

Virtual Visits in Cardiac Electrophysiology: Patient and Physician Preference

55

Peter Hu, Henry Hilow, Divyang Patel, Megan Eppich, Khaldoun Tarakji

Cleveland Clinic

Type of submitter

Fellow in Training

Abstract

Background: Cardiologists have long utilized devices to follow patients with arrhythmias in order to guide management. Virtual visits have been adopted as one modality to follow-up established patients with arrhythmias. Factors contributing to patient and physician preferences with virtual visits are unknown. To our knowledge, there are no prior studies that have collected objective feedback from patients and physicians after virtual visits.

Objectives: To determine patient and physician experience with virtual visits in Cardiac

Electrophysiology.

Methods: We performed a prospective survey of patients and physicians who participated in a virtual visit in the Department of Cardiac Electrophysiology at the Cleveland Clinic from December, 2018 and July, 2019. All established patients in the Department of Cardiac Electrophysiology at the Cleveland Clinic who had a virtual visit were invited to partake in our survey. A constructed, standardized phone script and patient survey questionnaire of 15 questions was implemented for each patient. In addition, for each virtual visit encounter the cardiac electrophysiologist who performed the virtual visit was also invited to participate in a separate physician survey.

Results: 100 patient and physician virtual visit encounters were included. The average age of patients who participated in a virtual visit was 65 years old. 70% were male and 30% were female. The average distance patients participated in their virtual visit was 656 miles. Of the 100 patients who participated in a virtual visit, 64 elected to complete a survey, 10 patients declined, 17 patients were unable to be reached on follow-up, and 9 patients were not included due to technical difficulties. Of those who responded, 51 patients participated in their first virtual visit, 4 participated in their second virtual visit, and 8 participated in their third or more virtual visit. 38/64 (59.4%) of patients preferred a virtual visit for their next visit, 12/64 (18.8%) preferred an in office visit, 13/64 (20.3%) responded that their decision for a virtual or office visit depended on their specific needs, 1/64 (1.6%) did not have a preference. A total of 14 cardiac electrophysiologists participated in 100 virtual visits. 9/100 visits were not included due to technical error and inability to complete the virtual visit. Of the 91 virtual visits by physicians, 62/91(68.1%) preferred a virtual visit for their next visit, 7/91 (7.7%) preferred an in office visit, 10/91 (11.0%) responded that their decision for a virtual or office visit depended on the indication

for follow-up, 6/91 (6.6%) did not have a preference, and 6/91 (6.6%) did not indicate their preference for their next visit.

Conclusions: Both patients and physicians showed favorable responses to virtual visits, with a majority of patients and physicians preferring a virtual visit over an in-office visit for their next encounter. Factors such as convenience, cost, feasibility, and reason for follow-up were important determinants that affected both patient and physician preference.

Categories

3rd year Fellow: Research

Program/Institution Name

Cleveland Clinic Foundation