A Scoping Review of Studies on Secure Messaging through Patient Portals: Persistent Challenges and the Promise of Human-Centered AI

Yawen Guo MISM[1], Di Hu MS[1], Yiliang Zhou MS[1], Tera L. Reynolds MPH, MA, PhD[2], Kai Zheng PhD[1]

1. Department of Informatics, University of California, Irvine, Irvine, California, United States
2. Department of Information Systems, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, Maryland, United States

Corresponding Author: Yawen Guo
Mailing Address: 6136 Donald Bren Hall, Irvine, CA 92697, United States
E-mail: yaweng5@uci.edu
Telephone: (412) 641-0453

Keywords: Secure Messaging, Patient–Provider Communication, Patient Portal [E05.318.308.940.968.249.750], Artificial Intelligence [L01.224.050.375], Electronic Health Records [E05.318.308.940.968.625.500], Scoping Review [V02.912.750]

ABSTRACT

Objectives: Secure messaging (SM) has seen increasing adoption over the past decade, prompting growing interest in understanding its impact on healthcare delivery. This review synthesizes existing SM research by examining key topics, such as usage patterns, perceived benefits, and persistent challenges, in order to identify research gaps and inform opportunities for AI and sociotechnical solutions to enhance SM effectiveness.

Materials and Methods: Searches were conducted in PubMed, Scopus, IEEE Xplore, ACM Digital Library, Cochrane CENTRAL, CINAHL, and Web of Science. Following the PRISMA guideline, we identified 271 relevant peer-reviewed studies published from January 2009 to April 2025.

Results: Existing research has primarily examined (1) the impact of SM use on clinical outcomes, (2) user experiences, and (3) adoption patterns. SM is widely recognized for promoting patient engagement, care coordination, and provider–patient communication. However, significant challenges persist, including privacy concerns, limited access for vulnerable populations, patient misuse, and increased clinician burden—many of which could be addressed through the application of AI.

Discussion and Conclusion: Educational initiatives and patient-centered design are essential for promoting appropriate and accessible use of SM. Emerging AI solutions show promise in enhancing SM use, particularly for message triaging and drafting. The integration of such AI solutions however must be guided by robust governance frameworks to ensure transparency, maintain trust, and align with evolving clinical, billing, and regulatory environments. Future research should include more diverse care settings and populations, prioritizing the development of equitable sociotechnical tools and interventions that can be seamlessly integrated into clinical workflows.

Background and Significance

The Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health (HITECH) Act has promoted the meaningful use of electronic health records (EHRs) to enhance healthcare quality, patient engagement, and data security[1]. Meaningful Use guidelines mandated secure electronic messaging as a standard for patient-provider communication and promoted EHR innovations like telehealth to enhance care between visits [2–4]. Secure messaging(SM) is a core feature of patient portals and plays a critical role in the broader landscape of telehealth[5–7]. As defined by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services(CMS), SM refers to "any electronic communication between a provider and patient that ensures only those parties can access the communication"[8].

SM has become a widely adopted feature in patient portals, supporting patients in self-managing health conditions and coordinating care[9,10]. It enables timely and efficient multimodal asynchronous information exchanges and has shown potential to improve patient engagement and provider workflows[11]. Despite its growing use, challenges persist in expanding adoption, ensuring effectiveness, and addressing overuse, particularly since the COVID-19 pandemic[12–16]. In response, CMS introduced billing codes for portal messages that involve medical decision-making and that require more than five minutes of clinician time within a seven-day period[11]. These policy changes represent a shift toward recognizing the clinical value and resource demands of SM[15,17]. As artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) tools become more integrated into healthcare, their potential to improve patient–provider communication through SM is increasingly explored[18–20]. Successful integration requires a clear understanding of existing SM practices and challenges, supported by strong governance frameworks that ensure transparency, promote equity, and include human oversight to preserve trust in clinical interactions.

Early reviews on SM explored its potential to enhance patient-provider communication, focusing on user expectations, confidentiality concerns, and system limitations reflective of the technological landscape before 2010[21–23]. These studies provided foundational insights into SM's benefits and limitations, particularly its integration with patient portals and its impact on user satisfaction and engagement. Recent reviews have examined specialized aspects of SM. A recent application review of 19 SM vendors highlights the growing need for structured

evaluation frameworks to support clinical integration decisions[24]. Other studies have examined SM use in specific patient populations, including those managing diabetes, patients with breast cancer, and individuals undergoing postoperative care[25–27].

No review has comprehensively assessed the research on patient–provider SM communication since 2009. Given the rapid AI and technological advancements and significant policy changes, a current synthesis is urgently needed to understand how SM has evolved and its role in modern healthcare. To address this gap, this review systematically maps the literature on patient–provider SM communication from the past 15 years, guided by three research questions:

1) How have primary topics and areas of focus evolved in studies on patient–provider SM?
2) How have insights on SM implementation, including adoption patterns, perceived benefits, and challenges, evolved over time?
3) How can AI-driven and sociotechnical solutions be applied to address key challenges and advance the effectiveness of SM?

Materials and Methods

Literature Search and Selection

We conducted a literature search across PubMed, Scopus, IEEE Xplore, ACM Digital Library, Cochrane CENTRAL, CINAHL, and Web of Science. The search strategy used the following terms: ("**secure messag***" AND **patient**) OR ("**portal messag***" AND **patient**) in the title and abstract, restricted to studies written in English and published from 2009 onwards. The final search was completed on April 6, 2025. The titles and abstracts of the identified articles were independently screened by two authors (YG and DH). Articles identified as relevant after the title and abstract screening process then underwent a full-text review to determine final inclusion. Any disagreements were resolved through consensus meetings with a third author (KZ).

We included studies where SM between patients and providers was either the primary research objective or one of the main focuses of the study. Studies that did not investigate SM or where SM did not occur between patients and providers were excluded. We also excluded studies

that examined SM alongside other communication methods and reported results collectively. Additionally, studies that only provided basic metrics on SM use without further analysis were excluded. We only included original empirical studies published as full-length peer-reviewed articles.

Data Extraction

To formulate the codebook, YG and DH iteratively coded sets of 10 articles, followed by consensus discussions with KZ to refine codes. A structured coding scheme was developed to categorize study objectives (Table 1), with open-text fields included to capture additional details. For each study, we extracted objectives, methods, key findings, and future recommendations. Two of the three researchers (YG, DH, and YZ) independently coded each article, and discrepancies were resolved through consensus or input from the third reviewer (KZ).

Table 1. Coding Framework for Study Objectives

Code Category	**Example Codes**
Message Content Analyses	sentiment analysis; topic or theme analysis; linguistic analysis
User Experience and Engagement Assessments	user perspective/satisfaction/preferences; comparative analysis of SM vs. other methods; strategies to improve engagement
Outcomes and Effectiveness Evaluations	use of SM as an intervention; SM as a predictive tool; evaluation of clinical or behavioral outcomes
System Evaluation and Computational Method Development Studies	development of SM-related computational tools; evaluation of SM system functionality; user interface design
Secure Messaging Adoption Analyses	SM adoption rates; proportion of SM users among EHR enrollees; usage behavior analysis
Proxy Use and Shared Access Investigations	examination of proxy message authorship; issues related to shared access to SM

Health and Technology Literacy Barrier Assessments	analysis of patient health literacy and education; technological literacy and associated barriers
Billing and Reimbursement Policy Investigations	evaluation of e-visit billing codes; reimbursement-related SM usage trends; financial incentives and barriers

Results

A search across seven databases yielded 810 unique studies. After full-text screening of 409 articles, 138 were excluded based on predefined criteria (Figure 1). We included 271 relevant studies in this review. The process followed PRISMA guidelines to ensure methodological rigor and comprehensive coverage.



Fig. 1. Literature search and selection process.

Our analysis categorized these 271 studies into eight distinct research objectives (Figure 2), capturing a wide range of topics related to SM within EHRs. The following sections present findings from each category, highlighting key insights on healthcare communication, patient engagement, clinical outcomes, and technological developments.



Fig. 2. Distribution of Study Objectives Across Reviewed Articles (n = 271)

** Note: Some studies were coded under multiple categories*

<u>Outcomes and Effectiveness Evaluations (n=72, 26.6%)</u>

SM is positively associated with outcome benefits across various clinical conditions, including enhanced diabetes self-management[28–35] and improved survival outcomes among oncology patients[36]. It also supports hypertension management through better blood pressure monitoring and medication intensification, reducing cardiovascular risks[37,38]. In preventive care, it is linked with increased rates of vaccination[39–43], colorectal and hepatitis C screenings[44,45], and pediatric care attendance[43,46,47]. SM also improved medication adherence among patients with , including smoking cessation[48–50], chronic myeloid leukemia[51], spina bifida[52], and

depression[53]. Among elderly patients, it has been found to facilitate care planning[54]. In pediatric settings, SM has supported medical decision-making[55], and delivered educational interventions in suicide prevention and HIV care for young adults[56–60].

SM serves as an indicator of hospitalist efficiency and patient engagement[61–64]. It influences clinical workflow by increasing patient engagement and supporting the adoption of e-visits[65–71], although higher volumes of SM interactions may reduce new patient intake capacity[65,72]. While its association with emergency visits varies by conditions[73–75], SM generally improves primary care workflows, reducing urgent care utilization and unnecessary visits[76–79]. Although provider burnout remains a concern, message characteristics do not appear to be a major contributing factor[80]. SM has also demonstrated effectiveness as a clinical research recruitment tool, achieving high response rates compared to mail, phone, and social media methods across diverse clinical trials[81–88].

Studies comparing SM with traditional communication methods highlight varied user preferences influenced by clinical context and demographics, indicating that tailored approaches are essential[87,89–96]. Studies report lower response rates of SM for COVID-19 research recruitment and preventive screening when compared to traditional phone or mail communication[89,90,97,98]. Influenza vaccination studies show mixed results, with some reporting improved uptake[93,99], while others find no population-level benefits from SM reminders[100,101]. SM outreach shows no significant advantage for smoking cessation[49,58,102] or HIV medication refills[103,104].

User Experience and Engagement Assessments (n=69, 25.5%)

Studies evaluating user experiences report high satisfaction among patients [105–109], and strong enthusiasm from providers[110,111], in terms of supporting medication refills, appointment scheduling, test result access, clinical inquiries[14,112–115]. Patients view SM as a tool that complement face-to-face communication, especially regarding sensitive issues like sexually transmitted diseases(STDs) and erectile dysfunction[105,116,117]. It also improves access to care[14,112,116,118–121] and strengthens patient-provider relationships[122]. Providers value SM for improving workflow, care coordination, and enabling remote work[118,123].

However, patients have raised concerns about provider burden from uncompensated SM interactions, delayed responses, unclear messages, and difficulty reaching specific providers–all contributing to tracking issues and inconsistent communication[12,48,115,124–128]. Providers also report increased workload due to time-intensive message management[120,127–132], and stress from inappropriate or emotionally challenging messages[12–14,115,133]. Additional concerns include liability risks[131], limited effectiveness of SM in inpatient settings[134], and inadequate training among medical trainees in using SM[135].

