



Deposited via The University of York.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/166050/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Serhal, Eva, Iwajomo, Tomisin, de Oliveira, Claire et al. (2020) Characterizing Family Physicians Who Refer to Telepsychiatry in Ontario. *Canadian journal of psychiatry-Revue canadienne de psychiatrie*. p. 706743720954061. ISSN: 0706-7437

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0706743720954061>

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



## Characterizing Family Physicians Who Refer to Telepsychiatry in Ontario

Journal:	<i>The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry/La Revue canadienne de psychiatrie</i>
Manuscript ID	CJP-2020-122-OR.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	26-Jun-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Serhal, Eva; Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, ; University of Toronto, Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation Iwajomo, Tomisin; Centre for Addiction and Mental Health de Oliveira, Claire; University of York, Hull York Medical School/Centre for Health Economics; Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, Institute for Mental Health Policy Research Crawford, Allison; Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, Northern Psychiatric Outreach Program and Telepsychiatry; University of Toronto, Psychiatry Kurdyak, Paul; Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, General Psychiatry
Key Words:	Telepsychiatry, Primary care, Telehealth, Family Physician, Adult Psychiatry, Telemedicine, Virtual Care, referral, Telemental Health
Abstract:	<p><b>Objectives:</b> Telepsychiatry can improve access to psychiatric services for those who otherwise cannot easily access care. Family physicians are gatekeepers to specialized care in Ontario, so it is essential to understand predictors relating to referrals to telepsychiatry to better plan services and increase telepsychiatry adoption.</p> <p><b>Methods:</b> This study used an annual retrospective cross-sectional study design to compare physicians who referred their patients to telepsychiatry each year from fiscal year (FY) 2008 to FY 2016. A one year (FY 2016) comparison of family physicians who referred to telepsychiatry compared to family physicians who did not refer to telepsychiatry matched (1:2) by region was also conducted. Finally, we used statistical modelling to understand the predictors of referring to telepsychiatry among physicians.</p> <p><b>Results:</b> Between FY 2008 to FY 2016, telepsychiatry visits increased from 925 visits to 13,825 visits. Thirty-two percent of Ontario primary care physicians referred to telepsychiatry in 2017. Several characteristics were notably different between family physicians who refer to telepsychiatry (FPTs) and family physicians who do not refer to telepsychiatry (FPNTs): FPTs were more likely to be from a residence with less than 10,000 people, to have more nurse practitioners in the</p>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

	<p>practice, and to be from a family health team than FPNTs. Rostered patients of FPTs were more likely to reside in rural areas, have more clinical complexity, and to utilize more mental health services compared to FPNTs.</p> <p>Conclusions: There has been an increase in the use of telepsychiatry by patients and family physicians over the study period and family physicians that are live in a rural area, are part of a FHT, have more NPs, with more patients in rural areas with high needs for mental health services are more likely to refer to telepsychiatry.</p>

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## CHARACTERIZING FAMILY PHYSICIANS WHO REFER TO TELEPSYCHIATRY IN ONTARIO

### Authors:

Eva Serhal<sup>1,2</sup>, Tomisin Iwajomo<sup>1,3</sup>, Claire de Oliveira<sup>1-3</sup>, Allison Crawford<sup>1,4</sup>, Paul

Kurdyak<sup>1-3</sup>

### Affiliations

1. The Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, Toronto, Ontario
2. The Institute for Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario
3. ICES, Toronto, Ontario
4. Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario

### Corresponding Author:

Eva Serhal, MBA, PhD  
Director, Virtual Mental Health and Outreach & ECHO Ontario  
Centre for Addiction and Mental Health  
821-250 College Street, Toronto, Ontario  
M5T1R8

## **Abstract**

### ***Introduction***

Telepsychiatry can improve access to psychiatric services for those who otherwise cannot easily access care. Family physicians are gatekeepers to specialized care in Ontario, so it is essential to understand predictors relating to referrals to telepsychiatry to better plan services and increase telepsychiatry adoption.

### ***Methods***

This study used an annual retrospective cross-sectional study design to compare physicians who referred their patients to telepsychiatry each year from fiscal year (FY) 2008 to FY 2016. A one year (FY 2016) comparison of family physicians who referred to telepsychiatry compared to family physicians who did not refer to telepsychiatry matched (1:2) by region was also conducted. Finally, we used statistical modelling to understand the predictors of referring to telepsychiatry among physicians.

