 3 on-call physicians who participated in one of nine focus group discussions. Additionally, all 14 nurses completed a written questionnaire (Table 1). The participants' ideas are presented within the following five domains: 1) Virtual exams at the call center, 2) In-person exams at the household, 3) Clinical resources, 4) Communication, and 5) Expectations and impact.

Virtual exams. When discussing how nurses perceive the information parents relay over the phone, nurses stated that they felt confident in the information families shared when responses were provided without hesitation, consistent over time, and in alignment with other responses. They doubted the accuracy of the information when they had to repeat a question multiple times, and when they received inconsistent or implausible responses. One nurse explained, *"…sometimes we ask questions, and they* [callers] *are bouncing between 'yes' or 'no'. This makes it difficult for us to have confidence in the information we are receiving. What also happens, when we do not have confidence, we mark 'not confident'* [on the case report form]. *For example, if you have asked your first question and the answer is yes, and for things to correlate, the answer to the second question must also be 'yes', but the parents say 'no'. Thus, there is a lack of correlation, and this makes us lack confidence in the information we are receiving."* In these situations, nurses stated that they attempt to improve the data quality by rewording questions and explaining the importance of providing accurate responses. If they

remain unsure about a particular response, they mark ‘not confident’ on the case report form and that response will not contribute to the treatment plan.

Nurses reported that specific components of the virtual exam were particularly challenging to complete. They felt that families were often resistant to identifying a chief complaint among other complaints and struggled to measure the respiratory and heart rates. Multiple nurses noted that questions related to respiratory problems (e.g., stridor, retractions) were difficult for parents to understand and often required repeat explanations and/or exploratory follow-up questions that were not part of the structured virtual exam.

Call center characteristics. When considering the work environment, nurses attributed the smooth functioning of the call center to the ready availability of necessary materials and the strong teamwork among the nursing staff. Unreliable internet and cell signal were obstacles to performing call center responsibilities. While technology plays a key role in the TMDS workflow, persistent changes to user-interfaces (laptop password expiration, software updates) and unfamiliar information technology (IT) issues were cited as impeding call center operations. One nurse commented, *“…problems we have are that in the applications, you connect to your account in a specific way and in a moment it changes. This means the nurse must have knowledge in informatics. If all the nurses did not have knowledge in informatics, this would be a big problem for us. I can come today to sign into my account to replace the nurse that was here last night, and the way I am used to signing in, I can’t sign in that way anymore.”* IT management strategies involved relying on contingencies (secondary internet carrier) and contacting the Study Director.

In-person exams. During in-person exams nurses faced both technical and clinical challenges. Technical challenges included inadequate lighting and space, a lack of flat surfaces to place a

scale to weigh patients, and missing materials due to failure to verify supply levels before departure. Clinical challenges included difficulty obtaining vital signs from young children, parental hesitancy to obtain temperature rectally and a feeling of incompetency when the TMDS clinical resources/formulary did not cover a patient's situation or when contacting the on-call physician in the presence of the parents. One nurse said, "*A difficulty we face performing in-person exams is when I encounter a complex case and I need to call the on-call physician in front of the family, they might think I am incompetent*". Despite these challenges, nurses valued several aspects of the in-person exam, including obtaining vital signs, exploring the patient's medical history, and administering the first dose of medication.

Household logistics. Nurses commonly reported challenges reaching participant households, which they attributed to the difficulties of nighttime travel by motorcycle, poor road quality, remote household locations, and inability to connect with the parent by phone upon arrival. Nurses reported spending substantial time explaining the consent process, educating parents on how to administer medications, and discussing the rationale for the TMDS guidelines (e.g., why it only serves children ≤10 years or only covers specific illnesses). A mismatch between the parameters of the TMDS and parental expectations also required dialogue. Nurses described parents wanting certain medications that were not indicated (e.g., an antibiotic for a cough), requesting in-person exams for additional unenrolled children at the household, and encountering a different clinical situation than what was relayed during the virtual exam. One nurse commented, "*The problem I face is that when we reach their house, they tell us that they have other children that are sick and if we could see them also. We tell the parent to call the call center first, but they don't agree. They want us to examine all their children, although they did not originally call for that. Another issue that we face is that the problem the parent calls for is*

