A Scoping Review of Studies on Secure Messaging through Patient Portals: Persistent Challenges and Potential Solutions

Yawen Guo MISM[1], Di Hu MS[1], Yiliang Zhou MS[1], Tianchu Lyu PhD[1], Ziqi Yang 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, Kai Zheng
Mailing Address: 6095 Donald Bren Hall, Irvine, CA 92697, United States
E-mail: yaweng5@uci.edu, kai.zheng@uci.edu
Telephone: (412)641-0453, (949) 639-9217

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 (word count: 243)

Secure messaging (SM) has seen increasing adoption over the past decade, prompting growing interest in understanding its impact on healthcare delivery. This review examines key themes in the existing SM research, such as usage patterns, perceived benefits, and persistent challenges, to identify research gaps and inform opportunities for sociotechnical solutions in the artificial intelligence (AI) era that could enhance patient–provider communication effectiveness. Searches were conducted in PubMed, Scopus, IEEE Xplore, ACM Digital Library, Cochrane CENTRAL, CINAHL, and Web of Science. Following the PRISMA guideline, we identified 366 relevant peer-reviewed studies published from January 2009 to September 2025. Existing research has primarily investigated (1) the effect of SM use on clinical outcomes, (2) adoption patterns, and (3) user experiences. The literature shows that SM promotes patient engagement, care coordination, and patient–provider communication. However, significant challenges persist, including privacy concerns, limited access for vulnerable populations, patient misuse, and increased clinician burden. Educational initiatives and patient-centered design are essential for promoting appropriate and accessible use of SM. Emerging AI solutions also show promise in enhancing SM use, particularly for message triaging and drafting replies. The integration of such AI solutions 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.

Introduction

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]. Under its Meaningful Use provisions, secure electronic messaging was established as the standard for patient-provider communication and was promoted in support of EHR innovations like telehealth to enhance care between visits [2–4]. Secure messaging (SM), defined as "any electronic communication between a provider and patient that ensures only those parties can access the communication", is a core feature of patient portals and plays a critical role in the broader landscape of telehealth [5–8].

SM has become a widely adopted feature in patient portals, supporting patients in self-managing health conditions and coordinating care[9,10], showing potential to improve patient engagement and provider workflows via enabling multimodal asynchronous information exchange[11]. Despite its growing use, challenges persist in expanding adoption, ensuring effectiveness, and addressing overuse, particularly since the COVID-19 pandemic [12–18]. As SM has taken on greater importance in clinical care, policy responses have followed. For example, CMS introduced billing codes for portal messages that involve medical decision-making and require more than five minutes of clinician time within a seven-day period[11]. These policies acknowledge the clinical value and resource burden of SM while underscoring the need for ongoing evaluation of their impact on care delivery, equity, and provider workload [15,19].

Machine learning (ML) and deep learning(DL) approaches have long been explored to enhance SM in support of a variety of clinical tasks, including triaging, message classification, and workload prediction[20–22]. More recently, advances in generative AI (GenAI) and large language models (LLMs) have prompted EHR integration of these technologies for message drafting and workflow optimization[23–25], particularly with respect to reduction of provider workload associated with SM[26–29]. Despite considerable enthusiasm, the real-world benefits of such AIML-enhanced SM approaches have yet to be firmly established. Such an evaluation presents a two-fold challenge: first, elucidating how SM affects care delivery and clinical workflows, and second, determining the additional impact of AIML on these processes.

While several SM studies exist that provide important insights on the former point, many were conducted before the widespread adoption of modern EHRs and digital health technologies and thus reflect an outdated technological landscape. Early reviews examined its potential to enhance patient-provider communication, focusing on user expectations, confidentiality concerns, and technological limitations reflective of the pre-2010 landscape[30–32]. Conversely, more recent reviews highlight specialized aspects rather than a generalized view of the field, covering specific vendor applications [33], disease- or population-specific implementations[34–36] , or possessing computational or methodological foci[37,38]. A comprehensive understanding of SM's role in care delivery—its benefits, limitations, and areas of adoption—is essential for determining whether, where, and how AI should be integrated into clinical workflows.

In this article, we therefore aim to systemically understand the current and prospective role of the patient–provider SM communication in clinical care: its benefits, drawbacks, and implications for potential solutions. In doing so, we establish a contemporary foundation to identify opportunities for, and risks inherent to, adoption of AIML-enhanced SM from the perspective of the health system as a whole. We then conclude with further elaboration on several such identified opportunities and risks.

Results

A search across seven databases yielded 1327 unique studies. A total of 773 studies were removed as they were unrelated to SM after title and abstract screening. After full-text screening of 554 articles, 188 were excluded based on predefined criteria (Figure 1). We included 366 relevant studies in this review. The process followed PRISMA guidelines to ensure methodological rigor and comprehensive coverage. Agreement between reviewers was substantial at both the title and abstract screening phase ($\kappa = 0.67$) and the full-text review phase ($\kappa = 0.66$). All conflicts were resolved through consensus.



Fig. 1. Literature search and selection process.

Our analysis categorized these 366 studies into nine distinct research themes (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 Research Themes Across Reviewed Articles (n = 366)

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

<u>Outcomes and Effectiveness Evaluations (n=102, 27.9%)</u>

Most studies accessing outcomes or effectiveness showed that SM utilization is associated with benefits for patient care and patient, clinician, and researcher work across various clinical conditions, care settings, and patient populations. For example, SM has been found to enhance diabetes care and self-management[39–48], and improved survival outcomes and symptom monitoring among oncology patients[49,50]. Use of SM has been associated with improved hypertension management via better blood pressure monitoring and medication intensification[51–53].

Studies assessing the effectiveness of SM outreach and interventions have been overall positive, but somewhat mixed. 12 studies have linked SM with increased rates of vaccination[54–59], colorectal and hepatitis C screenings[60–62], pediatric care attendance[58,63,64], and genetic testing for Alpha-1 Antitrypsin Deficiency[65]. Interventions conducted via SM also showed potential association with improved medication adherence among

patients, including for smoking cessation[61-65], chronic myeloid leukemia[66], spina bifida[67], and depression[68]. In surgical contexts, simplified dismissal instructions after prostatectomy were reported to be associated with fewer postoperative patient-initiated messages and ED visits[69]. Among elderly patients, SM communication has been found to facilitate care planning and advance directives completion[70]. In pediatric young adult settings, SM has been reported to support medical decision-making[71], deliver educational interventions in suicide prevention and HIV care[72–76], and facilitate follow-ups following office-based circumcision[77,78].

Secure messaging related usage metrics has been used as an indicator of hospitalist efficiency and patient portal engagement[79–83]. It has been reported to influence clinical workflow by increasing patient engagement and supporting the adoption of e-visits[84–91].However, a higher volume of SM interactions was reported to reduce new patient intake capacity[84,92]. While its association with emergency visits varies by conditions[93–95], SM has generally been linked with more efficient primary care workflows, including lower urgent care utilization and fewer unnecessary visits[96–100]. Studies have found that provider burnout remains a concern because of large message volume[101], while message characteristics, such as sentiment scores, do not appear to be a major contributing factor[102]. 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[103–112].

Studies comparing SM with traditional communication methods highlight varied user preferences influenced by clinical context and demographics, suggesting that tailored communication approaches are essential[109,113–124]. Studies report lower response rates of SM for COVID-19 research recruitment and preventive screening when compared to traditional in-person, phone, or mail communication[113,114,125,126]. Influenza vaccination studies show mixed results, with some reporting associations with higher uptake[117,127,128], while others find no population-level benefits from SM reminders[129,130] or content-tailored SM[131]. Although certain studies have suggested benefits of SM interventions, others report no significant advantage of SM outreach for smoking cessation[74,132,133] or HIV medication refills[134,135]. Similarly, a randomized trial found that a single SM was not associated with an increase in HbA1c follow-up testing[136].

Secure Messaging Adoption Analyses (n=81, 22.1%)

Secure messaging adoption has been expanding substantially since its introduction around 2010 and is now reported as the most used patient portal function[137–140]. During this time, most office-based physicians adopted SM, although uptake was lower among solo and non-primary care providers[141–143]. Disparities emerged following federal incentives, with certified health IT use positively associated with SM adoption, as well as providers' expectations that SM would improve performance and their overall attitudes toward its use[144–146]. Research shows SM volume continues to rise but per capita rates have plateaued, indicating SM adoption is still expanding [143,147–153]. The COVID-19 pandemic triggered a major surge in use, and persistent high volume has been suggested to contribute to multitasking, workflow disruptions, and potential medical errors[154–163]. A national study found that only 1.9% of veterans used SM during early adoption, with uptake varying by condition and demographics[164].