### ***Results***

Between FY 2008 to FY 2016, telepsychiatry visits increased from 925 visits to 13,825 visits. Thirty-two percent of Ontario primary care physicians referred to telepsychiatry in 2017. Several characteristics were notably different between family physicians who refer to telepsychiatry (FPTs) and family physicians who do not refer to telepsychiatry (FPNTs): FPTs were more likely to be from a residence with less than 10,000 people, to have more nurse practitioners in the practice, and to be from a family health team than

1  
2  
3 FPNTs. Rostered patients of FPTs were more likely to reside in rural areas, have more  
4  
5 clinical complexity, and to utilize more mental health services compared to FPNTs.  
6  
7

### 8 ***Conclusion***

9  
10  
11  
12 There has been an increase in the use of telepsychiatry by patients and family  
13  
14 physicians over the study period, although there remains opportunity for significant  
15  
16 growth. Family physicians that live in rural areas, are part of a FHT, have more NPs,  
17  
18 with more rural and complex patients were more likely to refer to telepsychiatry. As  
19  
20 recent pro-telemedicine policies support the growth of telepsychiatry, this study will  
21  
22 serve as an important baseline.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Introduction

Mental illness is among the world's leading causes of sickness and disability; one in five Canadians (two million Ontarians) and one in four people internationally will experience mental illness or addiction.<sup>1-3</sup> However, only one-third of Ontario patients reported having their mental health needs met or partially met within primary care.<sup>1</sup> Patients from lower-income countries and socially disadvantaged groups had lower rates of mental health service utilization.<sup>4-6</sup> Access to quality mental health services is often limited due to rurality, physician shortages and variation in the availability of mental health services.<sup>1,5,7-10</sup>

Telepsychiatry, the delivery of psychiatry via secure videoconferencing, can reduce access barriers such as distance, cost of travel, weather, and workforce shortages.<sup>11-17</sup> In particular, telepsychiatry can provide access to patients who otherwise are not able to easily access services, potentially reducing unnecessary hospitalizations and ED visits.<sup>18,19</sup> Several studies have deemed telepsychiatry effective for various mental health conditions and populations.<sup>20-24</sup> Telemedicine has been shown to reduce isolation and increase the morale of rural primary care practitioners.<sup>25,26</sup> While there is significant potential for telepsychiatry to connect patients to psychiatrists throughout Ontario, recent evidence has shown minimal adoption by patients.<sup>27</sup> In Ontario during the time of this study, in order to deliver and bill for telepsychiatry, psychiatrists were typically required to use a centralized government funded telemedicine platform and patients were typically required to access their telepsychiatry visit at a patient host site

1  
2  
3 (a clinical site that connects to the centralized provincial network). It is important to note  
4  
5 that at the time this paper was submitted temporary policy changes to virtual care as a  
6  
7 result of Covid-19 (introduced March 2020) have created more options for home-based  
8  
9 care for patients, and have allowed physicians to deliver virtual care via a variety of  
10  
11 virtual platforms. These recent changes will be discussed in relation to study findings  
12  
13 in the discussion section.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 Family physicians are the gatekeepers to specialist care in Canada and other parts of  
20  
21 the world.<sup>28,29</sup> Common reasons for family physician referral to psychiatry include  
22  
23 obtaining medication recommendations, obtaining second opinions, or non-  
24  
25 pharmacological treatment recommendations.<sup>30</sup> Evidence shows providers who are  
26  
27 more isolated had more positive feelings about telemedicine.<sup>25</sup> Positive perceptions of  
28  
29 telemedicine included convenience, perceived patient benefits, reduced wait time, cost-  
30  
31 effectiveness, and access to medical expertise, while negative aspects included cost,  
32  
33 reduced funding for in-person services, inconvenience, inadequate reimbursement and  
34  
35 training, medical liability, and physician fear of practice change.<sup>25,31-34</sup> Previous studies  
36  
37 suggest nurses may be more enthusiastic about telemedicine than physicians, referring  
38  
39 physicians tend to be more satisfied than specialists, satisfaction increases relative to  
40  
41 use and time, and that providers do not recommend telemedicine in all  
42  
43 circumstances.<sup>29,35,36</sup> The objective of this study was to examine the characteristics of  
44  
45 family physicians in Ontario who have referred patients to telepsychiatry (FPTs)  
46  
47 compared to family physicians who have not referred to telepsychiatry (FPNTs) from FY  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 2008 to FY 2016, in order to understand if there are specific factors that make certain  
4  
5 family physicians more likely to refer than others.  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 **Methods**