User-perceived barriers to SM adoption include patient misconceptions and previous negative experiences—such as uncertainty about what counts as a 'non-urgent' message or concerns about physician time[116,136]. Users also reported challenges related to message ambiguity and complexity, particularly among elderly with lower literacy[123,136,137]. Other barriers include delegation of messaging tasks that complicate provider communication[13], limited technology and internet access[13,114,138], and unclear guidelines for messaging use[136,139]. Proposed solutions emphasize user education and training[119,125,140–143], accessible user interfaces with clearly messaging instructions[136,139], and AI-driven tools designed to improve patientliteracy and support physician workflows[136,144,145]. Additional recommendations include strategic message management practices such as team-based message sharing[115,119,127,143,146], crafting clear and empathetic messages[147,148], and standardizing administrative processes to enhance efficiency and reduce clinician burden[141].

Secure Messaging Adoption Analyses (n=57, 21.0%)

SM adoption has expanded substantially since its introduction around 2010 and is now the most used patient portal function[149–152]. During this time, most office-based physicians adopted SM, although uptake was lower among solo and non-primary care providers[136,153,154]. Disparities emerged following federal incentives, with certified health IT use positively linked to SM adoption, along with provider performance expectancy and attitudes[155–157]. Research shows SM volume continues to rise, though per capita rates have plateaued[154,158–163]. The COVID-19 pandemic triggered a major surge in use, and persistent high volume may contribute to multitasking, disruptions, and medical errors[164–167]. A national study found that only 1.9% of veterans used SM during early adoption, with uptake varying by condition and demographics[168].

Patient SM usage patterns vary across demographics. Users are more often younger[70,169–175], women[170,173,175–179], Caucasian[70,170,172,173,177,179,180], married [70,85,172,173,179], employed[70], privately insured[70,156,175,181,182], and live in high socioeconomic neighborhoods [70,155,171,183] with higher education levels[169,173,184]. Many also have poor physical[169] or mental health conditions[177,185], and elevated morbidity[171–173,175,186]. Active users are generally English speaking[179], with high EHR usage and more outpatient visits[187–189]. Among adolescents, portal SM users were more often female or transgender with prior portal experience[190]. In contrast, lower SM engagement is observed among underrepresented minorities[152,156,191–193], veterans experiencing homelessness[185,194,195], individuals with limited English proficiency or low health literacy[186,196–198], and rural patients facing poor internet access and digital disparities[138,171,177,184].

Patient–provider interactions shape SM adoption, influenced by behavioral health models, clinical roles, and the characteristics of both patients and providers[199,200]. Women are more likely to request medical guidance via SM but receive fewer confirmations in response[201]. Female physicians are also more likely than their male colleagues to send and receive SM[176].

System Evaluation and Computational Method Development Studies (n=30, 11.1%)

Early evaluations of SM systems reported rapid turnaround times for consultations during pilot e-visit deployments[202]. However, later studies revealed persistent system-level usability and access challenges including delayed message response times, suggesting limitations in platform responsiveness and interface design[203,204]. System analyses using signal and log data highlighted rising message volumes and uneven clinician workload distribution, with primary care physicians and nurse practitioners handling most communication during standard work hours[174]. Usability research in hospital settings identified functionality gaps, such as clinical document sharing errors[205], while broader evaluations linked increased SM use to patient access to EHR data[206], underscoring the importance of system design and data transparency.

Recent studies leverage patient–provider SM data to improve clinical efficiency and communication using computational methods. Theory-informed tools—designed to enhance digital engagement, support content creation, and implement feedback mechanisms—have

increased portal use among users with diverse literacy and numeracy skills[207],[148,208,209]. Automated assessments of readability and health literacy provide insights into message complexity, informing both clinical care and population-level interventions[210–212],[213]. Rule-based, natural language processing(NLP), deep learning models have been developed to triage SM by risk and urgency[214], information type(e.g., clinical, medical, logistical, or social)[215], and medical decision complexity[216–218]. They were also applied to identify primary patient concerns, social needs, and mental health crisis[219–227]. Efforts to extract actionable insights from messages include building FHIR-aligned data models[228] and incorporating semantic and contextual features for improved classification[229]. Additionally, vector-based representation techniques have been explored with a focus on optimizing word embeddings for small, domain-specific datasets[230], and prompt engineering has been used to generate synthetic drug-related messages to reveal language patterns[231].

Message Content Analyses (n=24, 8.9%)

Studies analyzing SM content use both qualitative and computational methods to examine communication patterns. Common topics include medication-related issues, appointment scheduling, lab results, referrals, and other administrative tasks[28,28,91,165,170,232–241] . Patients use SM to report symptoms, express psychosocial concerns, seek medical advice, and convey appreciation or complaints[91,165,170,178,235,236,238,242,243]. SM content also reveals patterns around sensitive health topics such as STDs and cannabis use[105,244]. Tone analysis reveals that most messages are neutral and respectful, though cyber-incivility and problematic language occasionally challenge professional standards[133,245,246]. Evidence suggests that provider replies may lack language that fosters partnership or emotional support[247], and provider-initiated messages often reflect greater clinical complexity[248].

Proxy Use and Shared Access Investigations (n=10, 3.7%)

This body of research focuses on patient portal use among adolescents with their guardians, and elderly patients with their caregivers. Studies highlight benefits such as convenient communication and patient empowerment, but also raise concerns about privacy and confidentiality—particularly for adolescents under the Cures Act Final Rule[249],[250]. More than half of messages from adolescent accounts are accessed by guardians, revealing privacy management challenges[251,252]. For elderly populations, research consistently reports

caregiver use of portals and SM as proxies, reflecting significant reliance on caregiver support[241,253–255]. Caregiver proxies more commonly manage portals for older adults, males, non-white patients, non-English speakers, noncitizens, and those with public insurance[256]. To address these challenges, recent studies developed computational methods to identify non-patient authors, improving management efficiency and privacy safeguards in patient portal communications[186,257].

Health or Technology Literacy Barrier Assessments (n=9, 3.3%)

Several studies emphasize the importance of health and digital literacy for the adoption and effective use of SM. Research shows that while patients often write in simpler language, a mismatch in communication complexity is evident in a notable portion of exchanges[210]. Studies have identified disparities linked to the digital divide, highlighting barriers such as low digital literacy[152,197]. Providers frequently encounter technology-related difficulties, including complex login procedures and frequent log-offs[12]. Investigations into SM complexity suggest that automated feedback mechanisms can improve message clarity and user education, helping providers communicate more effectively[148]. Computational models using linguistic analysis of patient messages have also shown promise in assessing health literacy and identifying educational needs automatically[123,148,148,211–213].

Billing and Reimbursement Policy Investigations (n=7, 2.6%)

Recent studies examining billing policies for SM e-visits highlight changes in clinician billing behaviors and message usage patterns following the 2020 decision by CMS to allow billing for SM. Initial assessments noted modest declines in message volume after CMS's decision and low physician participation in billing activities[15,17,258,259], even though providers generally accepted the new model[260]. Emerging research proposes refining billing strategies using predictive models based on clinical complexity rather than time spent, potentially improving billing accuracy and effectiveness[261]. Investigations in specialty areas, such as ophthalmology, reported a temporary increase in billing during the pandemic, underscoring challenges in sustaining equitable SM billing across diverse healthcare contexts[262].

Discussion

This scoping review systematically maps the evolving landscape of SM research, emphasizing its role in patient–provider communication and the increasing influence of human-centered AI in shaping its implementation. SM has shown clear benefits in enhancing access, continuity, and care coordination. However, challenges around equity, usability, and provider burden persist, underscoring the need for coordinated efforts among all key stakeholders, including patients, providers, researchers, and policymakers. This discussion explores how AI tools, when combined with human judgment, ethical design, and an understanding of clinical and social context, could further enhance the effectiveness of SM.

Integrating Generative AI in SM Workflows Requires Careful Research and Governance

The integration of generative AI (GenAI) and large language models(LLMs) into SM offers new opportunities to improve efficiency and reduce clinician burden, especially in the management of in-basket messages[263,264]. While providers often prefer human-generated messages for their readability and empathy[265–267], Patients are generally receptive to GenAI-generated messages, especially when tone and context are appropriately managed[268]. Recent research has begun exploring GenAI's feasibility across varied message types and clinical scenarios to improve applicability and trust in message drafting[269–272]. Pilot studies are also testing GenAI for triage, response generation, and workload redistribution within SM systems[273,274]. Widespread integration will require robust evaluation of both message quality and broader impacts on communication safety, patient–provider relationships, and workflow efficiency. As SM continues to evolve, human-centered governance will be essential to ensure that GenAI enhances care while maintaining trust and accountability.

Patient Misconceptions, Privacy Concerns, and Misuse of SM

Patients often hold misconceptions about SM, shaped by negative experiences with telehealth, uncertainty about who receives their messages, and concerns over privacy and system responsiveness[116,136]. Some patients hesitate to use SM due to fear of overburdening their providers, while others misuse it for urgent needs[124,126],[164]. Although computational methods such as urgency classification have been developed to support triage[235], they alone are insufficient to ensure appropriate use. AI-based tools have the potential to guide patients in real time by suggesting appropriate message categories, clarifying urgency, or simplifying language. However, these solutions must be paired with user education to be effective, as

patients need guidance on when and how to use SM appropriately[12,115,125,128]. Some health systems have begun embedding brief guidance within patient portals or visit summaries, yet few efforts are tailored to individuals with limited digital literacy, language barriers, or disabilities. Furthermore, little is known about the effectiveness of these approaches or whether they reach the patients most in need. There is also a role for provider-facing education to ensure consistent messaging around SM use during clinical encounters. Finally, safeguards must be in place to protect the privacy of non-patient message senders, including caregivers, parents, and guardians of adolescents, as well as individuals with disabilities[241,250,251,275].

Expanding Access and Equity Through Patient-Centered Design

Non-English speakers and the elderly continue to face technical barriers that limit their effective use of SM[186,256]. SM system design must account for low literacy and adopt user-friendly interfaces to support communication. Patient-centered design is essential for effective healthcare delivery, improving SM functionality and accessibility for both patients and providers[245,247,263,276–278]. Individuals from low socioeconomic backgrounds often face barriers to accessing SM, particularly when care is delivered across multiple providers[70,155,171]. Many SM interventions are passive in nature, relying on patient-initiated engagement, which may inadvertently exclude underrepresented groups who are unaware of or hesitant to use SM. While some studies incorporated targeted outreach—such as reminders for vaccinations or preventive screenings—few tailored message content to meet specific needs. Interventions that combine patient-centered design with AI-powered tools can enhance comprehension and engagement in SM by using features such as simplified language, visual aids, and GenAI-generated tailored educational content to personalize communication.

Reducing the Burden on Providers

Misuse of SM for urgent issues can shift liability and clinical responsibility to providers, potentially compromising patient care[133,246]. Patients' use of inappropriate language or emotionally charged messages may contribute to a stressful professional environment and emotional exhaustion[133,246]. Beyond emotional strain, operational burdens include frequent attention shifts, prolonged inbox management, and increased cognitive load, which can reduce the quality and timeliness of responses[129,132,143]. The surge in message volume—especially during COVID-19—has intensified these pressures, extending work into personal time and

increasing physician burnout[115,127,279–281]. Disparities in SM use between physician- and hospital-owned practices suggest that organizational structures also shape provider engagement[180]. To address these challenges, some interventions have introduced structured workflows or support systems—such as team-based inbox management or message triage protocols—but few studies have systematically evaluated their effectiveness in reducing workload or improving care delivery. Future work should critically examine where AI can most effectively complement human systems, and where organizational restructuring, such as clearer staff roles or protected time for messaging, may be more impactful. A balanced approach that integrates automation with clinician-centered workflow design is likely needed to alleviate provider burden.