Patient SM usage patterns vary across demographics. Patient users are more often younger [89,165–173], women [166,169,171,174–178], Caucasian [89,166,168,169,175,177,179,180], married [89,107,168,169,177,181], employed [89], privately insured [89,145,171,182,183], and residing in high socioeconomic neighborhoods [89,144,167,184] with higher education levels[165,169,185,186]. Many also have poor physical[165] or mental health conditions[175,187,188], and higher levels of morbidity or comorbidity[167–169,171,188,189]. Active patient users are generally English speaking[177,180,190], with high EHR usage and more outpatient visits[191–194]. Portal refresh behaviors also shape adoption patterns, with patients who more frequently refreshed test results more often initiating SM[195]. Among adolescent patients, SM users were more often female or transgender with prior portal experience[196]. In contrast, lower SM engagement has been observed among underrepresented minorities[140,145,197–199], veterans experiencing homelessness[187,200,201], individuals with limited English proficiency or low health literacy[189,202–205], and patients facing poor internet access and other digital disparities[167,175,185,206,207].

Patient–provider interactions shape SM adoption, and have been described as being influenced by behavioral health models, clinical roles, and the characteristics of both patients and providers[208,209]. Female patients have been reported to be more likely to request medical guidance via SM but receive fewer confirmations in response[210]. Female physicians are more often than male physicians to send and receive SM, which may in turn contribute to higher rates of burnout among female providers[174,211–214]. However, among pediatric surgical specialists,

a recent analysis found no significant differences in inbox message volume or message length after adjusting for case complexity, suggesting that gender disparities in messaging may be context-dependent and vary by specialty[215].

User Experience and Engagement Assessments (n=67, 18.3%)

Studies evaluating user experiences report high satisfaction among patients [216–220], and strong enthusiasm from providers[221,222], particularly in relation to medication refills, appointment scheduling, test result access, clinical inquiries[14,223–230]. Patients view SM as a tool that complements face-to-face communication, especially regarding sensitive issues like sexually transmitted diseases(STDs) and erectile dysfunction[216,231,232]. SM use has also been reported to improve perceived access to care[14,223,231,233–236] and to strengthen patient-provider relationships[237]. Providers have described valuing SM for its potential role in improving workflow, care coordination, and enabling remote work[233,238].

However, patients have raised concerns about provider burden from uncompensated SM interactions, delayed responses, unclear messages, and difficulty reaching specific providers–issues that may contribute to tracking challenges and inconsistent communication[12,226,239–245]. Providers have likewise reported increased workload due to time-intensive message management[235,243,244,246–253], and stress from inappropriate or emotionally challenging messages[12–14,226,254]. Findings from several studies suggest that message-related work created additional burdens, such as constant redirection of attention, lengthy inbox management, and heavier mental workload—factors that have been associated with reduced efficiency and responsiveness[246,249,255–258]. A recent study of over 1,700 physicians reported that patient messages requesting medical advice were associated with significantly increased after-hours work, with specialists experiencing a greater burden than primary care physicians[259]. Additional concerns noted in the literature include liability risks[248], limited effectiveness of SM in inpatient settings[260], and inadequate training among medical trainees in using SM[261].

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 whether physicians have sufficient time to devote to messaging[141,231,262]. Patients have also reported challenges related to message ambiguity and complexity, particularly

among elderly patients with lower literacy[141,238,263]. Other barriers described in the literature from the provider perspective include delegation of messaging tasks that complicate communication[13], limited technology and internet access[13,206,225], and unclear guidelines for messaging use[141,264,265]. Further work has similarly characterized inbox tasks as fragmented and labor-intensive, often requiring additional articulation work to clarify conflicting or redundant requests[266]. One study reported that the use of medical scribes was not associated with reductions in time to completion of SM[267]. Proposed solutions emphasize education and systematic training to instill more efficient inbox management habits of providers [234,241,255,268–272], accessible user interfaces with clear messaging instructions[141,257,264], and AI-driven tools designed to improve patient literacy and support physician workflows[141,273,274]. Additional recommendations include strategic message management practices such as team-based message sharing[226,234,243,255,275], crafting clear and empathetic messages[276,277], and standardizing administrative processes to enhance efficiency and reduce clinician burden[269].

System Evaluation and Computational Method Development Studies (n=50, 13.7%)

Early evaluations of SM systems reported rapid consultations turnaround times during pilot e-visit deployments[278]. However, later studies identified persistent system-level usability and access challenges including delayed message response times, suggesting limitations in platform responsiveness and interface design[279,280]. 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[170,281]. Usability research in hospital settings identified functionality gaps, such as clinical document sharing errors[282], while broader evaluations linked increased SM use to patient access to EHR data[283].

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—were associated with increased portal use among users with diverse literacy and numeracy skills[277,284–286]. Automated assessments of readability and health literacy have provided insights into message complexity, informing both clinical care and population-level

interventions[287–291]. Framework-based approaches include SPICE, which emphasizes support, partnership, and information-giving, and a Chain-of-Thought routing framework leveraging LLMs; both illustrate structured strategies intended to improve message handling and patient-centered communication[234,292]. An extended Technology Acceptance Model that included affordances and communication efficacy found that young adults' intentions to use portal messaging were positively associated with editability and communication efficacy, but negatively associated with persistence[293].

Rule-based, natural language processing(NLP), deep learning(DL) models have been developed to triage SM by risk and urgency[22], classify information type (e.g., clinical, medical, logistical, or social)[20,21], detect medical decision complexity[26–29], and identify caregivers and caregiving network among people living with dementia[294]. A prospective deployment of a fine-tuned NLP classifier for automated routing reported reduction in response times and staff interactions while maintaining high accuracy across message categories[295]. They were also applied to identify primary patient concerns, social needs, and mental health crises[296–306]. Efforts to extract actionable insights from messages include building FHIR(Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources)-aligned data models to standardize SM content and enable downstream NLP analyses, integrated semantic and contextual features for improved categorization, and combined message-based features with predictive models to support clinical decision-making[307–310]. Additionally, vector-based representation techniques have been explored with a focus on optimizing word embeddings for small, domain-specific datasets[311], and prompt engineering has been used to generate synthetic drug-related messages to reveal language patterns[312]. More recently, studies have applied LLMs to tasks such as triaging patient messages to appropriate clinics or urgency levels, detecting knowledge questions, tailoring patient support tools for chronic disease management, and identifying emergencies in real time[313–317].

Generative-AI–Drafted Replies to Patient Messages (n=35, 9.6%)

A rapidly growing body of 35 studies published between 2023 and 2025 has examined the use of large language models (LLMs) to generate draft responses to patient portal messages. Live implementations in EHR pilots occurred mainly in Epic in-basket workflows, often pairing

GPT-4 with institutional customization[23,301,318–322], while the majority of studies used simulated or de-identified message sets across diverse specialties[24,25,323–339].

AI-generated replies were often rated as comparable to, or in some cases better than, clinician-authored responses in terms of informational adequacy and clarity, and several studies highlighted enhanced empathy, particularly in GPT-4 outputs[25,319,324,330–333,340–342]. Model benchmarking further reported GPT-4's consistent outperformance of earlier LLMs across domains[323,328]. Evidence from real-world pilots showed low adoption of draft functions and near-universal need for clinician edits before sending. Drafted messages were generally longer than clinician-authored replies, and objective time savings were inconsistent—though many clinicians perceived reduced burden[23,318–320,343]. Metrics such as edit distance and message length were commonly used to quantify these patterns[339]. Several studies emphasized that iterative prompt engineering and contextual grounding—for example, incorporating the most recent assessment and plan—were associated with improvements in draft quality and clinician acceptance[318,328,334,343,344]. Human-in-the-loop prompt refinement and structured prompt templates were also reported as effective strategies[321,335].

