Patient-Reported Experience with Pediatric Urology Telemedicine Visits

During the COVID-19 Pandemic

Ogundipe, E.A., Caldwell, B., Leavitt, C., Monnet, K., Hedlind, M., Anderson, A., Colby, J., Sevick, C.J., Vemulakonda, V.M.

Pediatric Urology Research Enterprise (PURE), Children's Hospital Colorado,

Division of Urology, Department of Surgery, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, CO



Pediatric Urology Research Enterprise Enterprise Operations Clinical Investigator raining Program Research Project Support Program

Background

Division of Urology

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO ANSCHUTZ MEDICAL CAMPUS

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

- Telemedicine has had a slow integration into surgical subspecialties like urology.
- Little data exists on telemedicine's effect on urologic patient-provider rapport nor long term clinical outcomes.
- Pediatric urologists account for only 8.3% of all practicing urologists
- Understanding feasibility and barriers specific to pediatric urology is needed especially given the recent COVID-19 pandemic.
- The purpose of this study was to assess the feasibility and parent-reported experience with telemedicine visits in a tertiary pediatric urology practice.

Methods

- Parents/guardians of pediatric urology patients
 who were seen via telemedicine between
 March 12th October 30th, 2020, at Children's
 Hospital Colorado main campus and two
 satellite campus were contacted within 1 week
 of their child's telehealth visit and invited to
 take a brief telephone survey.
- A total of 4 yes/no questions were asked.
 Additionally, an open-ended question was asked to explore domains of the drawbacks and benefits to telemedicine in pediatric urology.
- Respondent/patient and visit characteristics were analyzed descriptively for differences in response to the satisfaction questions.
- Open-ended questions were analyzed using a team-based content analysis approach.

Table 2. Survey response to questions 1-4 broken down by patient characteristic.

| | | | Question 1 | | Question 2 | | Question 3 | | Question 4 | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------|------|------------|-------|------------|------|------------|------|
| Characteristic | | Total | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Total | | 100.0% (374/374) | 98.1% | 1.9% | 86.8% | 13.2% | 96.5% | 3.5% | 97.8% | 2.2% |
| Sex | Female | 39.3% (147/374) | 97.9% | 2.1% | 86.2% | 13.8% | 94.6% | 5.4% | 98.6% | 1.4% |
| | Male | 60.7% (227/374) | 98.2% | 1.8% | 87.2% | 12.8% | 97.8% | 2.2% | 97.4% | 2.69 |
| Provider Type | APP | 47.1% (176/374) | 97.2% | 2.8% | 86.9% | 13.1% | 94.9% | 5.1% | 97.7% | 2.39 |
| | MD | 52.4% (196/374) | 99.0% | 1.0% | 86.7% | 13.3% | 98.0% | 2.0% | 97.9% | 2.1 |
| | PhD | 0.5% (2/374) | 100.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0 |
| Insurance Type | Public | 36.7% (136/374) | 98.5% | 1.5% | 88.1% | 11.9% | 97.1% | 2.9% | 97.8% | 2.2 |
| | Private | 63.5% (235/374) | 97.9% | 2.1% | 86.7% | 13.3% | 96.2% | 3.8% | 97.8% | 2.2 |
| Site | Anschutz | 69.0% (258/374) | 98.1% | 1.9% | 82.5% | 17.5% | 95.3% | 4.7% | 97.6% | 2.4 |
| | cos | 16.6% (62/374) | 100.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 98.4% | 1.6% | 100.0% | 0.0 |
| | South | 14.4% (54/374) | 96.2% | 3.8% | 92.5% | 7.5% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 96.2% | 3.8 |
| | N | 374 | 365 | 7 | 323 | 49 | 361 | 13 | 362 | 8 |
| | N Miss | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Mean | 6 | 6 | 6.4 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.9 | 9.3 | 6 | 4.3 |
| Age at Visit | Std Dev | 6.5 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 10 | 6.6 | 5.2 |
| | Median | 4.0 | 4 | 5.1 | 4.2 | 1.6 | 4 | 6.8 | 4.1 | 2. |
| | Quartile Range | 8.1 | 8.1 | 11.5 | 7.9 | 8.9 | 8 | 8.2 | 8.1 | 6.7 |
| Distance from Site (Miles) | N | 374 | 365 | 7 | 323 | 49 | 361 | 13 | 362 | 8 |
| | N Miss | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Mean | 54.8 | 54.7 | 54.8 | 55.2 | 51.0 | 55.0 | 50.0 | 53.8 | 95. |
| | Std Dev | 88.9 | 89.4 | 52.6 | 91.9 | 65.4 | 89.3 | 80.3 | 88.9 | 100 |
| | Median | 22.1 | 21.7 | 45.5 | 22.4 | 22.4 | 24.0 | 13.3 | 21.7 | 44. |
| | Quartile Range | 47.9 | 47.8 | 46.5 | 47.9 | 44.9 | 47.9 | 26.1 | 47.8 | 160 |

Results

Table 3. Diagnosis categories and their frequency. For each patient, visit diagnosis at the time of telemedicine visit was sorted into one of 14 broad urologic diagnoses categories.