not fully accurate. When we get there, we see that the child has more problems than they told us." The TMDS clinical guidelines recommend that patients with severe illness seek emergency level care. However, it was common for parents of children with severe conditions to report they were unable to do so due to financial constraints. In these situations, they expected to receive medications, despite delivery nurses not being equipped to treat severe conditions. One nurse shared, "*Another problem is that MotoMeds does not treat every problem, some problems that a child may have, they are in the red [severe] category, you must send them to the hospital. Sometimes when we get to the house, with the state of the child, we can't give them anything and we must send them to the hospital. But the parents don't have the means and they are not happy that we didn't give their child any medication. The parents feel as though they didn't get any service because of this.*"

Clinical resources. The nurses generally expressed satisfaction with the clinical resources, stating that they do not encounter clinical situations that they do not know how to manage. When faced with situations beyond the scope of the clinical resources, they contact an on-call physician, as the workflow intends. However, nurses did note occasional challenges regarding dosing medications. There was concern about not being able to divide pills evenly, or at all, if the medication was only available in capsule form. Further, nurses were concerned that the estimated weights they used to perform dosing calculations could misrepresent patients' actual weights given undernutrition.

The role of the on-call physician was evaluated from both the nurses' and physicians' perspectives. Nurses suggested that physicians may not fully appreciate the constraints they work under. For example, nurses are limited to the medications included on the formulary outlined in the clinical guidelines. Occasionally, when consulted, a physician may recommend a medication

that is not on the formulary, even though an equally effective alternative is available within it. Physicians generally agreed with the treatment plans proposed by nurses seeking consult. Despite the limitations of telemedicine, physicians said they were provided with sufficient case details to offer consultation. However, they noted that having a mechanism to receive photos or videos would be beneficial. It was acknowledged that the on-call physician role is crucial but could be improved by developing a formal tool for gathering and relaying case details, as well as providing physicians with feedback on the outcome of each case they consult. Additionally, despite feeling connected to project leadership through WhatsApp groups and weekly email updates, on-call physicians felt disconnected to the broader TMDS team.

With the rising popularity of clinical decision support (CDS) tools and specifically the digitization of World Health Organization guidelines, we queried interest in incorporating an electronic CDS tool into the TMDS workflow. All nurses expressed a desire to adopt this approach, believing it would increase efficiency, conserve resources, and improve the quality of clinical records/data collection. However, it was noted that the tool should not depend on a stable internet connection.

Communication. The TMDS workflow involves multiple communication channels, and adequate communication at each point is critical to providing quality and timely care. All participants were asked about their experience communicating with other staff and with families. Call center nurses resoundingly stated an unstable cellphone network was their main obstacle to communicating with delivery drivers and delivery nurses. Others mentioned experiencing delays in responses from colleagues, although it is unclear to what extent the cell network was responsible for these delays. Delivery drivers also identified the unstable cellphone network as their main obstacle in communicating with nurses, other drivers, and families. The inability to

reliably reach families by phone made it difficult to locate homes. In such situations, drivers stated that they relied on regional markers obtained by call center nurses along with their own local knowledge to locate households. Drivers suggested using radios or higher quality phones to improve communication. They advised that nurses should focus on collecting formal names for landmarks and people, rather than nicknames. Call center nurses, in turn, suggested several improvements, including ensuring that delivery nurses and drivers are ready to work when the call center opens, having checked that their phone is charged and has sufficient cell minutes and data. The delivery nurses proposed working from a dedicated office rather than working from home, and additional training with technology.

Expectations. Through both virtual and in-person interactions with families, nurses and drivers identified several expectations families had for the TDMS. Nurses reported that families expected and received reliable, timely care, and quality medication. However, nurses felt that families also expected care for patients older than 10 years, certain medications (e.g., cough syrup), care during daytime hours, and financial assistance to access emergency care when referred. These expectations were not met, as they fall outside the scope of the TMDS model. As one nurse explained, *"Sometimes when a parent calls with a problem that surpasses our limits, we ask them to go to the hospital. The parent usually expects that we would do something for them before they go to the hospital. But if we send them to the hospital, there is no visit or medication that is sent to that house*." Drivers reported observing similar expectations to those noted by nurses but also described families expected to receive medications with every call and did not understand that specific criteria (e.g., illness, severity, and location) exist to be eligible for medication delivery.