Clinicians described drafts as useful starting points that could reduce cognitive load, though some expressed concerns about over-reliance[257,325,330,332]. Patients in blinded evaluations frequently favored AI replies for empathy and readability[319,327,330] , while mixed feedback emerged around the tone of lengthy or formal responses[324,326]. Risks were documented across multiple contexts, including hallucinations, incoherence, and misinterpretation of clinical nuance[25,323,326,333,336,345]. These findings underscore the necessity of clinician oversight in all implementations[331]. Participants across several studies were often unable to reliably distinguish AI-authored from human-authored replies[327,330]. While disclosure of AI involvement slightly reduced patient satisfaction, transparency was widely viewed as necessary for trust and accountability[325,334,346,347].

Message Content Analyses (n=30, 8.2%)

Studies analyzing SM content have used both qualitative and computational methods to examine communication patterns. Common topics include medication-related issues, appointment scheduling, lab results, referrals, and other administrative tasks[39,39,115,156,166,348–357] . Patients have been observed to use SM to report symptoms, express psychosocial concerns, seek

medical advice, and convey appreciation or complaints[115,156,166,176,351,352,354,358–363]. SM content also reveals communication around sensitive health topics such as STDs and cannabis use[216,364]. In surgical populations, SM content has focused on drains, wounds, pain, and activity restrictions, with message patterns varying by patient age and mental health status[365]. Tone analysis reveals that most messages are neutral and respectful, though cyber-incivility and problematic language occasionally challenge professional standards[254,366,367]. Evidence suggests that provider replies may include less language that fosters partnership or emotional support[368], and provider-initiated messages often reflect greater clinical complexity[369]. Recent work has also applied large-scale NLP to patient portal messages to surface patient-driven research priorities in cancer care, with approximately one-third of the AI-generated topics rated by clinicians as highly meaningful and novel[370].

Proxy Use and Shared Access Investigations (n=12, 3.3%)

This body of research focuses on patient portal use among adolescents with their guardians, and elderly patients with their caregivers. Studies have highlighted benefits such as convenient communication and patient empowerment, but also raised concerns about privacy and confidentiality—particularly for adolescents under the Cures Act Final Rule[371,372]. Analyses indicate that more than half of messages from adolescent accounts are accessed by guardians, underscoring privacy management challenges[373,374]. For elderly populations, research has consistently reported caregiver use of portals and SM as proxies, reflecting significant reliance on caregiver support[357,375–377]. Caregiver proxies have been observed to more commonly manage portals for older adults, males, non-white patients, non-English speakers, noncitizens, and those with public insurance[378]. To address these challenges, recent studies developed computational methods to identify non-patient authors, aimed at improving management efficiency and strengthening privacy safeguards in patient portal communications[189,379,380].

Health or Technology Literacy Barrier Assessments (n=11, 3.0%)

Several studies have emphasized the importance of health and digital literacy for the adoption and effective use of SM. Research indicates that while patients often write in simpler language, a mismatch in communication complexity has been observed in a notable portion of exchanges[287]. Studies have also identified disparities linked to the digital divide, highlighting barriers such as low digital literacy[140,203]. Providers have reported technology-related

difficulties, including complex login procedures and frequent log-offs[12]. Investigations into SM complexity suggest that automated feedback mechanisms may support message clarity and user education, thereby helping providers communicate more effectively[277]. Computational models using linguistic analysis of patient messages have also shown promise in assessing health literacy and identifying educational needs automatically[238,277,288–291,381].

Billing and Reimbursement Policy Investigations (n=8, 2.2%)

Recent studies examining billing policies for SM e-visits have highlighted changes in clinician billing behaviors and message usage patterns following the 2020 decision by CMS to allow billing for SM. Initial assessments reported modest declines in message volume after CMS's decision and low physician participation in billing activities[15,19,382–384], even though providers generally accepted the new model[384]. Emerging research has proposed refining billing strategies using predictive models based on clinical complexity rather than time spent, with the aim of improving billing accuracy and effectiveness[29,385]. Investigations in specialty areas, such as ophthalmology, have reported a temporary increase in billing during the pandemic, underscoring challenges in sustaining equitable SM billing across diverse healthcare contexts[386].

Discussion

This scoping review systematically maps the evolving landscape of SM research, emphasizing its role in patient–provider communication and the increasing influence of 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. To guide future work, we discuss findings across four major domains, reflecting the research themes identified in our results.

Secure Messaging Supports Care but Evidence Across Populations and Care Settings Remains Limited

Across the included studies, the majority has been conducted within single healthcare institutions, particularly emphasizing primary care settings. Investigations often target specific

populations: e.g., older adults and veterans[101,245,357,375], or patients with specific diseases, such as chronic illnesses[240,354,380]. Concurrently, there has been limited exploration of SM's benefits and limitations beyond primary care, such as in emergency or specialty settings. While the bulk of SM's applicability is in primary care[280,287,303,346], they may also be useful in specialty settings[95,309]. These investigations on SM systems in limited, focused, settings inherently also limit the broader applicability and generalizability of findings. Future research should therefore diversify study populations, broaden the range of health conditions examined, and include varied care settings. Future research should therefore diversify study populations, broaden the range of health conditions examined, and include varied care settings.

Patient Misconceptions, Equity Barriers, and Privacy Risks Limit Adoption

Although SM offers important opportunities to strengthen patient–provider communication[30,31,34], many patient-side barriers persist, including misconceptions about appropriate use, inequities in adoption, and privacy concerns.

Patient Misconceptions, Privacy Concerns, and Misuse of SM. Patients often hold misconceptions about SM, influenced by negative experiences with telehealth, uncertainty about who receives their messages, and concerns over privacy and system responsiveness[141,231]. Some patients hesitate to use SM due to fear of overburdening their providers, while others misuse it for urgent needs[240,242]. Although computational methods such as urgency classification have been developed to support triage[351], 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[12,226,241,244]. 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. Clear communication at the point of care, e.g., setting expectations about appropriate message use during visits, may help address these misunderstandings without adding new technological burden. Finally, additional safeguards must be in place to protect patient privacy when messages are accessed or sent by non-patient senders, such as caregivers, guardians of adolescents, or

individuals assisting patients with disabilities[357,372,373,387]. Potential strategies include role-based access controls, clear proxy account policies, and automated alerts to help patients maintain awareness of who can view or send messages on their behalf.

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[189,378]. Addressing these challenges requires patient-centered design that incorporates user-friendly interfaces and supports low-literacy communication to enhance functionality and accessibility for diverse populations[366,368,388–391]. Individuals from low socioeconomic backgrounds often face barriers to accessing SM, particularly when care is delivered across multiple providers[89,144,167]. Current interventions are often passive, relying on patient-initiated engagement, which may inadvertently exclude underrepresented groups who are unaware of or hesitant to use SM. While some outreach efforts exist, such as reminders for vaccinations or preventive screenings, few are tailored to the needs of specific populations. Future directions include co-designed educational materials, multilingual and plain-language prompts, and accessibility features, alongside rigorous evaluation of their impact. AI-powered tools may further support equity by delivering simplified language, visual aids, and personalized educational content to improve comprehension and engagement.

Provider Burden Reflects System and Policy Gaps

Beyond patient-facing barriers, our review identified substantial strain on providers, driven by increasing message volumes, unclear workflows, and limited reimbursement mechanisms.

Reducing the Burden on Providers. Misuse of SM for urgent issues can shift liability and clinical responsibility to providers, potentially compromising patient care[254,367]. Patients' use of inappropriate language or emotionally charged messages may contribute to a stressful professional environment and emotional exhaustion[254,367]. 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[246,249,255]. The surge in message volume further intensified these pressures, often extending work into personal time and increasing physician burnout[226,243,258,392,393]. Disparities in SM use between physician- and hospital-owned practices suggest that organizational structures also shape provider engagement[179]. 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. There is also a role for provider-facing education to ensure consistent messaging around SM use during clinical encounters[234,241,255,268–272]. Future research should assess the comparative effectiveness of these workflow interventions and identify conditions under which AI-driven support, such as automated triage or message summarization, can reduce workload without undermining clinical judgment. Organizational strategies such as clearer role delineation and protected time for messaging are critical components of reducing provider burden. However, AI-generated drafts may introduce new forms of cognitive and time burden, underscoring the importance of human-centered workflow design to ensure net workload reduction[394]. A balanced approach that integrates automation with clinician-centered workflow design is 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[15,19]. Modest physician engagement and reduced patient messaging suggest hesitancy toward new billing protocols and potential shifts in patient behavior[382,383]. Predictive modeling based on clinical complexity has offered strategies to align care delivery with billing practices[385]. Although AI-enhanced billing tools could theoretically analyze message content and estimate clinical effort, they remain largely untested[395]. As these technologies evolve, it is important to monitor their impact on provider documentation and patient access. Future research should further evaluate how providers and patients adapt to SM billing and explore how AI can contribute to transparent and sustainable reimbursement models.