Billing Models and Economic Considerations in SM

While early billing policies for SM focused on clinician time and decision-making complexity, ongoing implementation has raised broader concerns around equity, resource allocation, and communication dynamics[15,17]. Modest physician engagement and reduced patient messaging suggest hesitancy toward new billing protocols and potential shifts in patient behavior[258,259]. Predictive modeling based on clinical complexity has offered strategies to align care delivery with billing practices[261]. AI-enhanced billing tools could analyze message content and estimate clinical effort, but they remain largely untested in SM-specific billing scenarios. As these technologies evolve, it will be important to monitor their impact on provider documentation and patient access. Future research should evaluate how providers and patients respond to SM billing and explore how AI can support more equitable and transparent reimbursement systems.

Expanding the Clinical Scope of SM Research

Most studies have focused on single healthcare systems, particularly emphasizing primary care settings. Investigations often target specific populations—older adults, veterans, and patients with chronic illnesses like diabetes or cancer. However, this focus limits the broader applicability and generalizability of findings. There has been limited exploration of SM's benefits and limitations beyond primary care, such as in emergency or specialty settings. Future research should diversify study populations, broaden the range of health conditions examined, and include varied care environments.

Limitations and Future Work

This review included only archival articles, excluding brief reports and research letters, which may have offered early insights into emerging trends. Future reviews should consider these formats to broaden analytical scope. Our search strategy focused on the terms "secure messag*" and "portal messag*" to distinguish SM from other communication like email or text messaging, which may have excluded older studies published before these terms became common. We also excluded studies on interprofessional communication (e.g., physician–nurse interactions), limiting findings to patient–provider contexts. Future research should explore these areas to better capture SM's broader impact on healthcare communication and teamwork.

Conclusion

This scoping review synthesized literature on patient–provider secure messaging (SM), highlighting key themes including user perspectives, communication patterns, clinical outcomes, and technology adoption. While SM offers clear benefits for patient engagement and care coordination, challenges persist around provider workload, digital access, and equitable implementation. AI-assisted tools show promise in addressing these barriers but must be paired with thorough patient evaluation and careful integration into clinical workflows. We underscore the need for user-centered system design, targeted education to improve digital and health literacy, and informed policy development regarding billing and physician burden. Future research should explore how LLMs and GenAI can be responsibly applied to support secure and efficient patient–provider communication.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors received no specific funding or external support for this study.

COMPETING INTERESTS STATEMENT

The authors have no competing interests to declare.

CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT

YG conceived the study, led the literature review, conducted data collection and analysis, and drafted the manuscript. DH and YZ contributed to screening and data extraction. TLR and KZ provided methodological guidance and critical revisions. All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data analyzed in this study were derived from previously published literature. Synthesized data supporting the findings of this review are available from the corresponding author upon request.

References

[1] Rights (OCR) O for C. HITECH Act Enforcement Interim Final Rule 2009. https://www.hhs.gov/hipaa/for-professionals/special-topics/hitech-act-enforcement-interim-final-rule/index.html (accessed November 5, 2024).

[2] The Federal Government Has Put Billions into Promoting Electronic Health Record Use: How Is It Going? n.d. https://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/newsletter-article/federal-government-has-put-billions-promoting-electronic-health (accessed November 5, 2024).

[3] What Are Electronic Health Records (EHRs)? | HealthIT.gov n.d. https://www.healthit.gov/topic/health-it-and-health-information-exchange-basics/what-are-electronic-health-records-ehrs (accessed November 5, 2024).

[4] Blumenthal D, Tavenner M. The “Meaningful Use” Regulation for Electronic Health Records. N Engl J Med 2010;363:501–4. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1006114.

[5] Konttila J, Siira H, Kyngäs H, et al. Healthcare professionals’ competence in digitalisation: A systematic review. J Clin Nurs 2019;28:745–61. https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.14710.

[6] Yeung AWK, Torkamani A, Butte AJ, et al. The promise of digital healthcare technologies. Front Public Health 2023;11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1196596.

[7] Tuckson RV, Edmunds M, Hodgkins ML. Telehealth. N Engl J Med 2017;377:1585–92. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsr1503323.

[8] Eligible Professional’s Guide to STAGE 2 of the EHR Incentive Programs n.d.

[9] Say Goodbye to Paper and Pagers: Modernizing Clinical Communication | Epic n.d. https://www.epic.com/epic/post/say-goodbye-to-paper-and-pagers-modernizing-clinical-co

mmunication-with-secure-chat/ (accessed November 5, 2024).

[10] Secure Messaging Component n.d. https://cernprphelp.cernerworks.com/Help/default.aspx?pg=11 (accessed November 5, 2024).

[11] MEDICARE TELEMEDICINE HEALTH CARE PROVIDER FACT SHEET | CMS n.d. https://www.cms.gov/newsroom/fact-sheets/medicare-telemedicine-health-care-provider-fact-sheet (accessed November 5, 2024).

[12] Ozkaynak M, Johnson S, Shimada S, et al. Examining the Multi-level Fit between Work and Technology in a Secure Messaging Implementation. AMIA Annu Symp Proc 2014;2014:954–62.

[13] Haun JN, Alman AC, Melillo C, et al. Using Electronic Data Collection Platforms to Assess Complementary and Integrative Health Patient-Reported Outcomes: Feasibility Project. JMIR Med Inf 2020;8:e15609. https://doi.org/10.2196/15609.

[14] Sisk BA, Bereitschaft C, Enloe M, et al. Oncology Clinicians' Perspectives on Online Patient Portal Use in Pediatric and Adolescent Cancer. JCO Clin Cancer Inf 2023;7:e2300124. https://doi.org/10.1200/CCI.23.00124.

[15] Liu T, Zhu Z, Holmgren AJ, et al. National trends in billing patient portal messages as e-visit services in traditional Medicare. Health Aff Sch 2024;2:qxae040. https://doi.org/10.1093/haschl/qxae040.

[16] Soekijad M. Efficiency paradox: Introducing secure messaging in outpatient care. Soc Sci Med 2025;365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2024.117578.

[17] Holmgren AJ, Grouse CK, Oates A, et al. Changes in Secure Messaging After Implementation of Billing E-Visits by Demographic Group. JAMA Netw Open 2024;7:e2427053. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.27053.

[18] Chen S, Guevara M, Moningi S, et al. The impact of responding to patient messages with large language model assistance 2023. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2310.17703.

[19] Chen S, Guevara M, Moningi S, et al. The effect of using a large language model to respond to patient messages. Lancet Digit Health 2024;6:e379–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(24)00060-8.

[20] Liu S, McCoy AB, Wright AP, et al. Leveraging large language models for generating responses to patient messages—a subjective analysis. J Am Med Inform Assoc 2024;31:1367–79. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocae052.

[21] McGeady D, Kujala J, Ilvonen K. The impact of patient–physician web messaging on healthcare service provision. Int J Med Inf 2008;77:17–23.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2006.11.004.

[22] Wallwiener M, Wallwiener CW, Kansy JK, et al. Impact of electronic messaging on the patient-physician interaction. J Telemed Telecare 2009;15:243–50. https://doi.org/10.1258/jtt.2009.090111.

[23] Goldzweig CL, Towfigh AA, Paige NM, et al. Systematic Review: Secure Messaging Between Providers and Patients, and Patients' Access to Their Own Medical Record: Evidence on Health Outcomes, Satisfaction, Efficiency and Attitudes. Washington (DC): Department of Veterans Affairs (US); 2012.

[24] Liu X, Sutton P, McKenna R, et al. Evaluation of Secure Messaging Applications for a Health Care System: A Case Study. Appl Clin Inform 2019;10:140–50. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0039-1678607.

[25] "Can you hear me now?": postoperative patient-initiated communication with providers. Am J Manag Care 2020;26:e333–41. https://doi.org/10.37765/ajmc.2020.88507.

[26] Conroy MP Miracle; Suelzer, Elizabeth; Pamulapati, Saagar; Min, Heun; Wright, Tamiah; Kamaraju, Sailaja. Electronic Medical Record–Based Electronic Messaging Among Patients with Breast Cancer: A Systematic Review. Appl Clin Inform 2023;14:134–43. https://doi.org/10.1055/a-2004-6669.

[27] Kuo A, Dang S. Secure Messaging in Electronic Health Records and Its Impact on Diabetes Clinical Outcomes: A Systematic Review. Telemed E-Health 2016;22:769–77. https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2015.0207.

[28] Robinson SA, Zocchi MS, Netherton D, et al. Secure Messaging, Diabetes Self-management, and the Importance of Patient Autonomy: a Mixed Methods Study. J Gen Intern Med 2020;35:2955–62. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-020-05834-x.

[29] Harris LT, Koepsell TD, Haneuse SJ, et al. Glycemic control associated with secure patient-provider messaging within a shared electronic medical record: a longitudinal analysis. Diabetes Care 2013;36:2726–33. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc12-2003.

[30] Russell NM, Vess J, Durham C, et al. Text-messaging to support diabetes self-management in a rural health clinic: A quality improvement project. Online J Nurs Inform 2017;21.

[31] Heisey-Grove DM, McClelland LE, Rathert C, et al. Associations Between Patient Health Outcomes and Secure Message Content Exchanged Between Patients and Clinicians: Retrospective Cohort Study. J Med Internet Res 2020;22:e19477. https://doi.org/10.2196/19477.

[32] Price-Haywood EG, Luo Q, Monlezun D. Dose effect of patient-care team communication

via secure portal messaging on glucose and blood pressure control. J Am Med Inf Assoc 2018;25:702–8. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocx161.

[33] Shimada SL, Allison JJ, Rosen AK, et al. Sustained Use of Patient Portal Features and Improvements in Diabetes Physiological Measures. J Med Internet Res 2016;18:e179. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.5663.

[34] Robinson SA, Netherton D, Zocchi M, et al. Differences in Secure Messaging, Self-management, and Glycemic Control Between Rural and Urban Patients: Secondary Data Analysis. JMIR Diabetes 2021;6:e32320. https://doi.org/10.2196/32320.

[35] Lyles CR, Grothaus L, Reid RJ, et al. Communication about diabetes risk factors during between-visit encounters. Am J Manag Care 2012;18:807–15.

[36] Alexander J, Beatty A. Association of Patient Portal Messaging with Survival Among Radiation Oncology Patients. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2024;120:627–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2024.05.003.

[37] Ralston JD, Cook AJ, Anderson ML, et al. Home blood pressure monitoring, secure electronic messaging and medication intensification for improving hypertension control: a mediation analysis. Appl Clin Inf 2014;5:232–48. https://doi.org/10.4338/ACI-2013-10-RA-0079.

[38] Iturralde E, Sterling SA, Uratsu CS, et al. Changing Results-Engage and Activate to Enhance Wellness: A Randomized Clinical Trial to Improve Cardiovascular Risk Management. J Am Heart Assoc 2019;8:e014021. https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.119.014021.

[39] Cutrona SL, Golden JG, Goff SL, et al. Improving Rates of Outpatient Influenza Vaccination Through EHR Portal Messages and Interactive Automated Calls: A Randomized Controlled Trial. J Gen Intern Med 2018;33:659–67. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-017-4266-9.