### 13 ***Setting and Study Design***

16  
17 We conducted an annual retrospective cross-sectional study assessing descriptive  
18 characteristics of FPTs for FYs (2008 to 2016); this time horizon was used because it  
19 includes data from when the Ontario Health Insurance Plan (OHIP) physician fee  
20 schedule telemedicine codes were introduced until the most recent data available from  
21 ICES. Referring physician and patient information were ascertained using the OHIP  
22 claims database; if referral information was not available, we looked back within the  
23 past 12 months to identify the most frequently seen family physician and, if not  
24 available, the most recently seen family physician. These data were linked to  
25 population-level health administrative databases held at ICES. Additionally, a one year  
26 (FY2016) comparison of FPTs vs FPNTs matched (1:2) by the 14 Local Health  
27 Integration Networks (LHIN). LHINs are artificially divided regions of Ontario which were  
28 designed to support local approaches to strategic planning, funding and regional  
29 coordination of clinical care, and are used in administrative data to classify provincial  
30 regions. This study was approved by the Research Ethics Board of Sunnybrook Health  
31 Sciences Centre, Toronto.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### ***Data Sources***

This study used province-wide health administrative databases that were linked using unique encoded identifiers and analyzed at ICES. OHIP data were used to collect family physician details, including physician number, fee code, service date, and location of service provided, and patient information, including patient ID, diagnosis, service date, and location. The National Ambulatory Care Reporting System was used to collect data on emergency department visits. The Ontario Mental Health Reporting System was used to obtain information on psychiatric hospitalizations. The ICES Physician Database and the Primary Care Population database were used to analyze data on primary care providers and teams, including the number of years since medical school graduation, years of practice since graduation, provider type, interprofessional team details, and total physicians per practice. The Client Agency Program Enrolment database was used to analyze data on physician practice type (defined as patient enrollment type). The Ontario Census Area Profiles and the Registered Persons Database were used to analyze patient-level demographic variables (such as age, sex, the region of residence), as well as geographic details (rurality, income quintiles). Primary care providers who had missing age or sex data, and patients with missing health card numbers, missing age or missing sex were excluded from the analysis.

### ***Provider Characteristics***

We selected primary care provider characteristics based on two things: availability within the ICES dataset, and previous literature within the field that assessed predictors

1  
2  
3 using these measures.<sup>34</sup> The primary care provider characteristics used to compare  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

FPTs vs FPNTs included age group, sex, number of years since medical school graduation, years of practice since graduation, rurality of residence, physician practice type (Family Health Team<sup>1</sup> or other), average number of nurse practitioners within the practice, and average number of social workers within the practice.

### ***Patient Characteristics***

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

We examined patient demographic and service utilization characteristics for patients rostered within each physician group (FPT vs FPNT). Patient demographic characteristics included age, sex, neighbourhood income quintile (NIQ) (NIQ 1= 0-20%, NIQ 2= 20-40%, NIQ 3= 40-60%, NIQ 4= 60-80%, NIQ 5= 80%+), and whether they live in a rural or urban area. Patient utilization and medical complexity were considered within each annual cross-section by assessing: number of primary care provider visits (total, mental health and non-mental health); number of emergency department visits (total, mental health and non-mental health-related); number of hospitalizations (total, mental health and non-mental health-related); and comorbidities using the Johns Hopkins' Aggregated Diagnosis Groups (ADG). Mental health primary care visits were defined using a validated algorithm to identify adults accessing care for a mental health disorder, which included adult mental health diagnostic codes 295-298, 300-304, 306, 309, 311, 897-902, 904, 905 (which represents a broad range of adult mental health

---

51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

<sup>1</sup> Family health teams are different from many primary care practices because they are funded to include an interprofessional team within the practice, and are also paid via a blended capitation model (where physicians are paid primarily through capitation fees based on a defined basket of services delivered to enrolled patients) or a salary model).<sup>163</sup>

1  
2  
3 and addiction diagnoses as defined by the International Classification of Diseases 10  
4 (ICD-10-CA).<sup>37</sup> Hospitalizations and ED visits included ICD-10-CA codes F04-F99  
5  
6 (which excludes dementia). The Johns Hopkins ADG's are categorized based on five  
7  
8 clinical dimensions, including the duration, the severity, the etiology, the diagnostic  
9  
10 certainty and the specialty care involvement of the condition.<sup>38</sup>  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