AI-Augmented Solutions Offer Promise but Require Careful Governance

Computational and AI-driven approaches are increasingly being explored to manage message volume and workflow, improve literacy support, and generate draft replies.

Computational Method for System Support. For current computationally augmented SM implementations, the primary focus has been on automated triage and response prioritization. Studies have applied approaches ranging from traditional ML models such as logistic regression,

support vector machines, and random forests[21,22,26] to DL architectures, particularly BERT and its variants[300,396] . These methods have been used to classify message urgency and decision complexity[302,379,397], and to assess readability or literacy mismatches in patient–provider communication[288–290]. While most work has been limited to retrospective analyses or small-scale pilots, findings suggest promising utility for identifying high-risk messages, enhancing literacy support, and improving workflow efficiency. Future directions include adapting these tools for live clinical workflows, integrating them with structured EHR data, and examining their impact on equity (e.g., whether automated triage inadvertently deprioritizes messages from underserved populations). As LLM-based methods are now being applied to similar SM tasks[313–317], future research should prioritize rigorous evaluation of their accuracy and safety, and determine how they can complement existing ML and DL approaches[37].

Integrating Generative AI in SM Workflows Requires Careful Research and Governance. The integration of GenAI and LLMs into SM offers new opportunities to improve efficiency and reduce clinician burden, especially in the management of in-basket messages[390,398]. While providers often prefer human-generated messages for their readability and empathy[25,319,339], patients are generally receptive to GenAI-generated messages, especially when tone and context are appropriately managed[329]. Recent research has begun exploring GenAI's feasibility across varied message types and clinical scenarios to improve applicability and trust in message drafting[325,331,344,399]. Pilot studies are also testing GenAI for triage, response generation, and workload redistribution within SM systems[23,318]. While early studies have explored GenAI feasibility, widespread integration will require more robust evaluation of 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.

Limitations and Future Work

This review included only full-length archival articles on empirical studies, excluding brief reports, research letters, and industry case studies that may have provided early insights into emerging trends. Future reviews should consider these formats to broaden analytical scope. Our search approach focused on SM terminology common in portal-based systems, which may have

excluded earlier studies using different descriptors such as “electronic messages”. We also limited inclusion to patient–provider communication via portals, excluding studies on stand-alone SM applications and interprofessional communication (e.g., physician–nurse exchanges) to maintain a clear focus. Future research should examine SM in alternative platforms and team-based care contexts to better capture its broader impact on healthcare communication and coordination.

Conclusion

This scoping review synthesized literature on patient–provider secure messaging (SM) within patient portal, 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 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 further explore how LLMs and GenAI can be responsibly applied to support secure and efficient patient–provider communication.

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 final search strategy combined the terms (“secure messag*” OR “portal messag*” OR “inbasket messag*” OR “in-basket messag*” OR “inbox messag*” OR “patient-initiated messag*” OR “patient-sent messag*”) AND patient* in the title and abstract, restricted to studies written in English and published from 2009 onwards. A detailed breakdown of search strategies for each database, including syntax variations and filters, is provided in the Supplemental Materials Table S1. The search process was conducted in four waves to ensure comprehensive coverage of the literature over the study period. The first

search was completed in December 2023 and provided the initial corpus used to pilot and refine the inclusion and exclusion criteria. A second and third search were conducted in October 2024 and April 2025 to update the corpus and incorporate new publications that had appeared in the interim, while also allowing refinement of coding practices and terminology. The final search was completed in September 2025, ensuring that the review reflects the most recent body of evidence. Results in this manuscript are based on the combined set of studies identified across all four searches. The titles and abstracts of the identified articles were independently screened by YG and another author (DH, YZ, TL, or ZY). Articles identified as relevant after the title and abstract screening process then underwent a full-text review to determine final inclusion(YG and DH). Any disagreements were resolved through consensus meetings with a third author (KZ). Inter-rater reliability was assessed using Cohen's κ in Covidence for both the title and abstract screening stage and the full-text review stage. Because all records from different search waves were uploaded together, the κ values represent overall agreement across the full screening process.

We included original, peer-reviewed full-length empirical studies in which patient–provider SM was a central focus. We excluded studies that: (i) did not examine SM directly, (ii) analyzed communication solely between providers, (iii) combined SM with other modalities (e.g., telephone or email) without separate reporting, (iv) were conducted outside the U.S., or (v) reported only basic descriptive metrics of SM use (e.g., counts or enrollment) without analytical depth. For example, studies reporting only annual message volumes without linking them to outcomes, content, or user experience were excluded.

Data Extraction

To formulate the codebook, YG and DH iteratively coded sets of 10 articles, followed by consensus discussions with KZ to refine codes. The nine final categories presented in Table 1 were derived inductively from recurring themes that emerged during the review of eligible studies. Once initial themes were identified, all authors, who actively conduct informatics research on clinical informatics, reviewed the categories and reached consensus on their definitions and boundaries. These nine categories— *Outcomes and Effectiveness Evaluations, Secure Messaging Adoption Analyses, User Experience and Engagement Assessments, Message Content Analyses, System Evaluation and Computational Method Development Studies,*

Generative-AI–Drafted Replies to Patient Messages, Proxy Use and Shared Access Investigations, Health and Technology Literacy Barrier Assessments, and *Billing and Reimbursement Policy Investigations*—formed the framework for categorizing research themes and synthesizing findings.

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). A structured coding scheme was developed with open-text fields to capture additional details. We coded research themes using a multi-select field comprising nine inductively derived categories, with the study's objective recorded verbatim and an "other" option for edge cases. In practice, although this manuscript reports primarily on thematic findings due to the large scale and heterogeneity of included studies, the extraction instrument also captured study design, data scope, data source, and site scope (single-site vs. multi-site), as well as population, clinical domain, and healthcare setting. Outcomes, key results, and author-stated recommendations were recorded in structured free-text fields, with the full instrument available in Supplementary Table S2.

Table 1. Coding Framework for SM research themes

Code Category	**Example Codes**
Outcomes and Effectiveness Evaluations	use of SM as an intervention; SM as a predictive tool; evaluation of clinical or behavioral outcomes
Secure Messaging Adoption Analyses	SM adoption rates; proportion of SM users among EHR enrollees; usage behavior analysis
User Experience and Engagement Assessments	user perspective/satisfaction/preferences; comparative analysis of SM vs. other methods; strategies to improve engagement
System Evaluation and Computational Method Development Studies	development of SM-related computational tools; evaluation of SM system functionality; user interface design
Generative-AI–Drafted Replies to Patient Messages	evaluation and user perceptions of AI vs clinician response quality; assessment of utilization; prompt engineering and context grounding; disclosure of AI involvement and authorship recognition; identification of risks and safety concerns

Message Content Analyses	sentiment analysis; topic or theme analysis; linguistic 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

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

Y.G. conceived the study, led the literature review, performed screening, data collection, and analysis, and drafted the manuscript. D.H. and Y.Z. contributed to screening and data extraction. Z.Y. and T.L. contributed to screening. T.L.R. and K.Z. 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 exclusively from previously published literature. The extracted and synthesized data supporting the findings of this review are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable 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-communication-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] Fogg JF, Sinsky CA. In-Basket Reduction: A Multiyear Pragmatic Approach to Lessen the Work Burden of Primary Care Physicians. NEJM Catal 2023;4. https://doi.org/10.1056/CAT.22.0438.
[18] Kurek A, Inman E, Walmer M, et al. The "Inboxologist" — A Novel Approach to In-Basket Management in Primary Care. NEJM Catal 2024;5. https://doi.org/10.1056/CAT.24.0133.
[19] 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.
[20] 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.
[21] Cronin RM, Fabbri D, Denny JC, et al. A comparison of rule-based and machine learning approaches for classifying patient portal messages. Int J Med Inf 2017;105:110–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2017.06.004.
[22] 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.
[23] 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.
[24] Afshar M, Gao Y, Wills G, et al. Prompt engineering with a large language model to assist providers in responding to patient inquiries: a real-time implementation in the electronic health record. JAMIA Open 2024;7:ooae080. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamiaopen/ooae080.
[25] 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.
[26] 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.
[27] 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.
[28] 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.
[29] Ko DG, Tachinardi U, Warm EJ, et al. Beyond Time-Based Billing: An AI-Enabled Complexity Model for Secure Message Reimbursement. Telemed J E Health 2025. https://doi.org/10.1177/15305627251377376.
[30] 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.
[31] 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.
[32] 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.
[33] 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.
[34] 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.
[35] Wec A, Gleason KT, Peereboom D, et al. Measurement, drivers, and outcomes of patient-initiated secure messaging use and intensity: a scoping review. JAMIA Open 2025;8:ooaf087. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamiaopen/ooaf087.
[36] Conroy M, Powell M, Suelzer E, et al. 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.