Impact. All staff reported that their involvement with the TMDS had a positive impact on their

lives both personally and professionally. On a personal level, staff expressed increased satisfaction from helping their communities and benefitting from higher income. Nurses gained specific skills, including experience with the principles of telemedicine, pediatric care, medication dosing, technology applications, and awareness of self-education methods (e.g., referencing guidelines). Physicians shared that they found personal satisfaction in providing more affordable and accessible healthcare to their community. They also noted that exposure to telemedicine brought an innovative dimension to their practice. Delivery drivers reported feeling greater respect and a sense of security from belonging to an institution. Professionally, drivers increased their familiarity with technology and gained a deeper geographic knowledge of their communities.

Staff reported that the TMDS had positively impacted the community as well. They emphasized that the TMDS reduces barriers (e.g., financial, security, transportation) to accessing healthcare, prevents illnesses from progressing into emergencies, reduces overspending on hospital care, creates jobs in the community, increases respect for disadvantaged people, and improves health literacy among the community. Despite the overall positive impact of the TMDS on staff and the community, there exist several challenges to the durability and scalability of the intervention. Staff safety, potential for burnout, limited scope of the TMDS model, funding, and the humanitarian and political crises in Haiti were presented by nurses and drivers as risks to the long-term sustainability of the TMDS.

DISCUSSION

In this study, call center and delivery nurses, delivery drivers, and on-call physicians shared their perspectives on the barriers and facilitators to scaling the TMDS healthcare model through focus group sessions and written questionnaires. The areas of concentration spanned the entire

workflow from virtual exams at the call center to in-person exams at the household, as well as communication systems connecting staff to each other and families. Expectations and impact were assessed to determine the extent of alignment with the broader goal of improving accesses to pre-emergent care for children. The results have enabled staff and study leadership to develop solutions aimed at refining the service in a way that anticipates scaling (Table 2). The findings can also provide direction to other teams faced with similar challenges.

The process of evaluating the TMDS through matrix analysis inspired an unanticipated higher-ordered synthesis and visualization of the findings that helps to characterize the strengths and weaknesses of the model (Figure 2). This visualization divides the findings into two domains: procedural workflow and governing mission. Once the workflow is set to a virtual or in-person encounter, nurses must have immediate situational awareness and adapt accordingly. This involves a cognitive process of decision making and a series of physical actions. In parallel, the situational awareness and adaptations require communication with a spectrum of different types of people with variable access to connectivity (e.g., cellular networks). These activities are hard, stressful and carry risk. Motivation to succeed with these difficult tasks is founded in a commitment to mission. This mission extends from self to community, motivates personal and team-based creative problem-solving and requires recognition that the service has limited scope and capacity.

With this visualization in mind, several solutions were identified, relating to both the cognitive and physical challenges. Cognitive challenges included struggling to effectively phrase questions to conduct productive virtual exams, as well as difficulty managing situations outside the scope of the established workflow and clinical resources. While nurses mitigated these challenges through experience, the time required to gain sufficient experience poses a barrier to

scaling. To address this, consolidating acquired knowledge into a ‘tip sheet’ and protocolizing how to handle edge-cases might expedite the training of new providers. Additionally, implementing an electronic clinical decision support tool that digitizes the clinical guidelines may streamline onboarding and provide structured guidance for conducting exams. Finally, refining components of the virtual and in-person exam processes could further enhance the quality of treatment plans.

Solutions to address the physical challenges focused on strengthening the technology infrastructure and innovating resources. In settings like Haiti, where telecommunication services are unreliable yet critical for telemedicine, improving the telecommunication infrastructure at its source may not be feasible. However, establishing multiple contingencies at each touchpoint (‘hardening’) can help minimize communication barriers. Additionally, households where in-person exams are conducted lack the resources typically found in clinics. To improve the working conditions, innovating materials to provide adequate lighting, a designated workspace, and improved organizational capacity would strengthen the quality and efficiency of in-person encounters.