[40] Wijesundara JG, Ito Fukunaga M, Ogarek J, et al. Electronic Health Record Portal Messages and Interactive Voice Response Calls to Improve Rates of Early Season Influenza Vaccination: Randomized Controlled Trial. J Med Internet Res 2020;22:e16373. https://doi.org/10.2196/16373.

[41] Khan AA, Tran HN, Lai JA, et al. A Learning Health System Approach to Increasing Human Papillomavirus Immunizations Among Young Adults. Perm J 2023;27:31–6. https://doi.org/10.7812/TPP/22.094.

[42] Ueberroth BE, Labonte HR, Wallace MR. Impact of Patient Portal Messaging Reminders with Self-Scheduling Option on Influenza Vaccination Rates: a Prospective, Randomized

Trial. J Gen Intern Med 2022;37:1394–9. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-021-06941-z.

[43] Berset AE, Burkhardt MC, Xu Y, et al. Effect of Electronic Outreach Using Patient Portal Messages on Well Child Care Visit Completion: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Netw Open 2022;5:e2242853. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.42853.

[44] Goshgarian G, Sorourdi C, May FP, et al. Effect of Patient Portal Messaging Before Mailing Fecal Immunochemical Test Kit on Colorectal Cancer Screening Rates: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Netw Open 2022;5:e2146863. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.46863.

[45] Halket D, Dang J, Phadke A, et al. Targeted Electronic Patient Portal Messaging Increases Hepatitis C Virus Screening in Primary Care: a Randomized Study. J Gen Intern Med 2022;37:3318–24. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-022-07460-1.

[46] Yedulla NR, Hester JD, Patel MM, et al. Pre-Visit Digital Messaging Improves Patient-Reported Outcome Measure Participation Prior to the Orthopaedic Ambulatory Visit: Results from a Double-Blinded, Prospective, Randomized Controlled Trial. J Bone Jt Surg Am 2023;105:20–6. https://doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.21.00506.

[47] Yip JY, Geckeler KC, Barton KM, et al. Impact of a Patient Portal-Based Telehealth Outreach Program on Recall of Patients with Diabetic Retinopathy. Telemed E-Health 2024. https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2024.0454.

[48] Eschler J, Liu LS, Vizer LM, et al. Designing Asynchronous Communication Tools for Optimization of Patient-Clinician Coordination. AMIA Annu Symp Proc 2015;2015:543–52.

[49] Houston TK, Sadasivam RS, Allison JJ, et al. Evaluating the QUIT-PRIMO clinical practice ePortal to increase smoker engagement with online cessation interventions: a national hybrid type 2 implementation study. Implement Sci 2015;10:154. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-015-0336-8.

[50] Shahani S, Korenblit P, Thomas P, et al. Targeted Secure Messages to Facilitate Access to Tobacco Treatment Counseling for Veterans: Feasibility Study. JMIR Ment Health 2018;5:e18. https://doi.org/10.2196/mental.7957.

[51] Sawicki C, Friend KE, Patel R, et al. Two-Way Clinical Messaging in a CML Specialty Pharmacy Service Model. J Manag Care Spec Pharm 2019;25:1290–6. https://doi.org/10.18553/jmcp.2019.25.11.1290.

[52] Dicianno BE, Fairman AD, McCue M, et al. Feasibility of Using Mobile Health to Promote Self-Management in Spina Bifida. Am J Phys Med Rehabil 2016;95:425–37. https://doi.org/10.1097/PHM.0000000000000400.

[53] Turvey C, Fuhrmeister L, Klein D, et al. Secure Messaging Intervention in Patients Starting New Antidepressant to Promote Adherence: Pilot Randomized Controlled Trial. JMIR Form Res 2023;7:e51277. https://doi.org/10.2196/51277.

[54] Tieu C, Chaudhry R, Schroeder DR, et al. Utilization of Patient Electronic Messaging to Promote Advance Care Planning in the Primary Care Setting. Am J Hosp Palliat Care 2017;34:665–70. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049909116650237.

[55] Ginting K, Stolfi A, Wright J, et al. Patient Portal, Patient-Generated Images, and Medical Decision-Making in a Pediatric Ambulatory Setting. Appl Clin Inf 2020;11:764–8. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0040-1718754.

[56] Dang S, Siddharthan K, Ruiz DI, et al. Evaluating an Electronic Health Record Intervention for Management of Heart Failure Among Veterans. Telemed J E Health 2018;24:1006–13. https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2017.0307.

[57] Lamba AH, Muralidhar K, Jain A, et al. Characteristics of Women Enrolled in a Patient Portal Intervention for Menopause. Womens Health Rep New Rochelle 2020;1:500–10. https://doi.org/10.1089/whr.2020.0091.

[58] Sadasivam RS, Kamberi A, DeLaughter K, et al. Secure Asynchronous Communication Between Smokers and Tobacco Treatment Specialists: Secondary Analysis of a Web-Assisted Tobacco Intervention in the QUIT-PRIMO and National Dental PBRN Networks. J Med Internet Res 2020;22:e13289. https://doi.org/10.2196/13289.

[59] Whiteside U, Richards J, Simon GE. Brief Interventions via Electronic Health Record Messaging for Population-Based Suicide Prevention: Mixed Methods Pilot Study. JMIR Form Res 2021;5:e21127. https://doi.org/10.2196/21127.

[60] Zurlo J, Du P, Haynos A, et al. OPT-In For Life: A Mobile Technology–Based Intervention to Improve HIV Care Continuum for Young Adults Living With HIV. Health Promot Pract 2020;21:727–37. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839920936247.

[61] Carlson KJ, Matthias TH, Birge JR, et al. The effect of geographic rounding on hospitalist work experience: a mixed-methods study. Hosp Pr 1995 2022;50:124–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/21548331.2022.2050649.

[62] Bala TR. An Improvement Project in Reducing After-Visit Phone Calls in a Community Pediatric Neurology Clinic: Too Much Communication? Neurol Clin Pr 2024;14:e200269. https://doi.org/10.1212/CPJ.0000000000200269.

[63] Edwards AL, Trang K, Tolstykh IV, et al. Association between gastrointestinal symptoms and specialty care utilization among colon cancer survivors: a cohort study. Int J Colorectal Dis 2024;39:130. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00384-024-04685-w.

[64] Powell DS, Wu MMJ, Nothelle S, et al. The Annual Wellness Visit Health Risk Assessment: Potential of Patient Portal-Based Completion and Patient-Oriented Education and Support. Innov Aging 2024;8:igae023. https://doi.org/10.1093/geroni/igae023.

[65] Zhong X, Hoonakker P, Bain PA, et al. The impact of e-visits on patient access to primary care. Health Care Manag Sci 2018;21:475–91. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10729-017-9404-8.

[66] Chung S, Panattoni L, Chi J, et al. Can Secure Patient-Provider Messaging Improve Diabetes Care? Diabetes Care 2017;40:1342–8. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc17-0140.

[67] Liss DT, Reid RJ, Grembowski D, et al. Changes in office visit use associated with electronic messaging and telephone encounters among patients with diabetes in the PCMH. Ann Fam Med 2014;12:338–43. https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.1642.

[68] North F, Crane SJ, Stroebel RJ, et al. Patient-generated secure messages and eVisits on a patient portal: are patients at risk? J Am Med Inf Assoc 2013;20:1143–9. https://doi.org/10.1136/amiajnl-2012-001208.

[69] Heisey-Grove D, McClelland LE, Rathert C, et al. Associations Between Patient-Provider Secure Message Content and Patients' Health Care Visits. Telemed J E Health 2022;28:690–8. https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2021.0164.

[70] Plate JF, Ryan SP, Bergen MA, et al. Utilization of an Electronic Patient Portal Following Total Joint Arthroplasty Does Not Decrease Readmissions. J Arthroplasty 2019;34:211–4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2018.11.002.

[71] Hong YR, Turner K, Yadav S, et al. Trends in e-visit adoption among U.S. office-based physicians: Evidence from the 2011-2015 NAMCS. Int J Med Inf 2019;129:260–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2019.06.025.

[72] Bavafa H, Hitt LM, Terwiesch C. The Impact of E-Visits on Visit Frequencies and Patient Health: Evidence from Primary Care. Manage Sci 2018;64:5461–80. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2017.2900.

[73] Warren CJ, Mauler D, Butterfield III D, et al. A Tale of 102,726 Messages: Characterizing the Modern Urologist's Portal Message Burden After Common Urologic Surgeries. Urol Pract 2025;12. https://doi.org/10.1097/UPJ.0000000000000718.

[74] Ozdag Y, Makar GS, Kolessar DJ. Postoperative Communication Volume Following Total Joint Arthroplasty Can Be a Precursor for Emergency Department Visits. Arthroplast Today 2024;27:101352. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artd.2024.101352.

[75] Chua TL, Lucaciu AR, Jeffers TR, et al. Post-operative Patient Portal Messaging is

Associated With Return to the Emergency Department After Lumbar Spine Surgery. Spine Phila Pa 1976 2024. https://doi.org/10.1097/BRS.0000000000005006.

[76] Hoonakker PLT, Carayon P, Cartmill RS. The impact of secure messaging on workflow in primary care: Results of a multiple-case, multiple-method study. Int J Med Inf 2017;100:63–76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2017.01.004.

[77] Shimada SL, Hogan TP, Rao SR, et al. Patient-provider secure messaging in VA: variations in adoption and association with urgent care utilization. Med Care 2013;51:S21-8. https://doi.org/10.1097/MLR.0b013e3182780917.

[78] Reed M, Graetz I, Gordon N, et al. Patient-initiated e-mails to providers: associations with out-of-pocket visit costs, and impact on care-seeking and health. Am J Manag Care 2015;21:e632-9.

[79] O'Shea AMJ, Batten A, Hu EY, et al. Association of Secure Messaging with Primary Care In-Person and Telephone Visits Among Veterans: a Matched Difference-in-Difference Analysis. J Gen Intern Med 2021;36:946–51. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-020-06541-3.

[80] Baxter SL, Saseendrakumar BR, Cheung M, et al. Association of Electronic Health Record Inbasket Message Characteristics With Physician Burnout. JAMA Netw Open 2022;5:e2244363. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.44363.

[81] Pfaff E, Lee A, Bradford R, et al. Recruiting for a pragmatic trial using the electronic health record and patient portal: successes and lessons learned. J Am Med Inf Assoc 2019;26:44–9. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocy138.

[82] Miller HN, Gleason KT, Juraschek SP, et al. Electronic medical record-based cohort selection and direct-to-patient, targeted recruitment: early efficacy and lessons learned. J Am Med Inf Assoc 2019;26:1209–17. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocz168.

[83] Plante TB, Gleason KT, Miller HN, et al. Recruitment of trial participants through electronic medical record patient portal messaging: A pilot study. Clin Trials 2020;17:30–8. https://doi.org/10.1177/1740774519873657.

[84] Beaton M, Jiang X, Minto E, et al. Using patient portals for large-scale recruitment of individuals underrepresented in biomedical research: an evaluation of engagement patterns throughout the patient portal recruitment process at a single site within the All of Us Research Program. J Am Med Inf Assoc 2024;31:2328–36. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocae135.

[85] Miller HN, Charleston J, Wu B, et al. Use of electronic recruitment methods in a clinical trial of adults with gout. Clin Trials 2021;18:92–103.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1740774520956969.

[86] Pogue JR, da Graca BM, Adams M, et al. Strategies and lessons learned from a longitudinal study to maximize recruitment in the midst of a global pandemic. Proc Bayl Univ Med Cent 2022;35:309–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/08998280.2022.2034494.