[37] Hu D, Guo Y, Zhou Y, et al. A systematic review of early evidence on generative AI for drafting responses to patient messages. Npj Health Syst 2025;2:27. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44401-025-00032-5.
[38] Guo Y, Hu D, Zhou Y, et al. Computational Use of Patient–Provider Secure Messaging Data to Achieve Better Clinical Efficiency and Quality of Communication: A Systematic Review 2025. https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.05.19.25327936.
[39] 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.
[40] 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.
[41] 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.
[42] 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.
[43] 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.
[44] 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.
[45] 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.
[46] 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.
[47] Quinn CC, Butler EC, Swasey KK, et al. Mobile Diabetes Intervention Study of Patient Engagement and Impact on Blood Glucose: Mixed Methods Analysis. JMIR MHealth UHealth 2018;6:e31. https://doi.org/10.2196/mhealth.9265.
[48] Bredfeldt CE, Compton-Phillips AL, Snyder MH. Effects of between visit physician-patient communication on Diabetes Recognition Program scores. Int J Qual Health Care 2011;23:664–73. https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzr061.
[49] 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.
[50] Wagner LI, Schink J, Bass M, et al. Bringing PROMIS to practice: brief and precise symptom screening in ambulatory cancer care. Cancer 2015;121:927–34. https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.29104.
[51] 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.
[52] 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.
[53] North F, Elrashidi MY, Ward WJ, et al. Telemonitoring Blood Pressure by Secure Message

on a Patient Portal: Use, Content, and Outcomes. Telemed J E Health 2015;21:630–6. https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2014.0179.
[54] 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.
[55] 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.
[56] 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.
[57] 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.
[58] 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.
[59] Rauhut MA. Digital engagement and the efficacy of patient portal-based preventive care interventions. Digit Health 2025;11:20552076251356013. https://doi.org/10.1177/20552076251356013.
[60] 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.
[61] 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.
[62] Hojat L, Avery A, Greco PJ, et al. Doubling Hepatitis C Virus Screening in Primary Care Using Advanced Electronic Health Record Tools—A Non-Randomized Controlled Trial. J Gen Intern Med 2020;35:498–504. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-019-05536-z.
[63] 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.
[64] 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.
[65] Lam SW, Strange C, Brantly ML, et al. A Novel Detection Method to Identify Individuals with Alpha-1 Antitrypsin Deficiency: Linking Prescription of COPD Medications with the Patient-Facing Electronic Medical Record. Chronic Obstr Pulm Dis 2022;9:26–33. https://doi.org/10.15326/jcopdf.2021.0260.
[66] 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.
[67] 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.
[68] 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.
[69] Manka MG, Viers BR, Bole R, et al. Assessing the Impact of Hospital Dismissal Summary Readability on Patient Outcomes Following Prostatectomy. Urology 2021;157:201–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2021.06.040.
[70] 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.
[71] 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.
[72] 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.
[73] 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.
[74] 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.
[75] 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.
[76] 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.
[77] Diyaolu M, Perry T, Hui N, et al. Outcome assessment of office Plastibell circumcision in infants utilizing interactive electronic health record. J Pediatr Surg 2023;58:1008–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpedsurg.2023.01.043.
[78] Smith JR, Sengstack DG, McCoy AB, et al. High-Frequency Utilization of the Outpatient Messaging System in a Specialized Outpatient Catatonia Clinic for Individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorder. J Child Adolesc Psychopharmacol 2025;35:424–30. https://doi.org/10.1089/cap.2025.0034.
[79] 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.
[80] 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.
[81] 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.
[82] 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.
[83] Powell KR, Deroche C. Predictors and patterns of portal use in patients with multiple chronic conditions. Chronic Illn 2020;16:275–83. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742395318803663.
[84] 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.
[85] 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.
[86] 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.
[87] 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.
[88] 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.
[89] 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.
[90] 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.
[91] Neeman E, Kumar D, Lyon L, et al. Attitudes and Perceptions of Multidisciplinary Cancer Care Clinicians Toward Telehealth and Secure Messages. JAMA Netw Open 2021;4:e2133877. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.33877.
[92] 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.
[93] 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.
[94] 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.
[95] 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.
[96] 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.
[97] 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.
[98] 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.
[99] 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.
[100] Kachroo N, Fedrigon D, Li J, et al. Does "MyChart" Benefit "My" Surgery? A Look at the Impact of Electronic Patient Portals on Patient Experience. J Urol 2020;204:760–8. https://doi.org/10.1097/JU.0000000000001090.
[101] Apaydin EA, Der-Martirosian C, Yoo C, et al. Secure Messages, Video Visits, and Burnout Among Primary Care Providers in the Veterans Health Administration: National Survey

Study. J Med Internet Res 2025;27:e68858–e68858. https://doi.org/10.2196/68858.
[102] 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.
[103] 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.
[104] 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.
[105] 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.
[106] 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.
[107] 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.
[108] 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.
[109] 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.
[110] 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.
[111] Dykes C, Gardner C, Chang J, et al. Implementation of MyChart for recruitment at an academic medical center. J Clin Transl Sci 2024;8:e160. https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2024.605.
[112] Ziegenfuss JY, Sour EU, Roelofs EJ, et al. A randomized study comparing patient portal and email communications for trial recruitment. Clin Trials 2025:17407745251358259. https://doi.org/10.1177/17407745251358259.
[113] 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.
[114] 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.
[115] 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.
[116] 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.
[117] 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.
[118] 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.
[119] 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.
[120] 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.
[121] Paige SR, Krieger JL, Williams M, et al. Patient message preferences to promote clinical conversations about chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD): A discrete choice experiment. PEC Innov 2023;2:100168. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecinn.2023.100168.
[122] Raghu TS, Frey K, Chang YH, et al. Using secure messaging to update medications list in ambulatory care setting. Int J Med Inf 2015;84:754–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2015.06.003.
[123] Whiteside U, Richards J, Steinfeld B, et al. Online cognitive behavioral therapy for depressed primary care patients: a pilot feasibility project. Perm J 2014;18:21–7. https://doi.org/10.7812/TPP/13-155.
[124] Sequist TD, Zaslavsky AM, Colditz GA, et al. Electronic patient messages to promote colorectal cancer screening: a randomized controlled trial. Arch Intern Med 2011;171:636–41. https://doi.org/10.1001/archinternmed.2010.467.
[125] 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.
[126] 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.
[127] 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.
[128] Rand ML. Nursing Interventions Increase Influenza Vaccination Quality Measures for Home Telehealth Patients. J Nurs Care Qual 2022;37:47–53. https://doi.org/10.1097/NCQ.0000000000000577.
[129] 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.
[130] 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.
[131] Szilagyi PG, Clark EJ, Duru OK, et al. Video and Infographic Messages From Primary Care Physicians and Influenza Vaccination Rates: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Netw Open 2025;8:e2526514–e2526514. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2025.26514.
[132] 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.
[133] 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.
[134] 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.
[135] 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.
[136] Nagler AR, Horwitz LI, Ahmed A, et al. Patient portal messaging to address delayed follow-up for uncontrolled diabetes: a pragmatic, randomised clinical trial. BMJ Qual Saf 2025. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2024-018249.
[137] 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.
[138] 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.
[139] 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.
[140] 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.
[141] 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.
[142] 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.
[143] 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.
[144] 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.
[145] 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.
[146] 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.
[147] 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.
[148] 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.
[149] 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.

