Is an online automated clinical care pathway for people with genital chlamydia within an eSexual Health Clinic feasible and acceptable?
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Background

• Reported diagnoses of chlamydia in England remain high <25 years
• UK health strategy supports self- and internet-based care
• eHealth could widen access but also health inequality – The Digital Divide

“……if we are to embrace the potential for technology to shift power to patients, we need patients to be willing and able to harness that technology. Digital inclusion is as vital in healthcare as everywhere else - not least because some of the greatest impacts of new technology in health is with the most vulnerable patients.”

Making healthcare more human-centred and fit for patient-centred Rt Hon Jeremy Hunt 15.7.15

Background

• Young people are avid users of technology (>80% UK under 25s own smartphone)
• Evidence from qualitative study in target population (Fuller SS et al. 2013) suggests smartphone enabled online STI care acceptable
• We developed UK’s first automated, online chlamydia management pathway within an eSexual Health Clinic, compliant with regulatory, professional and prescribing guidance and public health data requirements (P12.82: Gibbs J et al)
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Aim

- to explore acceptability, feasibility & safety online chlamydia management pathway within an eSexual Health Clinic in people tested for genital chlamydia.

Specific Objectives

- demonstrate proof of concept (NHS first)
- determine preliminary evidence of effectiveness

Methods 1

- **Design:** non-randomised, exploratory study
- **Participants:**
  a) chlamydia positive untreated Genitourinary Medicine (GUM) clinic attenders
  b) chlamydia positive untreated people tested through National Chlamydia Screening Programme (NCSP) online postal testing: 21.07.14 - 13.3.15
- **Exclusions:** under 16yrs; co-existing STIs, no mobile phone, extra-genital chlamydia

Methods 2

- **Intervention:** eligible people were sent an SMS message with a link to access their results from eSHC via a password protected web-app. Having consented online, they followed the automated Chlamydia-OCCP. Those who declined received routine care.
- **Evaluation:** treatment rate (primary outcome); time to-, method and safety of treatment; PN outcomes; engagement with clinical helpline, acceptability, costs.
- **Analysis:** descriptive statistics analysed using Microsoft Excel and Stata v13
Ascertainment of Outcomes

Primary Outcome, proportion of index patients treated:
1. index collected pack from pharmacy
2. index reported treatment at 2 week follow up call
3. Clinical helpline logs
4. GUM Clinic & NCSP records

Secondary outcomes: time to treatment, method and safety of treatment, PN outcomes:
• online log
• 2 week follow up call

Participant characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n=221</th>
<th>GUM (n=116)</th>
<th>NCSP (n=105)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median age (yr)</td>
<td>25 (23-29)</td>
<td>22 (20-23)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: F</td>
<td>74 (64%)</td>
<td>69 (65%)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>(n=104)</td>
<td>(n=95)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>37 (36%)</td>
<td>67 (71%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>29 (28%)</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Mixed/Other</td>
<td>21 (20%)</td>
<td>12 (13%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners 0/1</td>
<td>20 (24%)</td>
<td>21 (30%)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>54 (65%)</td>
<td>42 (59%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>31 (27%)</td>
<td>5 (11%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Ct</td>
<td>30 (24%)</td>
<td>27 (26%)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Index Outcome: Proportion index patients treated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n=221</th>
<th>GUM (n=116)</th>
<th>NCSP (n=105)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index treated</td>
<td>205 (93%)</td>
<td>112 (97%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where treated
- Remotely without Helpline
- Remotely with Helpline
- GUM, GP etc

Flow of index patients through study

Eligible patients (n=343)
Accessed results within 7 days (n=295; 86%)
Consented (n=221; 75%)

Flow of index patients through study

Eligible patients (n=343)
Accessed results by 7 days (n=295; 86%)
Consented (n=221; 75%)
Completed consultation & treatment authorised (n=151; 68%)
Collected treatment from pharmacy (n=134; 95%)

Time to access results
- same day: 96%
- end following day: 98%
- all (consented) accessed results within 5 days
Time to treatment participants Rx online

Days to treatment

Partner notification

154 index patients
482 sexual partners
28 accessed online care
20 treated via online pathway

Participants who did not complete online consultation: reasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Total (n=70)</th>
<th>Men (n=14)</th>
<th>Women (n=56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration (post-consent)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptoms</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soya or peanut allergy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed consultation but didn’t choose pharmacy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants who did not complete online consultation: outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Total (n=70)</th>
<th>Men (n=14)</th>
<th>Female (n=56)</th>
<th>GUM (n=34)</th>
<th>NCSP (n=36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Known to be treated</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants who did not complete online consultation: outcomes

13 patients with unknown treatment outcomes:
- 11 symptomatic
- 9 had contact with the clinical helpline
- 6 were actively directed into GUM or to GP

User satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you recommend online clinic to your friends? (n=153)</th>
<th>Overall, how would you rate the online care you received (n=99)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

✓ Demonstrated possible to manage people with a positive chlamydia test effectively online - proof of concept
✓ Preliminary evidence of effectiveness – outcomes equivalent (or >) to direct clinical contact
✓ High user acceptability

Conclusions

• Chlamydia online clinical care pathway offers a safe, rapid, effective, regulation-compliant & user friendly alternative to face to face care alongside specialist services
• Addresses some barriers to accessing care
• Implemented over wide geographical areas
• Speed of treatment (in context of NCSP 6 week guidance)
  Potential for completely remote testing, diagnosis and management with STI home-tests

Conclusions

• NHS structural hurdles remain:

  "In conclusion, good progress has been made in the last twelve months, but the digital health agenda remains an ambition rather than a reality." Digitising the NHS by 2018 - One Year On techUK report / March 2014

• Full scale trial, disparities & digital divide
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