[87] Nassif M, Birmingham MC, Lanfear DE, et al. Recruitment Strategies of a Decentralized Randomized Placebo Controlled Clinical Trial: The Canagliflozin Impact on Health Status, Quality of Life and Functional Status in Heart Failure (CHIEF-HF) Trial. J Card Fail 2023;29:863–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cardfail.2023.04.001.

[88] Baucom RB, Ousley J, Poulose BK, et al. Case report: patient portal versus telephone recruitment for a surgical research study. Appl Clin Inf 2014;5:1005–14. https://doi.org/10.4338/ACI-2014-07-CR-0059.

[89] Peeler A, Miller H, Ogungbe O, et al. Centralized registry for COVID-19 research recruitment: Design, development, implementation, and preliminary results. J Clin Transl Sci 2021;5:e152. https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2021.819.

[90] Loftus JR, Kadom N, Baran TM, et al. Impact of Early Direct Patient Notification on Follow-Up Completion for Nonurgent Actionable Incidental Radiologic Findings. J Am Coll Radiol 2024;21:558–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacr.2023.07.026.

[91] Si Sun, Xiaomu Zhou, Joshua C. Denny, et al. Messaging to your doctors: understanding patient-provider communications via a portal system, Paris, France: Association for Computing Machinery; 2013, p. 1739–48. https://doi.org/10.1145/2470654.2466230.

[92] Mehta SJ, Day SC, Norris AH, et al. Behavioral interventions to improve population health outreach for hepatitis C screening: randomized clinical trial. BMJ 2021;373:n1022. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n1022.

[93] Lieu TA, Elkin EP, Escobar PR, et al. Effect of Electronic and Mail Outreach From Primary Care Physicians for COVID-19 Vaccination of Black and Latino Older Adults: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Netw Open 2022;5:e2217004. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.17004.

[94] Chen Y, Tang C, Doung V, et al. “I don’t bother with the phone!” Feeling Closer to Physician using Secure Messaging. vol. 2017- January, 2017, p. 3813–22.

[95] Greenwood DA, Hankins AI, Parise CA, et al. A Comparison of In-person, Telephone, and Secure Messaging for Type 2 Diabetes Self-Management Support. Diabetes Educ 2014;40:516–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/0145721714531337.

[96] Bundogji N, Toma G, Khan A. Identification of preferred reminder systems and patient factors to promote adherence in the management of urinary incontinence. PEC Innov

2022;1:100067. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecinn.2022.100067.

[97] Lee JK, Koripella PC, Jensen CD, et al. Randomized Trial of Patient Outreach Approaches to De-implement Outdated Colonoscopy Surveillance Intervals. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2024;22:1315-1322.e7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2023.12.027.

[98] Bennett WL, Bramante CT, Rothenberger SD, et al. Patient Recruitment Into a Multicenter Clinical Cohort Linking Electronic Health Records From 5 Health Systems: Cross-sectional Analysis. J Med Internet Res 2021;23:e24003. https://doi.org/10.2196/24003.

[99] Fisher L, Loiacono MM, Payne N, et al. A novel household-based patient outreach pilot program to boost late-season influenza vaccination rates during the COVID-19 pandemic. Influenza Other Respir Viruses 2022;16:1141–50. https://doi.org/10.1111/irv.13041.

[100] Szilagyi PG, Duru OK, Casillas A, et al. Text vs Patient Portal Messaging to Improve Influenza Vaccination Coverage: A Health System-Wide Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Intern Med 2024;184:519–27. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2024.0001.

[101] Haff N, Choudhry NK, Bhatkhande G, et al. “How” Versus “Why” Messaging to Increase Uptake of Booster Vaccination Against COVID-19: Results of a Pragmatic Randomized Trial. J Gen Intern Med 2024;39:611–8. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-023-08492-x.

[102] Erdmann M, Edwards B, Adewumi MT. Effect of Electronic Portal Messaging With Embedded Asynchronous Care on Physician-Assisted Smoking Cessation Attempts: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Netw Open 2022;5:e220348. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.0348.

[103] Midboe AM, Cave S, Shimada SL, et al. Relationship Between Patient Portal Tool Use and Medication Adherence and Viral Load Among Patients Living with HIV. J Gen Intern Med 2024;39:127–35. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-023-08474-z.

[104] McInnes DK, Shimada SL, Midboe AM, et al. Patient Use of Electronic Prescription Refill and Secure Messaging and Its Association With Undetectable HIV Viral Load: A Retrospective Cohort Study. J Med Internet Res 2017;19:e34. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.6932.

[105] Haun JN, Lind JD, Shimada SL, et al. Evaluating user experiences of the secure messaging tool on the Veterans Affairs’ patient portal system. J Med Internet Res 2014;16:e75. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.2976.

[106] Lam R, Lin VS, Senelick WS, et al. Older adult consumers’ attitudes and preferences on electronic patient-physician messaging. Am J Manag Care 2013;19:eSP7-11.

[107] Paige SR, Campbell-Salome G, Alpert J, et al. Cancer patients' satisfaction with telehealth during the COVID-19 pandemic. PLoS One 2022;17:e0268913. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0268913.

[108] Kudel I, Perry T. Communicating Treatment-Related Symptoms Using Passively Collected Data and Satisfaction/Loyalty Ratings: Exploratory Study. JMIR Cancer 2022;8:e29292. https://doi.org/10.2196/29292.

[109] Short-Russell M, Thompson J, Waldrop J. Secure Messaging: Demonstration and Enrollment Patient Portal Program: Patient Portal Use in Vulnerable Populations. Comput Inf Nurs 2024;42:104–8. https://doi.org/10.1097/CIN.0000000000001098.

[110] Heyworth L, Clark J, Marcello TB, et al. Aligning medication reconciliation and secure messaging: qualitative study of primary care providers' perspectives. J Med Internet Res 2013;15:e264. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.2793.

[111] Turvey CL, Fuhrmeister LA, Klein DM, et al. Patient and Provider Experience of Electronic Patient Portals and Secure Messaging in Mental Health Treatment. Telemed J E Health 2022;28:189–98. https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2020.0395.

[112] Haun JN, Patel NR, Lind JD, et al. Large-Scale Survey Findings Inform Patients' Experiences in Using Secure Messaging to Engage in Patient-Provider Communication and Self-Care Management: A Quantitative Assessment. J Med Internet Res 2015;17:e282. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.5152.

[113] Rief JJ, Hamm ME, Zickmund SL, et al. Using Health Information Technology to Foster Engagement: Patients' Experiences with an Active Patient Health Record. Health Commun 2017;32:310–9. https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2016.1138378.

[114] Brady JE, Linsky AM, Simon SR, et al. The Perceived Effectiveness of Secure Messaging for Medication Reconciliation During Transitions of Care: Semistructured Interviews With Patients. JMIR Hum Factors 2022;9:e36652. https://doi.org/10.2196/36652.

[115] Lieu TA, Altschuler A, Weiner JZ, et al. Primary Care Physicians' Experiences With and Strategies for Managing Electronic Messages. JAMA Netw Open 2019;2:e1918287. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.18287.

[116] Wade-Vuturo AE, Mayberry LS, Osborn CY. Secure messaging and diabetes management: experiences and perspectives of patient portal users. J Am Med Inf Assoc 2013;20:519–25. https://doi.org/10.1136/amiajnl-2012-001253.

[117] Hoopes AJ, Cushing-Haugen K, Coley RY, et al. Teen Secure Messaging is Associated With Use of Sexual and Reproductive Health Services in One Health System. J Adolesc Health 2025;76:455–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2024.10.016.

[118] Haun JN, Hathaway W, Chavez M, et al. Clinical Practice Informs Secure Messaging Benefits and Best Practices. Appl Clin Inf 2017;8:1003–11. https://doi.org/10.4338/ACI-2017-05-RA-0088.

[119] Alpert JM, Wang S, Bylund CL, et al. Improving secure messaging: A framework for support, partnership & information-giving communicating electronically (SPICE). Patient Educ Couns 2021;104:1380–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2020.11.021.

[120] Hernandez BF, Morgan BJ, Ish J, et al. Communication Preferences and Satisfaction of Secure Messaging Among Patients and Providers in the Military Healthcare System. Mil Med 2018;183:e383–90. https://doi.org/10.1093/milmed/usy094.

[121] Ko SA, Warm EJ, Schauer DP, et al. Secure Messaging Use Among Patients with Depression: An Analysis Using Real-World Data. Telemed J E Health 2024;30:2157–64. https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2024.0171.

[122] Nazi KM. The personal health record paradox: health care professionals' perspectives and the information ecology of personal health record systems in organizational and clinical settings. J Med Internet Res 2013;15:e70. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.2443.

[123] Brown W 3rd, Balyan R, Karter AJ, et al. Challenges and solutions to employing natural language processing and machine learning to measure patients' health literacy and physician writing complexity: The ECLIPPSE study. J Biomed Inf 2021;113:103658. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2020.103658.

[124] Stewart MT, Hogan TP, Nicklas J, et al. The Promise of Patient Portals for Individuals Living With Chronic Illness: Qualitative Study Identifying Pathways of Patient Engagement. J Med Internet Res 2020;22:e17744. https://doi.org/10.2196/17744.

[125] Sieck CJ, Hefner JL, Schnierle J, et al. The Rules of Engagement: Perspectives on Secure Messaging From Experienced Ambulatory Patient Portal Users. JMIR Med Inf 2017;5:e13. https://doi.org/10.2196/medinform.7516.

[126] Bosold AL, Lin SY, Taylor JO, et al. Older adults' personal health information management: The role and perspective of various healthcare providers. AMIA Annu Symp Proc 2021;2021:255–64.

[127] Alpert JM, Hampton CN, Markham MJ, et al. Clinicians' Attitudes and Behaviors Towards Communicating Electronically with Patients: A Grounded Practical Theory Approach. J Health Commun 2022;27:103–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2022.2059723.

[128] Strand M, Gammon D, Eng LS, et al. Exploring Working Relationships in Mental Health Care via an E-Recovery Portal: Qualitative Study on the Experiences of Service Users and Health Providers. JMIR Ment Health 2017;4:e54.

https://doi.org/10.2196/mental.8491.

[129] Knees M, Keniston A, Yu A, et al. Academic hospitalist perspectives on the benefits and challenges of secure messaging: A mixed methods analysis. J Hosp Med 2025;20:248–57. https://doi.org/10.1002/jhm.13522.

[130] King G, Maxwell J, Karmali A, et al. Connecting Families to Their Health Record and Care Team: The Use, Utility, and Impact of a Client/Family Health Portal at a Children's Rehabilitation Hospital. J Med Internet Res 2017;19:e97. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.6811.

[131] Crotty BH, Mostaghimi A, Landon BE. Preparing residents for future practice: report of a curriculum for electronic patient-doctor communication. Postgrad Med J 2013;89:554–9. https://doi.org/10.1136/postgradmedj-2012-131688.

[132] Lew D, Baratta LR, Xia L, et al. Association of EHR-Integrated Secure Messaging Use with Clinician Workload and Attention Switching. J Gen Intern Med 2025. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-025-09466-x.

[133] Lee JL, Matthias MS, Huffman M, et al. Insecure messaging: how clinicians approach potentially problematic messages from patients. JAMIA Open 2020;3:576–82. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamiaopen/ooaa051.