[150] 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.
[151] 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.
[152] 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.
[153] Ryan SP, Schwartz AM, Jiranek WA, et al. The Contemporary "In-Basket": An Explosion of Unchecked Administrative Expectations. J Arthroplasty 2025. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2025.06.069.
[154] Arndt BG, Micek MA, Rule A, et al. More Tethered to the EHR: EHR Workload Trends Among Academic Primary Care Physicians, 2019-2023. Ann Fam Med 2024;22:12–8. https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.3047.
[155] 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.
[156] 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.
[157] 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.
[158] 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.
[159] Hansen MA, Chen R, Hirth J, et al. Impact of COVID-19 lockdown on patient-provider electronic communications. J Telemed Telecare 2024;30:1285–92. https://doi.org/10.1177/1357633X221146810.
[160] Holmgren AJ, Apathy NC, Crews J, et al. National trends in oncology specialists' EHR inbox work, 2019-2022. J Natl Cancer Inst 2025;117:1253–9. https://doi.org/10.1093/jnci/djaf052.
[161] Holmgren AJ, Downing NL, Tang M, et al. Assessing the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on clinician ambulatory electronic health record use. J Am Med Inf Assoc 2022;29:453–60. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocab268.
[162] Holmgren AJ, Thombley R, Sinsky CA, et al. Changes in Physician Electronic Health Record Use With the Expansion of Telemedicine. JAMA Intern Med 2023;183:1357–65. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2023.5738.
[163] Smith DC, Thumm EB, Anderson J, et al. Sudden Shift to Telehealth in COVID-19: A Retrospective Cohort Study of Disparities in Use of Telehealth for Prenatal Care in a Large Midwifery Service. J Midwifery Womens Health 2024;69:522–30. https://doi.org/10.1111/jmwh.13601.
[164] 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.
[165] 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.
[166] 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.
[167] 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.
[168] 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.
[169] 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.
[170] 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.
[171] 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.
[172] Khalil N, Aungst A, Casady L, et al. Multiple Sclerosis and MyChart Messaging: A Retrospective Chart Review Evaluating Its Use. Int J MS Care 2022;24:271–4. https://doi.org/10.7224/1537-2073.2020-101.
[173] Mueller B, Sweetnam C, Klenofsky B, et al. A retrospective cohort study of clinical factors, visit patterns, and demographic factors associated with use of remote communications in patients with headache. Headache 2021;61:1521–8. https://doi.org/10.1111/head.14226.
[174] 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.
[175] 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.
[176] 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.
[177] 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.
[178] Fleming NL, Cullen D, Luna G. An Evaluation of Patient Web Portal Engagement: An Exploratory Study of Patients with Hypertension and Diabetes. Online J Nurs Inform 2015;19:1–8.
[179] 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.
[180] Hansen MA, Hirth J, Zoorob R, et al. Demographics and clinical features associated with rates of electronic message utilization in the primary care setting. Int J Med Inf 2024;183:105339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2024.105339.
[181] Siddiqui S, Etingen B, Patrianakos J, et al. Use of the Veterans Health Administration online patient portal among Veterans with spinal cord injuries and disorders. J Spinal Cord Med 2023;46:917–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/10790268.2022.2084967.
[182] 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.
[183] 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.
[184] 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.
[185] 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.
[186] Corriveau B, Denault G, Wang R, et al. Sociodemographic variation in use of and preferences for digital technologies among patients in primary care: Results from the OurCare national survey. Can Fam Physician 2025;71:324–36. https://doi.org/10.46747/cfp.7105324.
[187] 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.
[188] Staloff J, Gunnink E, Rojas J Jr, et al. High Users of Primary Care Secure Messaging in the Veterans Health Administration. Ann Fam Med 2025;23:285–93. https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.240360.
[189] 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.
[190] Alexander J, Beatty AL. Disparities in Patient Portal Messaging Among Oncology Patients Enrolled in the Patient Portal. JCO Clin Cancer Inf 2025;9:e2400234. https://doi.org/10.1200/CCI-24-00234.
[191] 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.
[192] 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.
[193] 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.
[194] Zhong L, Bather JR, Goodman MS, et al. Importance of Prior Patient Interactions With the Healthcare System to Engaging With Pretest Cancer Genetic Services via Digital Health Tools Among Unaffected Primary Care Patients: Findings From the BRIDGE Trial. Health Serv Res 2025:e14652. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.14652.
[195] Steitz BD, Turer RW, Salmi L, et al. Repeated Access to Patient Portal While Awaiting Test Results and Patient-Initiated Messaging. JAMA Netw Open 2025;8:e254019–e254019. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2025.4019.
[196] 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.
[197] 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.
[198] 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.
[199] 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.
[200] 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.
[201] 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.
[202] 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.
[203] 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.
[204] 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.
[205] Roy M, Purington N, Liu M, et al. Limited English Proficiency and Disparities in Health Care Engagement Among Patients With Breast Cancer. JCO Oncol Pr 2021;17:e1837–45. https://doi.org/10.1200/OP.20.01093.
[206] 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.
[207] Javier SJ, Troszak LK, Shimada SL, et al. Racial and ethnic disparities in use of a personal health record by veterans living with HIV. J Am Med Inf Assoc 2019;26:696–702. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocz024.
[208] 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.
[209] 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.
[210] 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.
[211] Branford GL, Bucala MD, Hepper A, et al. The Gender Gap in EHR Workload: A Comparative Analysis of Primary Care Physician In Basket Usage. J Gen Intern Med 2025;40:2255–64. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-025-09629-w.
[212] Ngo M, Sambhariya WS, Myers M, et al. Gender based differences in electronic medical record utilization in an academic ophthalmology practice. AJO Int 2024;1. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajoint.2024.100082.
[213] Rittenberg E, Liebman JB, Rexrode KM. Primary Care Physician Gender and Electronic Health Record Workload. J Gen Intern Med 2022;37:3295–301. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-021-07298-z.
[214] Scholes J, Schiff L, Jacobs AA, et al. Special Topic Burnout: The Digital Workload Divide: Investigating Gender Differences in EHR Messaging Among Primary Care Clinicians. Appl Clin Inf 2025. https://doi.org/10.1055/a-2618-4580.
[215] Ha D, Russell N, Olson KE, et al. Gender Differences in Electronic Health Record Inbox Message Volumes Among Pediatric Surgeon Specialists. J Pediatr Surg 2025;60:162191. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpedsurg.2025.162191.
[216] 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.
[217] 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.
[218] 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.
[219] 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.
[220] 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.
[221] 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.
[222] 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.
[223] 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.
[224] 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.
[225] 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.
[226] 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.
[227] Harary M, Bommakanti KK, Nakhla MN, et al. Audit of Postoperative Readmissions and Patient Messages following Endoscopic Transnasal Transsphenoidal Surgery. J Neurol Surg B Skull Base 2022;83:611–7. https://doi.org/10.1055/a-1840-9874.
[228] Makhnoon S, Lee M, Basit M, et al. Electronic Patient Portals as a Modality for Returning Reclassified Genetic Test Results. Mol Genet Genomic Med 2025;13:e70123. https://doi.org/10.1002/mgg3.70123.
[229] Mervak BM, Davenport MS, Flynt KA, et al. What the Patient Wants: An Analysis of Radiology-Related Inquiries From a Web-Based Patient Portal. J Am Coll Radiol 2016;13:1311–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacr.2016.05.022.
[230] Heukelom JV, Jacobsen K, Petry NJ, et al. Patient satisfaction with return of pharmacogenomic results utilizing a patient portal message. Pharmacogenomics 2023;24:315–23. https://doi.org/10.2217/pgs-2023-0032.
[231] 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.
[232] 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.
[233] 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.
[234] 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.
[235] 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.
[236] 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.
[237] 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.
[238] 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.
[239] 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.
[240] 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.
[241] 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.
[242] 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.
[243] 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.
[244] 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.
[245] Haun JN, Lind JD, Shimada SL, et al. Evaluating secure messaging from the veteran perspective: Informing the adoption and sustained use of a patient-driven communication platform. Ann Anthropol Pract 2013;37:57–74. https://doi.org/10.1111/napa.12029.
[246] 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.
[247] 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.
[248] 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.
[249] 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.
[250] Akbar F, Mark G, Warton EM, et al. Physicians' electronic inbox work patterns and factors associated with high inbox work duration. J Am Med Inf Assoc 2021;28:923–30. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocaa229.
[251] Laccetti AL, Chen B, Cai J, et al. Increase in cancer center staff effort related to electronic