Finally, unmet expectations from both families and staff, along with risks to the long-term sustainability of the TMDS, present obstacles to the mission. During this initial pilot phase, the scope of the TMDS was intentionally limited in terms of age, clinical offerings, hours of operation, and workflow to establish proofs of concept. As the TMDS is positioned for scale, the scope may expand. Until then, aligning the scope with staff and community expectations can be achieved through clear and consistent messaging . In addition, an uncertain path to sustainability is a barrier to maintaining high levels of impact and trust among staff and the community. To mitigate these risks, increasing and diversifying partnerships, while ensuring high standards for

working conditions and professional development, may improve the likelihood of long-term scalability and sustainability.

Our results align with, as well as differ from, other telemedicine services. In the telemedicine literature, staff and end-user acceptability are cited as common barriers(38). While we did not encounter opposition to telemedicine, misaligned expectations suggest underlying concerns related to acceptability. Another frequently cited barrier involves factors related to the implementation environment, such as nationwide policies and legal liability(28, 39). These concerns did not apply to our controlled pilot implementation but may become relevant as the service scales. The limited technical abilities of staff were also identified as a barrier in our study as well as others(38, 40). Most telemedicine services face challenges of unreliable telecommunication infrastructure, especially in low resource settings (39, 40).

This study was not without limitations. First, we gathered staff impressions of user expectations and community impact, rather than directly enrolling families as participants. Second, methodologically, the translation process could have introduced information bias, potentially altering the nuances and exact meanings of responses from the original language. We worked with bilingual facilitators to mitigate this risk. Third, conducting focus groups via video conferencing may have introduced a second form of information bias, as some sections of the recordings were inaudible due to unstable Internet connectivity. Despite these limitations, important findings were made that have both internal and external benefits for the telemedicine research community.

CONCLUSION

Telemedicine has secured a permanent role in healthcare delivery worldwide. However, scaling novel telemedicine applications presents challenges. To better understand these challenges, we used matrix analysis to identify and summarize insights gathered from focus group discussions

and written questionnaires with TMDS staff. The results revealed areas for improvement and led to essential action items, categorized into three domains: conceptual, physical and mission oriented. These action items will guide internal efforts to position the MotoMeds TMDS for scale and hopefully catalyze external improvement among like-minded telemedicine teams.

Table 1.

Telemedicine and medication delivery service (TMDS) staff participant characteristics.

Characteristic	Call center nurses[a] n=8	Delivery nurses[b] n=6	On-call physicians[c] n=3	Delivery drivers[d] n= 13
Age; median yrs (min, max) or values	31 (27-39)	31 (27-42)	36, 51, 66	36 (27-40)
Relevant professional experience; median yrs (min, max) or values	9 (3-11)	7 (1-14)	10, 15, 34	12 (5-22)
Experience working for TMDS; median yrs (min, max) or values	3 (1-3)	1	3	3 (1-3)

[a] Call center nurses conduct virtual exams at the call center and relay treatment plans to delivery nurses.
[b] Delivery nurses receive and enact virtual treatment plans by conducting in-person household exams or dispatching a motorcycle delivery driver.
[c] On-call physicians provide consultations by phone.
[d] Delivery drivers transport nurses and deliver medications/fluids to households by motorcycle.

Table 2.

Barriers and solutions for scaling a telemedicine and medication delivery service (TMDS) from the perspective of TMDS staff.