[134] McAlearney AS, Fareed N, Gaughan A, et al. Empowering Patients during Hospitalization: Perspectives on Inpatient Portal Use. Appl Clin Inf 2019;10:103–12. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0039-1677722.

[135] Halterman AW, Cochrane AR, Miller AD, et al. Pediatric resident use, perceptions, and desires for improvement of a clinical secure messaging application. Comput Methods Programs Biomed Update 2024;6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmpbup.2024.100162.

[136] Hefner JL, MacEwan SR, Biltz A, et al. Patient portal messaging for care coordination: a qualitative study of perspectives of experienced users with chronic conditions. BMC Fam Pr 2019;20:57. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12875-019-0948-1.

[137] Wooldridge AR, Carayon P, Hoonakker P, et al. Technology-mediated communication between patients and primary care clinicians and staff: Ambiguity in secure messaging, 2016, p. 556–60. https://doi.org/10.1177/1541931213601128.

[138] Judson TJ, Subash M, Harrison JD, et al. Patient Perceptions of e-Visits: Qualitative Study of Older Adults to Inform Health System Implementation. JMIR Aging 2023;6:e45641. https://doi.org/10.2196/45641.

[139] Shimada SL, Zocchi MS, Hogan TP, et al. Impact of Patient-Clinical Team Secure Messaging on Communication Patterns and Patient Experience: Randomized

Encouragement Design Trial. J Med Internet Res 2020;22:e22307. https://doi.org/10.2196/22307.

[140] Miller HN, Lindo S, Fish LJ, et al. Describing current use, barriers, and facilitators of patient portal messaging for research recruitment: Perspectives from study teams and patients at one institution. J Clin Transl Sci 2023;7:e96. https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2023.522.

[141] Hefner JL, Sieck CJ, Walker DM. Patient and physician perspectives on training to improve communication through secure messaging: Clarifying the rules of engagement. Health Care Manage Rev 2022;47:3–11. https://doi.org/10.1097/HMR.0000000000000279.

[142] Hefner J, Sieck C, McAlearney A. Training to Optimize Collaborative Use of an Inpatient Portal. Appl Clin Inform 2018;09:558–64. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0038-1666993.

[143] Lieu TA, Warton EM, East JA, et al. Evaluation of Attention Switching and Duration of Electronic Inbox Work Among Primary Care Physicians. JAMA Netw Open 2021;4:e2031856. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.31856.

[144] Morrow D, Azevedo RFL, Garcia-Retamero R, et al. Contextualizing numeric clinical test results for gist comprehension: Implications for EHR patient portals. J Exp Psychol Appl 2019;25:41–61. https://doi.org/10.1037/xap0000203.

[145] Kapoor A, Patel P, Chennupati S, et al. Comparing the Efficacy of Targeted and Blast Portal Messaging in Message Opening Rate and Anticoagulation Initiation in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation in the Preventing Preventable Strokes Study II: Prospective Cohort Study. JMIR Cardio 2024;8:e49590. https://doi.org/10.2196/49590.

[146] Taylor Pearson KE. Pediatric Clinical Staff Perspectives on Secure Messaging. J Nurs Care Qual 2024;39:317–23. https://doi.org/10.1097/NCQ.0000000000000775.

[147] Alpert JM, Hampton CN, Raisa A, et al. Integrating patient-centeredness into online patient-clinician communication: a qualitative analysis of clinicians' secure messaging usage. Support Care Cancer 2022;30:9851–7. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-022-07408-5.

[148] Roscoe RD, Balyan R, McNamara DS, et al. Automated Strategy Feedback Can Improve the Readability of Physicians' Electronic Communications to Simulated Patients. Int J Hum Comput Stud 2023;176. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2023.103059.

[149] Ralston JD, Silverberg MJ, Grothaus L, et al. Use of web-based shared medical records among patients with HIV. Am J Manag Care 2013;19:e114-124.

[150] Steitz B, Cronin RM, Davis SE, et al. Long-term Patterns of Patient Portal Use for

Pediatric Patients at an Academic Medical Center. Appl Clin Inf 2017;8:779–93. https://doi.org/10.4338/ACI-2017-01-RA-0005.

[151] Waselewski ME, Flickinger TE, Canan C, et al. A Mobile Health App to Support Patients Receiving Medication-Assisted Treatment for Opioid Use Disorder: Development and Feasibility Study. JMIR Form Res 2021;5:e24561. https://doi.org/10.2196/24561.

[152] Yamin CK, Emani S, Williams DH, et al. The digital divide in adoption and use of a personal health record. Arch Intern Med 2011;171:568–74. https://doi.org/10.1001/archinternmed.2011.34.

[153] Furukawa MF, King J, Patel V, et al. WEB FIRST. Despite Substantial Progress In EHR Adoption, Health Information Exchange And Patient Engagement Remain Low In Office Settings. Health Aff (Millwood) 2014;33:1672–9. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2014.0445.

[154] Cronin RM, Davis SE, Shenson JA, et al. Growth of Secure Messaging Through a Patient Portal as a Form of Outpatient Interaction across Clinical Specialties. Appl Clin Inf 2015;6:288–304. https://doi.org/10.4338/ACI-2014-12-RA-0117.

[155] Senft N, Butler E, Everson J. Growing Disparities in Patient-Provider Messaging: Trend Analysis Before and After Supportive Policy. J Med Internet Res 2019;21:e14976. https://doi.org/10.2196/14976.

[156] Heisey-Grove DM, Carretta HJ. Disparities in Secure Messaging Uptake Between Patients and Physicians: Longitudinal Analysis of Two National Cross-Sectional Surveys. J Med Internet Res 2020;22:e12611. https://doi.org/10.2196/12611.

[157] Yousef CC, Salgado TM, Farooq A, et al. Predicting Health Care Providers' Acceptance of a Personal Health Record Secure Messaging Feature. Appl Clin Inform 2022;13:148–60. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0041-1742217.

[158] Masterman M, Cronin RM, Davis SE, et al. Adoption of Secure Messaging in a Patient Portal across Pediatric Specialties. AMIA Annu Symp Proc 2016;2016:1930–9.

[159] Shenson JA, Cronin RM, Davis SE, et al. Rapid growth in surgeons' use of secure messaging in a patient portal. Surg Endosc 2016;30:1432–40. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00464-015-4347-y.

[160] North F, Luhman KE, Mallmann EA, et al. A Retrospective Analysis of Provider-to-Patient Secure Messages: How Much Are They Increasing, Who Is Doing the Work, and Is the Work Happening After Hours? JMIR Med Inf 2020;8:e16521. https://doi.org/10.2196/16521.

[161] Haun JN, Panaite V, Cotner BA, et al. Primary care virtual resource use prior and post COVID-19 pandemic onset. BMC Health Serv Res 2022;22:1370.

https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-022-08790-w.

[162] Martinez KA, Schulte R, Rothberg MB, et al. Patient Portal Message Volume and Time Spent on the EHR: an Observational Study of Primary Care Clinicians. J Gen Intern Med 2024;39:566–72. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-023-08577-7.

[163] Crotty BH, Tamrat Y, Mostaghimi A, et al. Patient-to-physician messaging: volume nearly tripled as more patients joined system, but per capita rate plateaued. Health Aff Millwood 2014;33:1817–22. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2013.1145.

[164] Huang M, Khurana A, Mastorakos G, et al. Patient Portal Messaging for Asynchronous Virtual Care During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Retrospective Analysis. JMIR Hum Factors 2022;9:e35187. https://doi.org/10.2196/35187.

[165] Campbell BR, Swoger S, Tabackman A, et al. PositiveLinks and the COVID-19 Response: Importance of Low-Barrier Messaging for PLWH in Non-urban Virginia in a Crisis. AIDS Behav 2021;25:3519–27. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-021-03294-w.

[166] Brickson C, Keniston A, Knees M, et al. Characterizing electronic messaging use among hospitalists and its association with patient volumes. J Hosp Med 2024. https://doi.org/10.1002/jhm.13462.

[167] Lou SS, Lew D, Xia L, et al. Secure Messaging Use and Wrong-Patient Ordering Errors among Inpatient Clinicians. JAMA Netw Open 2024;7:e2447797. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.47797.

[168] Shimada SL, Brandt CA, Feng H, et al. Personal health record reach in the Veterans Health Administration: a cross-sectional analysis. J Med Internet Res 2014;16:e272. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.3751.

[169] Lyles CR, Harris LT, Jordan L, et al. Patient race/ethnicity and shared medical record use among diabetes patients. Med Care 2012;50:434–40. https://doi.org/10.1097/MLR.0b013e318249d81b.

[170] Riera KM, Robinson JR, Van Arendonk KJ, et al. Care Delivered by Pediatric Surgical Specialties Through Patient Portal Messaging. J Surg Res 2019;234:231–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2018.09.013.

[171] Weppner WG, Ralston JD, Koepsell TD, et al. Use of a shared medical record with secure messaging by older patients with diabetes. Diabetes Care 2010;33:2314–9. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc10-1124.

[172] Neeman E, Lyon L, Sun H, et al. Future of Teleoncology: Trends and Disparities in Telehealth and Secure Message Utilization in the COVID-19 Era. JCO Clin Cancer Inf 2022;6:e2100160. https://doi.org/10.1200/CCI.21.00160.

[173] Chivela FL, Burch AE, Asagbra O. An Assessment of Patient Portal Messaging Use by Patients With Multiple Chronic Conditions Living in Rural Communities: Retrospective Analysis. J Med Internet Res 2023;25:e44399. https://doi.org/10.2196/44399.

[174] Huang M, Fan J, Prigge J, et al. Characterizing Patient-Clinician Communication in Secure Medical Messages: Retrospective Study. J Med Internet Res 2022;24:e17273. https://doi.org/10.2196/17273.

[175] Ralston JD, Rutter CM, Carrell D, et al. Patient use of secure electronic messaging within a shared medical record: a cross-sectional study. J Gen Intern Med 2009;24:349–55. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-008-0899-z.

[176] Couture A, Birstler J. The Gender of the Sender: Assessing Gender Biases of Greetings in Patient Portal Messages. J Womens Health Larchmt 2023;32:171–7. https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2022.0333.

[177] Bryan M, Norton D, Birstler J, et al. Resource Utilization Among Portal Users Who Send Messages: A Retrospective Cohort Study. WMJ 2020;119:26–32.

[178] Yakushi J, Wintner M, Yau N, et al. Utilization of Secure Messaging to Primary Care Departments. Perm J 2020;24. https://doi.org/10.7812/TPP/19.177.

[179] M. Huang, A. Khurana, G. Mastorakos, et al. Characterizing the Users of Patient Portal Messaging: A Single Institutional Cohort Study, 2023, p. 381–7. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICHI57859.2023.00057.

[180] Monestime JP, Biener AI, Wolford M, et al. Characteristics of office-based providers associated with secure electronic messaging use: Achieving meaningful use. Int J Med Inf 2019;129:43–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2019.04.002.

[181] Ukoha EP, Feinglass J, Yee LM. Disparities in Electronic Patient Portal Use in Prenatal Care: Retrospective Cohort Study. J Med Internet Res 2019;21:e14445. https://doi.org/10.2196/14445.

[182] Levine DM, Linder JA, Landon BE. Characteristics and Disparities among Primary Care Practices in the United States. J Gen Intern Med 2018;33:481–6. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-017-4239-z.