patient portal use. J Oncol Pract 2016;12:e981–90. https://doi.org/10.1200/JOP.2016.011817.
[252] Apathy NC, Hicks K, Bocknek L, et al. Inbox message prioritization and management approaches in primary care. JAMIA Open 2024;7:ooae135. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamiaopen/ooae135.
[253] Hadeed N, Ameling J, Henderson J, et al. Taming the In-Basket-How Two Simple Tools Reduced Portal Message Volume in an Academic Internal Medicine Clinic. J Gen Intern Med 2025. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-025-09478-7.
[254] 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.
[255] 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.
[256] Akbar F, Mark G, Prausnitz S, et al. Physician Stress During Electronic Health Record Inbox Work: In Situ Measurement With Wearable Sensors. JMIR Med Inform 2021;9:e24014. https://doi.org/10.2196/24014.
[257] Murphy DR, Giardina TD, Satterly T, et al. An Exploration of Barriers, Facilitators, and Suggestions for Improving Electronic Health Record Inbox-Related Usability: A Qualitative Analysis. JAMA Netw Open 2019;2:e1912638. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.12638.
[258] 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.
[259] Mandal S, Wiesenfeld BM, Mann DM, et al. Quantifying the impact of telemedicine and patient medical advice request messages on physicians' work-outside-work. Npj Digit Med 2024;7:35. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-024-01001-2.
[260] 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.
[261] 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.
[262] Lanham HJ, Leykum LK, Pugh JA. Examining the Complexity of Patient-Outpatient Care Team Secure Message Communication: Qualitative Analysis. J Med Internet Res 2018;20:e218. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.9269.
[263] 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.
[264] 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.
[265] Lee JL, Williams CE, Baird S, et al. Too Many Don'ts and Not Enough Do's? A Survey of Hospitals About Their Portal Instructions for Patients. J Gen Intern Med 2020;35:1029–34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-019-05528-z.
[266] Rule A, Vang P, Micek MA, et al. Primary care staff members' experiences with managing electronic health record inbox messages. J Am Med Inf Assoc 2025;32:1040–9. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocaf067.
[267] Zallman L, Altman W, Chu L, et al. Do Medical Scribes Help Primary Care Providers Respond More Quickly to Out-of-Visit Tasks? J Am Board Fam Med 2021;34:70–7.

https://doi.org/10.3122/jabfm.2021.01.200330.
[268] 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.
[269] 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.
[270] 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.
[271] Hyslop A, Swazo R, Smith JP. “A friendly reminder” – Improving workflow and efficiency in a pulmonary fellows’ outpatient continuity clinic. Heart Lung 2024;63:167–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrtlng.2023.10.007.
[272] Smith RC, Yiin T, Monelavongsy C, et al. Ways to Improve Workflow and Morale in an Ophthalmology Clinic: Survey Advice from Clinic Staff. J Biotechnol Biomed 2023;6:460–7. https://doi.org/10.26502/jbb.2642-91280108.
[273] 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.
[274] 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.
[275] 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.
[276] 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.
[277] 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.
[278] 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.
[279] 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.
[280] 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.
[281] Dyrbye LN, Gordon J, O’Horo J, et al. Relationships Between EHR-Based Audit Log Data and Physician Burnout and Clinical Practice Process Measures. Mayo Clin Proc 2023;98:398–409. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2022.10.027.
[282] 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.
[283] 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.
[284] 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.
[285] 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.
[286] 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.
[287] 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.
[288] 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.
[289] 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.
[290] 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.
[291] Schillinger D, Balyan R, Crossley S, et al. Validity of a Computational Linguistics-Derived Automated Health Literacy Measure Across Race/Ethnicity: Findings from The ECLIPPSE Project. J Health Care Poor Underserved 2021;32:347–65. https://doi.org/10.1353/hpu.2021.0067.
[292] Gao M, Pejavara K, Balu S, et al. Development of a Flexible Chain of Thought Framework for Automated Routing of Patient Portal Messages. AMIA Annu Symp Proc 2024;2024:443–52.
[293] Mao CM, Hovick SR. Adding Affordances and Communication Efficacy to the Technology Acceptance Model to Study the Messaging Features of Online Patient Portals among Young Adults. Health Commun 2022;37:307–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2020.1838106.
[294] Martin D, Lyons J, Powers JD, et al. Systematic Identification of Caregivers of Patients Living With Dementia in the Electronic Health Record: Known Contacts and Natural Language Processing Cohort Study. J Med Internet Res 2025;27:e63654. https://doi.org/10.2196/63654.
[295] Anderson BJ, Zia Ul Haq M, Zhu Y, et al. Development and Evaluation of a Model to Manage Patient Portal Messages. NEJM AI 2025;2. https://doi.org/10.1056/AIoa2400354.
[296] Huang M, Khurana A, Mastorakos GM, et al. Identification of Transportation Barriers in Patient Portal Messages via Deep Semantic Embeddings and Clustering. Stud Health Technol Inf 2022;290:794–8. https://doi.org/10.3233/SHTI220188.
[297] 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.
[298] 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.
[299] 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.

[300] 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.
[301] 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.
[302] 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.
[303] 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.
[304] 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.
[305] 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.
[306] Bhandarkar AR, Arya N, Lin KK, et al. Building a Natural Language Processing Artificial Intelligence to Predict Suicide-Related Events Based on Patient Portal Message Data. Mayo Clin Proc Digit Health 2023;1:510–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mcpdig.2023.09.001.
[307] 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.
[308] 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.
[309] Kiani H, Hassan S, Genkins JZ, et al. Improving Emergency Department Visit Risk Prediction: Exploring the Operational Utility of Applied Patient Portal Messages. AMIA Annu Symp Proc 2024;2024:610–9.
[310] Sulieman L, Yin Z, Malin BA. Why Patient Portal Messages Indicate Risk of Readmission for Patients with Ischemic Heart Disease. AMIA Annu Symp Proc 2019;2019:828–37.
[311] 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.
[312] 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.
[313] Liu S, Wright AP, McCoy AB, et al. Detecting emergencies in patient portal messages using large language models and knowledge graph-based retrieval-augmented generation. J Am Med Inf Assoc 2025;32:1032–9. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocaf059.
[314] Kim J, Chen ML, Rezaei SJ, et al. Artificial intelligence tools in supporting healthcare professionals for tailored patient care. NPJ Digit Med 2025;8:210. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-025-01604-3.
[315] Chekuri A, Johal AS, Allen MR, et al. Towards Optimizing LLM Use in Healthcare: Identifying Patient Questions in MyChart Messages. AMIA Annu Symp Proc 2024;2024:232–41.
[316] Alsumait A, Deshmukh S, Wang C, et al. Triage of Patient Messages Sent to the Eye Clinic via the Electronic Medical Record: A Comparative Study on AI and Human Triage Performance. J Clin Med 2025;14. https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm14072395.
[317] Pham JH, Thongprayoon C, Miao J, et al. Large language model triaging of simulated