Domain	Challenges	Solutions
Virtual exam	• Lack of confidence in the accuracy of patient details provided by parents over the phone	• Request 'read back' from parents to ensure two-way understanding • Provide a 'tip sheet' with common follow-up and exploratory questions • Establish a standardized pathway for handling situations when the nurse is uncertain about the quality of responses • Eliminate or modify unproductive components of the virtual exam
Call center environment	• Technological barriers (e.g., unstable cellular signal, changing user interfaces)	• Enhance the robustness of technology infrastructure and establish contingencies • Strengthen and diversify technology training
In-person exam	• Restrictive scope of workflow and clinical resources	• Address barriers to seeking emergency care for families and facilitate interactions with hospital access points • Iterate the workflow for when additional patients are encountered during a household visit
Household environment	• Maneuvers to arrive at the household and function effectively once there	• Assure dispatch of nurses to conduct in-person exams is indicated • Innovate nurse equipment to increase lighting, maximize space, and improve durability
Clinical resources	• Limitations on medication dosing and edge cases • Informal workflow for consulting on-call physicians	• Incorporate clinical decision support tools for medication dosing • Protocolize edge cases within the clinical resources • Create structured systems for presenting cases and outcomes to on-call physicians
Communication	• Unstable cellular connectivity disrupts communication chains • Unreliable patient addresses	• Create an office in the delivery zone, rather than utilize mobile workstations • Focus on obtaining proper names for people and locations
Expectations	• Family expectations exceed the scope of the TMDS	• Improve messaging on the scope of a TMDS with staff and within the community
Impact	• Risks to long-term sustainability could limit impact	• Foster in-depth partnerships and distribute risk • Ensure standards of professionalism are supported and continue offering professional development opportunities

Figure 1. General workflow of a telemedicine and medication delivery service (TMDS). The parent of a sick child contacts the call center. A TMDS nurse receives the call and conducts a virtual exam by asking the parent targeted questions about the child and their symptoms. The nurse references clinical resources to create a treatment plan that includes disposition, medications/fluids, and follow-up recommendations. Families are contacted by phone at 24 hours and/or 10 days. A version of this figure was published previously(34).



Figure 2. Positioning a TMDS for scale; barriers and solutions between operations and mission.



Technology affects multiple touch points
*Not interviewed

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Code availability. Not applicable.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank the TMDS staff for their enrollment and participation in this study. We would also like to acknowledge the University of Florida Department of Pediatrics administrators Randy Autrey, Krista Berquist and Brittney Johnson. Additionally, we express our appreciation for the academic support provided by Glenn Morris at the Emerging Pathogens Institute, and Rashmin Savani Chair of the Department of Pediatrics.

FUNDING This work was supported by the Children's Miracle Network at University of Florida (EJN), The National Institutes of Health [5R21TW012332-02] (EJN) and private donations to the University of Florida Foundation. The funders had no direct role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Data availability. Upon request.

Author contributions:

Conceptualization: EJN, MBK, TKB, RKR,

Implementation of the study: FG, KC, MBK

Statistical analyses and visualizations: FG, KC, KF, EJN, MBK

Funding acquisition: MBK, EJN

Supervision: MBK, EJN, VBR, JRB, LE, CB

Writing – original draft: MBK, EJN

Writing – review & editing: RKR, FG, KC, YC, KEF, JRB, TKB, LE, VBR, CB,

Competing interests: Authors declare that they have no competing interests.