[183] Huang M, Wen A, He H, et al. Midwest rural-urban disparities in use of patient online services for COVID-19. J Rural Health 2022;38:908–15. https://doi.org/10.1111/jrh.12657.

[184] Graetz I, Gordon N, Fung V, et al. The Digital Divide and Patient Portals: Internet Access Explained Differences in Patient Portal Use for Secure Messaging by Age, Race, and Income. Med Care 2016;54:772–9. https://doi.org/10.1097/MLR.0000000000000560.

[185] Avoundjian T, Troszak L, Cave S, et al. Correlates of personal health record registration

and utilization among veterans with HIV. JAMIA Open 2021;4:ooab029. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamiaopen/ooab029.

[186] Semere W, Crossley S, Karter AJ, et al. Secure Messaging with Physicians by Proxies for Patients with Diabetes: Findings from the ECLIPPSE Study. J Gen Intern Med 2019;34:2490–6. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-019-05259-1.

[187] Smith SG, O'Conor R, Aitken W, et al. Disparities in registration and use of an online patient portal among older adults: findings from the LitCog cohort. J Am Med Inf Assoc 2015;22:888–95. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocv025.

[188] Blok AC, Amante DJ, Hogan TP, et al. Impact of Patient Access to Online VA Notes on Healthcare Utilization and Clinician Documentation: a Retrospective Cohort Study. J Gen Intern Med 2021;36:592–9. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-020-06304-0.

[189] Harris LT, Haneuse SJ, Martin DP, et al. Diabetes quality of care and outpatient utilization associated with electronic patient-provider messaging: A cross-sectional analysis. Diabetes Care 2009;32:1182–7. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc08-1771.

[190] Hoopes AJ, Cushing-Haugen KL, Coley RY, et al. Characteristics of Adolescents Who Use Secure Messaging on a Health System's Patient Portal. Pediatrics 2023;152. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2022-060271.

[191] Ko D-G. The Impact of Secure Messaging Telehealth Service on the Quality of Healthcare. Telehealth Med Today 2023;8. https://doi.org/10.30953/thmt.v8.435.

[192] Crotty BH, Mostaghimi A, O'Brien J, et al. Prevalence and Risk Profile Of Unread Messages To Patients In A Patient Web Portal. Appl Clin Inform 2015;06:375–82. https://doi.org/10.4338/ACI-2015-01-CR-0006.

[193] Tang M, Mishuris RG, Payvandi L, et al. Differences in Care Team Response to Patient Portal Messages by Patient Race and Ethnicity. JAMA Netw Open 2024;7:e242618. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.2618.

[194] Jones AL, Gelberg L, deRussy AJ, et al. Low Uptake of Secure Messaging Among Veterans With Experiences of Homelessness and Substance Use Disorders. J Addict Med 2021;15:508–11. https://doi.org/10.1097/ADM.0000000000000785.

[195] Leung LB, Zhang E, Chu K, et al. Characteristics of Veterans Experiencing Homelessness using Telehealth for Primary Care Before and After COVID-19 Pandemic Onset. J Gen Intern Med 2024;39:53–9. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-023-08462-3.

[196] Holder K, Feinglass J, Niznik C, et al. Use of Electronic Patient Messaging by Pregnant Patients Receiving Prenatal Care at an Academic Health System: Retrospective Cohort Study. JMIR Mhealth Uhealth 2024;12:e51637. https://doi.org/10.2196/51637.

[197] Gordon NP, Torreblanca A, Ford RG, et al. lower use of and Potential Barriers to using Patient Portals among limited english Proficient latino and Chinese american adults: a health Techquity Concern. Perm J 2025;29:1–22. https://doi.org/10.7812/TPP/24.119.

[198] Mora J, Thompson LL, Hurtado M Jr, et al. Language Disparities in Patient Portal Access and Use among Radiation Oncology Patients Across an Integrated Health Enterprise. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2024;120:E48–9.

[199] Arizmendi BJ, Craven MR, Martinez-Camblor P, et al. Engagement in GI Behavioral Health Is Associated with Reduced Portal Messages, Phone Calls, and ED Visits. Dig Sci 2024;69:1939–47. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10620-024-08428-3.

[200] Wolcott V, Agarwal R, Nelson DA. Is Provider Secure Messaging Associated With Patient Messaging Behavior? Evidence From the US Army. J Med Internet Res 2017;19:e103. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.6804.

[201] Heisey-Grove D, Rathert C, McClelland LE, et al. Patient and Clinician Characteristics Associated With Secure Message Content: Retrospective Cohort Study. J Med Internet Res 2021;23:e26650. https://doi.org/10.2196/26650.

[202] Padman R, Shevchik G, Paone S, et al. eVisit: a pilot study of a new kind of healthcare delivery. Stud Health Technol Inf 2010;160:262–6.

[203] Parpia C, Moore C, Beatty M, et al. Evaluation of a Secure Messaging System in the Care of Children With Medical Complexity: Mixed Methods Study. JMIR Form Res 2023;7:e42881. https://doi.org/10.2196/42881.

[204] Rohrer JE, North F, Angstman KB, et al. Timely response to secure messages from primary care patients. Qual Manag Health Care 2013;22:161–6. https://doi.org/10.1097/QMH.0b013e31828be314.

[205] Jahn MA, Porter BW, Patel H, et al. Usability Assessment of Secure Messaging for Clinical Document Sharing between Health Care Providers and Patients. Appl Clin Inf 2018;9:467–77. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0038-1660521.

[206] Sulieman L, Steitz B, Rosenbloom ST. Analysis of Employee Patient Portal Use and Electronic Health Record Access at an Academic Medical Center. Appl Clin Inf 2020;11:433–41. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0040-1713412.

[207] Morrow D, Hasegawa-Johnson M, Huang T, et al. A multidisciplinary approach to designing and evaluating Electronic Medical Record portal messages that support patient self-care. J Biomed Inf 2017;69:63–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2017.03.015.

[208] Garvin LA, Simon SR. Prioritizing Measures of Digital Patient Engagement: A Delphi Expert Panel Study. J Med Internet Res 2017;19:e182. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.4778.

[209] Alpert JM, Amin TB, Zhongyue Z, et al. Evaluating the SEND eHealth Application to Improve Patients' Secure Message Writing. J Cancer Educ 2024. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13187-024-02491-0.

[210] Mirsky JB, Tieu L, Lyles C, et al. Readability assessment of patient-provider electronic messages in a primary care setting. J Am Med Inf Assoc 2016;23:202–6. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocv087.

[211] Crossley SA, Balyan R, Liu J, et al. Predicting the readability of physicians' secure messages to improve health communication using novel linguistic features: Findings from the ECLIPPSE study. J Commun Heal 2020;13:1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/17538068.2020.1822726.

[212] Crossley SA, Balyan R, Liu J, et al. Developing and Testing Automatic Models of Patient Communicative Health Literacy Using Linguistic Features: Findings from the ECLIPPSE study. Health Commun 2021;36:1018–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2020.1731781.

[213] Schillinger D, Balyan R, Crossley SA, et al. Employing computational linguistics techniques to identify limited patient health literacy: Findings from the ECLIPPSE study. Health Serv Res 2021;56:132–44. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.13560.

[214] Chen J, Lalor J, Liu W, et al. Detecting Hypoglycemia Incidents Reported in Patients' Secure Messages: Using Cost-Sensitive Learning and Oversampling to Reduce Data Imbalance. J Med Internet Res 2019;21:e11990. https://doi.org/10.2196/11990.

[215] Cronin RM, Fabbri D, Denny JC, et al. Automated Classification of Consumer Health Information Needs in Patient Portal Messages. AMIA Annu Symp Proc 2015;2015:1861–70.

[216] Sulieman L, Robinson JR, Jackson GP. Automating the Classification of Complexity of Medical Decision-Making in Patient-Provider Messaging in a Patient Portal. J Surg Res 2020;255:224–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2020.05.039.

[217] Mermin-Bunnell K, Zhu Y, Hornback A, et al. Use of Natural Language Processing of Patient-Initiated Electronic Health Record Messages to Identify Patients With COVID-19 Infection. JAMA Netw Open 2023;6:e2322299. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.22299.

[218] Mastorakos G, Khurana A, Huang M, et al. Probing Patient Messages Enhanced by Natural Language Processing: A Top-Down Message Corpus Analysis. Health Data Sci 2021;2021. https://doi.org/10.34133/2021/1504854.

[219] Duvall MJ, Miller NE, North F, et al. Portal Message Language Use Prior to Suicide,

Suicide Attempts, and Hospitalization for Depression. Telemed J E Health 2022;28:1143–50. https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2021.0318.

[220] Duvall M, North F, Leasure W, et al. Patient portal message characteristics and reported thoughts of self-harm and suicide: A retrospective cohort study. J Telemed Telecare 2021;27:501–8. https://doi.org/10.1177/1357633X19887262.

[221] A. P. Tafti, S. Fu, A. Khurana, et al. Artificial intelligence to organize patient portal messages: a journey from an ensemble deep learning text classification to rule-based named entity recognition, 2019, p. 1380–7. https://doi.org/10.1109/BIBM47256.2019.8982942.

[222] Si S, Wang R, Wosik J, et al. Students Need More Attention: BERT-based Attention Model for Small Data with Application to Automatic Patient Message Triage. vol. 126, 2020, p. 436–56.

[223] Yang J, So J, Zhang H, et al. Development and evaluation of an artificial intelligence-based workflow for the prioritization of patient portal messages. JAMIA Open 2024;7:ooae078. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamiaopen/ooae078.

[224] Moon S, Wu Y, Doughty JB, et al. Automated Identification of Patients' Unmet Social Needs in Clinical Text Using Natural Language Processing. Mayo Clin Proc Digit Health 2024;2:411–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mcpdig.2024.06.008.

[225] Ren Y, Wu Y, Fan JW, et al. Automatic uncovering of patient primary concerns in portal messages using a fusion framework of pretrained language models. J Am Med Inform Assoc 2024;31:1714–24. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocae144.

[226] Baek J, Simon-Friedt B, Lopez A, et al. Assessing Patient Needs During Natural Disasters: Mixed Methods Analysis of Portal Messages Sent During Hurricane Harvey. J Med Internet Res 2021;23:e31264. https://doi.org/10.2196/31264.

[227] Alpert JM, Campbell-Salome G, Gao C, et al. Secure Messaging and COVID-19: A Content Analysis of Patient-Clinician Communication During the Pandemic. Telemed J E Health 2022;28:1028–34. https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2021.0316.

[228] De A, Huang M, Feng T, et al. Analyzing Patient Secure Messages Using a Fast Health Care Interoperability Resources (FIHR)–Based Data Model: Development and Topic Modeling Study. J Med Internet Res 2021;23:e26770. https://doi.org/10.2196/26770.

[229] Sulieman L, Gilmore D, French C, et al. Classifying patient portal messages using Convolutional Neural Networks. J Biomed Inf 2017;74:59–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2017.08.014.

[230] Song Q, Ni C, Warner JL, et al. Optimizing word embeddings for small dataset: a case

study on patient portal messages from breast cancer patients. Sci Rep 2024;14:16117. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-66319-z.

[231] Wang N, Treewaree S, Zirikly A, et al. Taxonomy-based prompt engineering to generate synthetic drug-related patient portal messages. J Biomed Inform 2024;160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2024.104752.

[232] Green AR, Martin D, Jessen A, et al. Characterizing patient portal use of people with cognitive impairment and potentially inappropriate medications. J Am Geriatr Soc 2025;73:750–8. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.19284.