nephrology patient inbox messages. Front Artif Intell 2024;7:1452469. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2024.1452469.
[318] 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.
[319] 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.
[320] Tailor PD, Dalvin LA, Chen JJ, et al. A Comparative Study of Responses to Retina Questions from Either Experts, Expert-Edited Large Language Models, or Expert-Edited Large Language Models Alone. Ophthalmol Sci 2024;4:100485. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xops.2024.100485.
[321] Tailor PD, Xu TT, Fortes BH, et al. Appropriateness of Ophthalmology Recommendations From an Online Chat-Based Artificial Intelligence Model. Mayo Clin Proc Digit Health 2024;2:119–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mcpdig.2024.01.003.
[322] Proctor S, Lawton G, Sinha S. An AI-Powered Strategy for Managing Patient Messaging Load and Reducing Burnout. Appl Clin Inf 2025;16:747–52. https://doi.org/10.1055/a-2576-0579.
[323] 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.
[324] 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.
[325] 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.
[326] Athavale A, Baier J, Ross E, et al. The potential of chatbots in chronic venous disease patient management. JVS Vasc Insights 2023;1. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvsvi.2023.100019.
[327] Nov O, Singh N, Mann D. Putting ChatGPT's Medical Advice to the (Turing) Test: Survey Study. JMIR Med Educ 2023;9:e46939. https://doi.org/10.2196/46939.
[328] English E, Laughlin J, Sippel J, et al. Utility of Artificial Intelligence-Generative Draft Replies to Patient Messages. JAMA Netw Open 2024;7:e2438573. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.38573.
[329] 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.
[330] Robinson EJ, Qiu C, Sands S, et al. Physician vs. AI-generated messages in urology: evaluation of accuracy, completeness, and preference by patients and physicians. World J Urol 2024;43:48. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00345-024-05399-y.
[331] 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.
[332] Soroudi D, Gozali A, Knox JA, et al. Comparing Provider and ChatGPT Responses to Breast Reconstruction Patient Questions in the Electronic Health Record. Ann Plast Surg 2024;93:541–5. https://doi.org/10.1097/SAP.0000000000004090.
[333] Hao Y, Holmes J, Hobson J, et al. Retrospective Comparative Analysis of Prostate Cancer In-Basket Messages: Responses From Closed-Domain Large Language Models Versus Clinical Teams. Mayo Clin Proc Digit Health 2025;3. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mcpdig.2025.100198.
[334] Hong C, Chowdhury A, Sorrentino AD, et al. Application of unified health large language

model evaluation framework to In-Basket message replies: bridging qualitative and quantitative assessments. J Am Med Inf Assoc 2025. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocaf023.
[335] Kaur A, Budko A, Liu K, et al. Primary Care Providers Acceptance of Generative AI Responses to Patient Portal Messages. Appl Clin Inf 2025. https://doi.org/10.1055/a-2565-9155.
[336] Tse G, Zahedivash A, Anoshiravani A, et al. Large Language Model Responses to Adolescent Patient and Proxy Messages. JAMA Pediatr 2025;179:93–4. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2024.4438.
[337] Bootsma-Robroeks CMHHT, Workum JD, Schuit SCE, et al. AI-generated draft replies to patient messages: exploring effects of implementation. Front Digit Health 2025;7:1588143. https://doi.org/10.3389/fdgth.2025.1588143.
[338] ANDREADIS K, RODRIGUEZ DV, ZAKREUSKAYA A, et al. Bridging Gaps with Generative AI: Enhancing Hypertension Monitoring Through Patient and Provider Insights...Medical Informatics Europe (MIE) 34th Conference, August 25–29, 2024, Athens, Greece. Stud Health Technol Inform 2024;316:939–43. https://doi.org/10.3233/SHTI240565.
[339] 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.
[340] Kim J, Chen ML, Rezaei SJ, et al. Perspectives on Artificial Intelligence-Generated Responses to Patient Messages. JAMA Netw Open 2024;7:e2438535. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.38535.
[341] Luo M, Warren CJ, Cheng L, et al. Assessing Empathy in Large Language Models with Real-World Physician-Patient Interactions, 2024, p. 6510–9. https://doi.org/10.1109/BigData62323.2024.10825307.
[342] Liu S, Wright AP, Mccoy AB, et al. Using large language model to guide patients to create efficient and comprehensive clinical care message. J Am Med Inf Assoc 2024;31:1665–70. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocae142.
[343] Yan S, Knapp W, Leong A, et al. Prompt engineering on leveraging large language models in generating response to InBasket messages. J Am Med Inf Assoc 2024;31:2263–70. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocae172.
[344] 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.
[345] Lee NS, Richards N, Grandominico J, et al. Use of a Medical Communication Framework to Assess the Quality of Generative Artificial Intelligence Replies to Primary Care Patient Portal Messages: Content Analysis. JMIR Form Res 2025;9:e71966. https://doi.org/10.2196/71966.
[346] Biro JM, Handley JL, Malcolm McCurry J, et al. Opportunities and risks of artificial intelligence in patient portal messaging in primary care. NPJ Digit Med 2025;8:222. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-025-01586-2.
[347] Foresman G, Biro J, Tran A, et al. Patient Perspectives on Artificial Intelligence in Health Care: Focus Group Study for Diagnostic Communication and Tool Implementation. J Particip Med 2025;17:e69564. https://doi.org/10.2196/69564.
[348] 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.
[349] 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.
[350] 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.
[351] 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.
[352] 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.
[353] 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.
[354] 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.
[355] 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.
[356] 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.
[357] 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.
[358] 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.
[359] 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.
[360] Carter RR, Rothwell CD, Sieck CJ, et al. Assessing Mental Models from Communications: Patient, Family, and Care Team Messaging within the Hospital. Proc Hum Factors Ergon Soc Annu Meet 2019;63:653–7. https://doi.org/10.1177/1071181319631440.
[361] Meier-Diedrich E, Turvey C, Wördemann JM, et al. Patient-Health Care Professional Communication via a Secure Web-Based Portal in Severe Mental Health Conditions: Qualitative Analysis of Secure Messages. JMIR Form Res 2025;9:e63713. https://doi.org/10.2196/63713.
[362] Yin Z, Warner JL, Chen Q, et al. Patient Messaging Content Associated with Initiating Hormonal Therapy after a Breast Cancer Diagnosis. AMIA Annu Symp Proc 2019;2019:962–71.
[363] Heisey-Grove DM, DeShazo JP. Look Who's Talking: Application of a Theory-Based Taxonomy to Patient-Clinician E-mail Messages. Telemed J E Health 2020;26:1345–52. https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2019.0192.
[364] 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.
[365] Palmer SK, Shah A, Aryanpour Z, et al. Deep Inferior Epigastric Perforator In-Basket?

Evaluation of Patient Electronic Communication Following Autologous Breast Reconstruction. Aesthet Surg J 2025. https://doi.org/10.1093/asj/sjaf177.
[366] 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.
[367] 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.
[368] 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.
[369] 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.
[370] Kim J, Chen ML, Rezaei SJ, et al. Patient-Centered Research Through Artificial Intelligence to Identify Priorities in Cancer Care. JAMA Oncol 2025;11:630–5. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.2025.0694.
[371] ONC's Cures Act Final Rule | HealthIT.gov n.d. https://www.healthit.gov/topic/oncs-cures-act-final-rule (accessed November 6, 2024).
[372] 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.
[373] 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.
[374] 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.
[375] 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.
[376] 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.
[377] 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.
[378] 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.
[379] 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.
[380] 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 2023;14:296–9. https://doi.org/10.1055/a-2015-8679.
[381] Balyan R, Crossley SA, Brown W 3rd, et al. Using natural language processing and machine learning to classify health literacy from secure messages: The ECLIPPSE study.

PLoS One 2019;14:e0212488. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0212488.
[382] 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.
[383] 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.
[384] 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.
[385] 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.
[386] 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.
[387] Reynolds TL, Ali N, Zheng K. What Do Patients and Caregivers Want? A Systematic Review of User Suggestions to Improve Patient Portals n.d.
[388] 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.
[389] 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.
[390] 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.
[391] 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.
[392] 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.
[393] 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.
[394] Hu D, Guo Y, Cho HN, et al. When AI Writes Back: Ethical Considerations by Physicians on AI-Drafted Patient Message Replies 2025. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2508.13217.
[395] Reddy S. Generative AI in healthcare: an implementation science informed translational path on application, integration and governance. Implement Sci 2024;19:27. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-024-01357-9.
[396] Ren Y, Wu D, Khurana A, et al. Classification of Patient Portal Messages with BERT-based Language Models. 2023 IEEE 11th Int. Conf. Healthc. Inform. ICHI, Houston, TX, USA: IEEE; 2023, p. 176–82. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICHI57859.2023.00033.
[397] Van Buchem MM, De Hond AAH, Fanconi C, et al. Applying natural language processing to patient messages to identify depression concerns in cancer patients. J Am Med Inform Assoc 2024;31:2255–62. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocae188.
[398] 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.
[399] 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.