REFERENCES

1. Bhaskar S, Bradley S, Chattu VK, Adisesh A, Nurtazina A, Kyrykbayeva S, et al. Telemedicine Across the Globe-Position Paper From the COVID-19 Pandemic Health System Resilience PROGRAM (REPROGRAM) International Consortium (Part 1). Frontiers in Public Health. 2020;8.
2. Ndwabe H, Basu A, Mohammed J. Post pandemic analysis on comprehensive utilization of telehealth and telemedicine. Clinical eHealth. 2024;7:5-14.
3. Sood S, Mbarika V, Jugoo S, Dookhy R, Doarn CR, Prakash N, et al. What is telemedicine? A collection of 104 peer-reviewed perspectives and theoretical underpinnings. Telemed J E Health. 2007;13(5):573-90.
4. World Health Organization. Telemedicine Opportunities and Developments in Member States Geneva Switzerland2010 [Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/44497/9789241564144_eng.pdf.
5. Liu P, Wang F, Xu W, Li Y, Li B. Trends and frontiers of research on telemedicine from 1971 to 2022: A scientometric and visualisation analysis. Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare. 2023;29(9):731-46.
6. Harst L, Otto L, Timpel P, Richter P, Lantzsch H, Wollschlaeger B, et al. An empirically sound telemedicine taxonomy – applying the CAFE methodology. Journal of Public Health. 2022;30(11):2729-40.
7. USA DoHaHS. Telehealth for emergency departments. Tele-triage 2025 [cited 2025 February 19]. Available from: https://telehealth.hhs.gov/providers/best-practice-guides/telehealth-for-emergency-departments/tele-triage#:~:text=Tele%2Dtriage%20can%20be%20used,come%20to%20the%20emergency%20department.
8. McConnochie KM, Conners GP, Brayer AF, Goepp J, Herendeen NE, Wood NE, et al. Effectiveness of Telemedicine in Replacing In-Person Evaluation for Acute Childhood Illness in Office Settings. Telemedicine and e-Health. 2006;12(3):308-16.
9. Mahmoud K, Jaramillo C, Barteit S. Telemedicine in Low- and Middle-Income Countries During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Scoping Review. Front Public Health. 2022;10:914423.
10. Alnasser Y, Proaño A, Loock C, Chuo J, Gilman RH. Telemedicine and Pediatric Care in Rural and Remote Areas of Middle-and-Low-Income Countries: Narrative Review. J Epidemiol Glob Health. 2024;14(3):779-86.
11. Moyo J, Madziyire G. Use of telemedicine in obstetrics and gynaecology in Zimbabwe during a lockdown period. Pan Afr Med J. 2020;35(Suppl 2):89.
12. Klarman MB, Flaherty KE, Chi X, Cajusma Y, Capois AC, Vladimir Dofiné MD, et al. Implementation of a pediatric telemedicine and medication delivery service in a resource-limited setting: A pilot study for clinical safety and feasibility. The Journal of Pediatrics. 2022.
13. Flaherty KE, Klarman MB, Zakariah AN, Mahama MN, Osei-Ampofo M, Nelson EJ, et al. Evaluating the prerequisites for adapting a paediatric nighttime telemedicine and medication delivery service to a setting with high malarial burden: A cross-sectional pre-implementation study. Trop Med Int Health. 2023;28(9):763-70.
14. McCannon CJ, Berwick DM, Massoud MR. The Science of Large-Scale Change in Global Health. JAMA. 2007;298(16):1937-9.
15. Hanson K, Ranson MK, Oliveira-Cruz V, Mills A. Expanding access to priority health interventions: a framework for understanding the constraints to scaling-up. Journal of International Development. 2003;15(1):1.
16. Zomahoun HTV, Ben Charif A, Freitas A, Garvelink MM, Menear M, Dugas M, et al. The pitfalls of scaling up evidence-based interventions in health. Glob Health Action. 2019;12(1):1670449.
17. Access PiEHQa. ExpandNet [Available from: https://expandnet.net/.