| Diagnosis Category | Frequency |
|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Anorectal | 2.6% (10/374) |
| Dysfunctional Voiding | 13.6% (51/374) |
| Genital Abnormality | 12.0% (45/374) |
| Hydronephrosis | 21.9% (82/374) |
| Kidney Condition | 2.4% (9/374) |
| Malignant Neoplasm | 1.0% (4/374) |
| Neurogenic Condition | 2.1% (8/374) |
| Testicular & Scrotal Conditions | 6.1% (23/374) |
| Urinary Tract Infection | 6.1% (23/374) |
| Urethral Abnormality | 3.7% (14/374) |
| Urinary Incontinence | 3.2% (12/374) |
| Urinary Tract Malformation | 11.8% (44/374) |
| Vesicoureteral Reflux | 8.2% (31/374) |
| Other | 5.3% (20/374) |

Table 4. Open ended responses categorized into one of five themes.

| Positive (63/172) | | Neutral | (99/172) | Negative (10/172) | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Great/Awesome/Excellent (26) I liked it/love it/happy with it (11) Worked well (10) Very helpful (5) As good or better than regular appointment Easy (2) Glad I did it (1) Good enough for COVID (1) Worthwhile (1) Fun (1) Child liked the appointment (1) Very organized (1) Very comfortable (1) | (2) | No drawbacks/no c Fine/Okay/ | | Did not like it (4) Not good at all/Not great (2) Not helpful (1) Difficult (1) Apprehensive (1) Too stressful (1) | | |
| Techn | ology | | | Clinical Ir | nteraction | |
| Positive (9/81) | ٨ | legative (72/81) | Positive (20/76) | | Negative (56/76) | |
| Easy to connect/set up (5) Did not require technical support (3) Was able to do it on a laptop (1) Difficult Difficul | | cult to set up/connect (43) all/poor internet connection (13) idio/video problems (9) Poor software (4) ulty with patient portal (2) ology was a distraction (1) | Answered questions/got needed information (11) Liked the physician (6) Eased our minds (1) Very personal (1) Did not feel rushed (1) | | Weird showing genitals/pictures online (15) Hard to do physical exam (12) Rushed (10) Provider didn't care/rude/didn't like provider (8) Not personal (7) Can't do necessary testing/imaging (2) Had more questions but couldn't ask due to time (2) | |
| Logis | | Visit Preference | | | | |
| Positive (207/251) | N | egative (44/251) | Positive (39/74 | 1) | Negative (35/74) | |
| Didn't have to drive/travel (44) Easy (37) Nice to do it from home (35) Fast/efficient (12) Convenient (12) Didn't have to be exposed to COVID (12) Didn't have to worry about other kids in the office (7) Didn't have to get a babysitter (6) Telehealth appointment availability was better than inperson/allowed to see doctor despite COVID (6) Safe (5) Convenient for fast appoint/lab or test result (5) No parking (5) Pre-call was helpful (5) Didn't have to travel with newborn (4) Kids could be more relaxed at home (2) Easier with special needs kids (2) No waiting (2) Better than expected (2) Didn't have to go into the hospital (2) Had more time than a regular appointment (1) Both parents could be present despite work (1) | Too ma Not sure how Needed babys Not sure Need a noti Not Would have Financia Diffi Hard t Needed forms pi Poor Doe Would like | Didn't get pre-call (8) ny moving parts/complex (7) v-to follow-up/get school notes (6) sitter for other kids/hard to manage other kids at home (4) how to schedule surgery (3) see about whether provider is on time/present/late (2) as easy as expected (2) Hard to schedule (2) e been better with older kids (1) il concerns related to visit (1) scult to review history (1) o get kids to cooperate (1) rior to appointment and didn't receive them (1) ancillary support/staff (1) sen't seem as private (1) set to cluster appointments (1) about type of appointment (1) Too quick (1) | Would do it again/prefer this type of visit (30) Wouldn't mind doing it again (5) Have done it in past and prefer it (2) Please keep this going (1) This is a great plan (1) | | Like in person/face to face/personal visits better (23) Okay for follow-up but need in person once a year (6) Kid would do better in person (1) Logistics are better in person (1) Didn't feel right (1) Not sure if I would do it again (1) Would not see them same doctor again (1) Never doing it again (1) | |

Overall Experience

Table 1. Survey questions administered to parents/guardians whose child was seen via telemedicine for their appointment.

| Survey Questions | | | | | |
|------------------------|--|---------------|--|--|--|
| Question 1 (Yes/No) | Was your "MyChart E-Check-in" call the day prior to your Telemedicine appointment helpful? | "Eggsibility" | | | |
| Question 2 (Yes/No) | Was your Telemedicine "Technical Call" 30 minutes prior to your appointment helpful? | "Feasibility" | | | |
| Question 3 (Yes/No) | By the conclusion of your Telemedicine appointment were all your questions answered by the provider? | | | | |
| Question 4 (Yes/No) | Would you be comfortable using Telemedicine again for future appointments? | "Experience" | | | |
| Open ended | Were there any benefits or drawbacks from your Telemedicine appointment? | | | | |

Conclusions

- Overall, parents reported telemedicine to be an acceptable alternative to in-person visits and demonstrated a willingness to continue to use it in the future.
- Parents noted that pediatric urology offers unique challenges due to its personal and sensitive treatment, including the need to evaluate the genitalia.
- As the role of telemedicine continues to expand, consideration of these challenges is needed to ensure that pediatric urology patients and their parents are comfortable with this approach.