[233] Lieu TA, Warton EM, Delaunay A, et al. Pharmacist vs physician management of e-visit requests for COVID-19 medication: A randomized clinical trial. J Manag Care Spec Pharm 2025;31:189–97. https://doi.org/10.18553/jmcp.2025.31.2.189.

[234] Shimada SL, Petrakis BA, Rothendler JA, et al. An analysis of patient-provider secure messaging at two Veterans Health Administration medical centers: message content and resolution through secure messaging. J Am Med Inf Assoc 2017;24:942–9. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocx021.

[235] Heisey-Grove D, Rathert C, McClelland LE, et al. Classification of patient- and clinician-generated secure messages using a theory-based taxonomy. Health Sci Rep 2021;4:e295. https://doi.org/10.1002/hsr2.295.

[236] Flickinger TE, Waselewski M, Tabackman A, et al. Communication between patients, peers, and care providers through a mobile health intervention supporting medication-assisted treatment for opioid use disorder. Patient Educ Couns 2022;105:2110–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2022.02.014.

[237] Davoudi A, Lee NS, Luong T, et al. Identifying Medication-Related Intents From a Bidirectional Text Messaging Platform for Hypertension Management Using an Unsupervised Learning Approach: Retrospective Observational Pilot Study. J Med Internet Res 2022;24:e36151. https://doi.org/10.2196/36151.

[238] Robinson SA, Zocchi M, Purington C, et al. Secure Messaging for Diabetes Management: Content Analysis. JMIR Diabetes 2023;8:e40272. https://doi.org/10.2196/40272.

[239] Green AR, Wec A, Gleason KT, et al. Use of the Patient Portal to Discuss Medications Among People with Dementia and Their Care Partners: Patient Portal Correspondence About Medications: Green et al. J Gen Intern Med 2024;39:3164–71. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-024-09064-3.

[240] Anderson B, Lyon L, Lee M, et al. Empowering Care Teams: Redefining Message Management to Enhance Care Delivery and Alleviate Oncologist Burnout. JNCCN J Natl

Compr Cancer Netw 2024;22:664–9. https://doi.org/10.6004/jnccn.2024.7055.

[241] Ramirez-Zohfeld V, Seltzer A, Xiong L, et al. Use of Electronic Health Records by Older Adults, 85 Years and Older, and Their Caregivers. J Am Geriatr Soc 2020;68:1078–82. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.16393.

[242] Sieck CJ, Walker DM, Hefner JL, et al. Understanding Secure Messaging in the Inpatient Environment: A New Avenue for Communication and Patient Engagement. Appl Clin Inf 2018;9:860–8. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0038-1675814.

[243] Yin Z, Harrell M, Warner JL, et al. The therapy is making me sick: how online portal communications between breast cancer patients and physicians indicate medication discontinuation. J Am Med Inf Assoc 2018;25:1444–51. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocy118.

[244] Shetty VA, Gregor CM, Tusing LD, et al. Discussions of Cannabis Over Patient Portal Secure Messaging: Content Analysis. J Med Internet Res 2024;26. https://doi.org/10.2196/63311.

[245] Hogan TP, Luger TM, Volkman JE, et al. Patient Centeredness in Electronic Communication: Evaluation of Patient-to-Health Care Team Secure Messaging. J Med Internet Res 2018;20:e82. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.8801.

[246] Spencer C, Loehr K, Byrd A. Patient and Family Perpetrated Cyber-Incivility and Cyber-Aggression Within Healthcare: A Cross-Sectional Descriptive Study. SAGE Open Nurs 2023;9:23779608231158970. https://doi.org/10.1177/23779608231158970.

[247] Alpert JM, Dyer KE, Lafata JE. Patient-centered communication in digital medical encounters. Patient Educ Couns 2017;100:1852–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2017.04.019.

[248] Robinson JR, Valentine A, Carney C, et al. Complexity of medical decision-making in care provided by surgeons through patient portals. J Surg Res 2017;214:93–101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2017.02.077.

[249] ONC's Cures Act Final Rule | HealthIT.gov n.d. https://www.healthit.gov/topic/oncs-cures-act-final-rule (accessed November 6, 2024).

[250] Xie J, McPherson T, Powell A, et al. Ensuring Adolescent Patient Portal Confidentiality in the Age of the Cures Act Final Rule. J Adolesc Health 2021;69:933–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2021.09.009.

[251] Ip W, Yang S, Parker J, et al. Assessment of Prevalence of Adolescent Patient Portal Account Access by Guardians. JAMA Netw Open 2021;4:e2124733. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.24733.

[252] Sisk BA, Antes AL, Bereitschaft C, et al. Acceptability of Adolescent Portal Access Policies to Parents and Adolescents: A Delphi Study. J Adolesc Health 2025;76:448–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2024.10.021.

[253] Gleason KT, Wu MMJ, Wec A, et al. Use of the patient portal among older adults with diagnosed dementia and their care partners. Alzheimers Dement 2023. https://doi.org/10.1002/alz.13354.

[254] Semere W, Karter AJ, Lyles CR, et al. Care Partner Engagement in Secure Messaging Between Patients With Diabetes and Their Clinicians: Cohort Study. JMIR Diabetes 2024;9:e49491. https://doi.org/10.2196/49491.

[255] Pecina J, Duvall MJ, North F. Frequency of and Factors Associated with Care Partner Proxy Interaction with Health Care Teams Using Patient Portal Accounts. Telemed J E Health 2020;26:1368–72. https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2019.0208.

[256] Armstrong M, Benda NC, Seier K, et al. Improving Cancer Care Communication: Identifying Sociodemographic Differences in Patient Portal Secure Messages Not Authored by the Patient. Appl Clin Inform 2022;14:296–9. https://doi.org/10.1055/a-2015-8679.

[257] Benda NC, Rogers C, Sharma M, et al. Identifying Nonpatient Authors of Patient Portal Secure Messages in Oncology: A Proof-of-Concept Demonstration of Natural Language Processing Methods. JCO Clin Cancer Inf 2022;6:e2200071. https://doi.org/10.1200/CCI.22.00071.

[258] Holmgren AJ, Byron ME, Grouse CK, et al. Association Between Billing Patient Portal Messages as e-Visits and Patient Messaging Volume. JAMA 2023;329:339. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2022.24710.

[259] Alpert JM, Pfoh E, Criswell V, et al. Qualitative Analysis of Patients' and Physicians' Attitudes and Behaviors Toward Billing Patient Portal Messages. Ann Intern Med 2024;177:1734–6. https://doi.org/10.7326/ANNALS-24-00560.

[260] Dunlay SM, Sangaralingham LR, Lampman MA, et al. Implementation of Billing for Patient Portal Messages as E-visits in a Large Integrated Health System. Ann Intern Med 2025;178:11–9. https://doi.org/10.7326/ANNALS-24-01711.

[261] Ko DG, Tachinardi U, Warm EJ. Secure messaging telehealth billing in the digital age: moving beyond time-based metrics. J Am Med Inf Assoc 2024. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocae250.

[262] Oke I, Elze T, Miller JW, et al. Trends in Billing Secure Messages at Ophthalmology Practices across the United States. Ophthalmol Sci 2025;5.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xops.2024.100683.

[263] Rodriguez DV, Andreadis K, Chen J, et al. Development of a GenAI-Powered Hypertension Management Assistant: Early Development Phases and Architectural Design, 2024, p. 350–9. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICHI61247.2024.00052.

[264] Clusmann J, Kolbinger FR, Muti HS, et al. The future landscape of large language models in medicine. Commun Med 2023;3:141. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43856-023-00370-1.

[265] Reynolds K, Nadelman D, Durgin J, et al. Comparing the quality of ChatGPT- and physician-generated responses to patients' dermatology questions in the electronic medical record. Clin Exp Dermatol 2024;49:715–8. https://doi.org/10.1093/ced/llad456.

[266] Baxter SL, Longhurst CA, Millen M, et al. Generative artificial intelligence responses to patient messages in the electronic health record: early lessons learned. JAMIA Open 2024;7:ooae028. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamiaopen/ooae028.

[267] Small WR, Wiesenfeld B, Brandfield-Harvey B, et al. Large Language Model–Based Responses to Patients' In-Basket Messages. JAMA Netw Open 2024;7:e2422399. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.22399.

[268] Kim J, Chen ML, Rezaei SJ, et al. Patient Perspectives on Large Language Model Responses to Patient Messages 2024. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4867523.

[269] Scott M, Muncey W, Seranio N, et al. Assessing Artificial Intelligence–Generated Responses to Urology Patient In-Basket Messages. Urol Pract 2024;11:793–8. https://doi.org/10.1097/UPJ.0000000000000637.

[270] Kaur A, Budko A, Liu K, et al. Automating Responses to Patient Portal Messages Using Generative AI 2024:2024.04.25.24306183. https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.25.24306183.

[271] Yan S, Knapp W, Leong A, et al. Prompt engineering on leveraging large language models in generating response to InBasket messages. J Am Med Inform Assoc 2024;31:2263–70. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocae172.

[272] Cavalier JS, Goldstein BA, Ravitsky V, et al. Ethics in Patient Preferences for Artificial Intelligence–Drafted Responses to Electronic Messages. JAMA Netw Open 2025;8:e250449–e250449. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2025.0449.

[273] Garcia P, Ma SP, Shah S, et al. Artificial Intelligence–Generated Draft Replies to Patient Inbox Messages. JAMA Netw Open 2024;7:e243201. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.3201.

[274] Tai-Seale M, Baxter SL, Vaida F, et al. AI-Generated Draft Replies Integrated Into Health Records and Physicians' Electronic Communication. JAMA Netw Open 2024;7:e246565. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.6565.

[275] Reynolds TL, Ali N, Zheng K. What Do Patients and Caregivers Want? A Systematic Review of User Suggestions to Improve Patient Portals n.d.

[276] Raisa A, Alpert JM, Bylund CL, et al. Identifying the mechanisms of patient-centred communication in secure messages between clinicians and cancer patients. PEC Innov 2023;2:100161. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecinn.2023.100161.

[277] MCCORMACK J, LEHMANN CU, LUSK KG, et al. Direct Secure Messaging in Practice: Addressing Workflow Challenges...19th World Congress on Medical and Health Informatics, July 8-12, 2023, New South Wales, Australia. Stud Health Technol Inform 2023;310:189–93. https://doi.org/10.3233/SHTI230953.

[278] Ball SL, Kim B, Cutrona SL, et al. Clinician and staff experiences with frustrated patients during an electronic health record transition: a qualitative case study. BMC Health Serv Res 2024;24:535. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-024-10974-5.

[279] Alpert JM, Markham MJ, Bjarnadottir RI, et al. Twenty-first Century Bedside Manner: Exploring Patient-Centered Communication in Secure Messaging with Cancer Patients. J Cancer Educ 2021;36:16–24. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13187-019-01592-5.

[280] Gold KJ, Chen D, Shumer G, et al. Patient-Reported Reasons for Sending Portal Messages: A Survey of Use in a Family Medicine Department. J Gen Intern Med 2024;39:2608–11. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-024-08815-6.

[281] Hoerter JE, Debbaneh PM, Jiang N. Differences in Patient Secure Message Volume Among Otolaryngologists: A Retrospective Cohort Study. Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol 2024:34894241264114. https://doi.org/10.1177/00034894241264114.