18. Bulthuis SE, Kok MC, Raven J, Dieleman MA. Factors influencing the scale-up of public health interventions in low- and middle-income countries: a qualitative systematic literature review. Health Policy Plan. 2020;35(2):219-34.
19. Damschroder LJ, Reardon CM, Widerquist MAO, Lowery J. The updated Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research based on user feedback. Implement Sci. 2022;17(1):75.
20. Huang F, Cheng S, Du X, Chen W, Scano F, Falzon D, et al. Electronic recording and reporting system for tuberculosis in China: experience and opportunities. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2014;21(5):938-41.
21. Ndlovu K, Scott RE, Mars M. Interoperability opportunities and challenges in linking mhealth applications and eRecord systems: Botswana as an exemplar. BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making. 2021;21(1):246.
22. Spicer N, Berhanu D, Bhattacharya D, Tilley-Gyado RD, Gautham M, Schellenberg J, et al. 'The stars seem aligned': a qualitative study to understand the effects of context on scale-up of maternal and newborn health innovations in Ethiopia, India and Nigeria. Globalization and Health. 2016;12(1):75.
23. Adebayo PB, Oluwole OJ, Taiwo FT. COVID-19 and Teleneurology in Sub-Saharan Africa: Leveraging the Current Exigency. Frontiers in Public Health. 2021;8.
24. Mengiste SA, Antypas K, Johannessen MR, Klein J, Kazemi G. eHealth policy framework in Low and Lower Middle-Income Countries; a PRISMA systematic review and analysis. BMC Health Services Research. 2023;23(1):328.
25. Pérez-Noboa B, Soledispa-Carrasco A, Padilla VS, Velasquez W. Teleconsultation Apps in the COVID-19 Pandemic: The Case of Guayaquil City, Ecuador. IEEE Engineering Management Review. 2021;49(1):27-37.
26. Jiang Y, Sun P, Chen Z, Guo J, Wang S, Liu F, et al. Patients' and healthcare providers' perceptions and experiences of telehealth use and online health information use in chronic disease management for older patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a qualitative study. BMC Geriatrics. 2022;22(1):9.
27. Aydemir S, Ocak S, Saygılı S, Hopurcuoğlu D, Haşlak F, Kıykım E, et al. Telemedicine Applications in a Tertiary Pediatric Hospital in Turkey During COVID-19 Pandemic. Telemedicine and e-Health. 2020;27(10):1180-7.
28. Dodoo JE, Al-Samarraie H, Alzahrani AI. Telemedicine use in Sub-Saharan Africa: Barriers and policy recommendations for Covid-19 and beyond. International Journal of Medical Informatics. 2021;151:104467.
29. Hamilton AB, Finley EP. Qualitative methods in implementation research: An introduction. Psychiatry Res. 2019;280:112516.
30. Proctor E, Silmere H, Raghavan R, Hovmand P, Aarons G, Bunger A, et al. Outcomes for Implementation Research: Conceptual Distinctions, Measurement Challenges, and Research Agenda. Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research. 2011;38(2):65-76.
31. Rosen RK, Gainey M, Nasrin S, Garbern SC, Lantini R, Elshabassi N, et al. Use of Framework Matrix and Thematic Coding Methods in Qualitative Analysis for mHealth: The FluidCalc app. International Journal of Qualitative Methods. 2023;22:16094069231184123.
32. Klarman M, Schon J, Cajusma Y, Maples S, Beau de Rochars VEM, Baril C, et al. Opportunities to catalyse improved healthcare access in pluralistic systems: a cross-sectional study in Haiti. BMJ Open. 2021;11(11):e047367.
33. Klarman MB, Chi X, Cajusma Y, Flaherty KE, Capois AC, Dofiné MDV, et al. Development and Evaluation of a Clinical Guideline for a Pediatric Telemedicine and Medication Delivery Service: A Prospective Cohort Study in Haiti. medRxiv. 2023:2023.02.15.23285858.

34. Klarman MB, Chi X, Cajusma Y, Flaherty KE, Beausejour JR, Exantus L, et al. Evaluation of a Scalable Design for a Pediatric Telemedicine and Medication Delivery Service: A Prospective Cohort Study in Haiti. medRxiv. 2024:2024.08.16.24312128.
35. Flaherty KE, Klarman MB, Cajusma Y, Schon J, Exantus L, Beau de Rochars VM, et al. A Nighttime Telemedicine and Medication Delivery Service to Avert Pediatric Emergencies in Haiti: An Exploratory Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2022;106(4):1063-71.
36. Biswas D, Hossin R, Rahman M, Bardosh KL, Watt MH, Zion MI, et al. An ethnographic exploration of diarrheal disease management in public hospitals in Bangladesh: From problems to solutions. Social Science & Medicine. 2020;260:113185.
37. Rosen RK, Garbern SC, Gainey M, Lantini R, Nasrin S, Nelson EJ, et al. Designing a Novel Clinician Decision Support Tool for the Management of Acute Diarrhea in Bangladesh: Formative Qualitative Study. JMIR Hum Factors. 2022;9(1):e33325.
38. Scott Kruse C, Karem P, Shifflett K, Vegi L, Ravi K, Brooks M. Evaluating barriers to adopting telemedicine worldwide: A systematic review. J Telemed Telecare. 2018;24(1):4-12.
39. Mamuye A, Nigatu AM, Chanyalew MA, Amor LB, Loukil S, Moyo C, et al. Facilitators and Barriers to the Sustainability of eHealth Solutions in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: Descriptive Exploratory Study. JMIR Form Res. 2023;7:e41487.
40. Sagaro GG, Battineni G, Amenta F. Barriers to Sustainable Telemedicine Implementation in Ethiopia: A Systematic Review. Telemedicine Reports. 2020;1(1):8-15.