## 16 ***Analysis***

### 17 *Descriptive Analysis*

#### 18 Annual Outputs and Trends over Time

19 Annual panels containing physician and patient characteristics were described,  
20  
21 including counts, column percentages, and means with standard deviations.  
22  
23

24 Additionally, changes over time were evaluated for each of the physician characteristics.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

#### 30 Matched Physician Comparison

31  
32 Matched comparisons between FTPs and FTNPs were presented as counts, column  
33  
34 percentages, and standardized mean differences (SMD). We compared between-group  
35  
36 differences using the standard mean difference (SMD). Cohen (1988) suggests a small  
37  
38 effect size is equal to 0.2 SMD, but recent studies suggest that a more prudent  
39  
40 threshold for assessing effect size is 0.1 SMD, especially with large data sets.<sup>39,40</sup> Using  
41  
42 this threshold (0.1 SMD), this study identifies significant differences between groups.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 The model covariates included physician age (categorical; <34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64,  
52  
53 64+), sex (Male/Female), number of years after graduation (categorical; 1-10, 11-20,  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

9

1  
2  
3 21-30, 31-40, 41+ years), rural residence (living in community with less than 10,000  
4 people- Yes/No), total nurse practitioner on the team (continuous), total social workers  
5 on the team (continuous), if the family physician is a Canadian Medical Graduate  
6 (Yes/No), the physician practice type (FHT/Other), patient age (categorical; 0-10, 11-20,  
7 21-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, 61-70, 71-80, 81+ years), patient sex (Male/Female),  
8 patient NIQ (categorical; 1-5), if the FP has more patients in low NIQ areas (Yes/No),  
9 patient residence (Urban/Rural), if the FP has more urban patients than rural (Yes/No),  
10 if the FP has more patients with at least one psychosocial ADG (Yes/No), patient region  
11 (categorical; LHIN1-14), total number of ED visits (categorical; 0-59, 60-156, 157-257,  
12 258-414, 415+), total number of mental health ED visits (categorical; 0-3, 4-9, 10-19,  
13 20+ visits), total hospitalizations (categorical; 0, 1-2, 3-5, 6-10, 11+), total mental health  
14 hospitalizations (categorical; 0, 1-2, 3-5, 6-10, 11+), total primary care visits  
15 (categorical; 0-59, 60-156, 157-257, 258-414, 415+) and total mental health primary  
16 care provider visits (categorical; 0-59, 60-156, 157-257, 258-414, 415+).

### 36 Statistical Analysis

37  
38 We used statistical modeling to understand the predictors of referring to telepsychiatry  
39 among physicians. We used GEE for the statistical model, as it accounts for patient  
40 clustering at the provider level.<sup>41</sup> All analyses were carried out using SAS version 9.4  
41 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC). All results were presented as adjusted odds ratios (ORs) with  
42 corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

## 52 **Results**

### ***Descriptive analysis of FTPs***

In FY 2016, there were 13,290 family physicians in Ontario; this analysis includes a subset of those family physicians who have referred to telepsychiatry.<sup>42</sup>

#### ***Increase in Patients Accessing and Family Physicians Referring to Telepsychiatry***

The number of patients receiving telepsychiatry increased from 925 patients in FY 2008 to 13,825 patients in FY 2016, which represents approximately a fifteen-fold increase (see Table 1). There was substantial growth in the number of FPTs from 474 to 4,224, which represents a nine-fold increase from FY 2008 to FY 2016 (see Table 1). Of all physicians in Ontario, 32% referred to telepsychiatry in FY 2016 (4224/13290). Less than 1% of total patients rostered to FPTs had a telepsychiatry visit in FY 2018 (n= 12,449/3,513,638). [Insert Figure 1]

#### ***Physician Rurality***

In FY 2008, the percentage of total telepsychiatry visits was highest in the North East LHIN (20%, n = 94), followed by the North West LHIN (16%, n = 74) (Ontario's most northern regions), followed by the South West LHIN (15%, n = 70). In FY 2016, those numbers shifted so the highest percentage of telepsychiatry referrals came from family physicians in regions such as Hamilton Niagara Haldimand Brant (10%, n = 433), Central East (10%, n = 421), and Toronto Central (10%, n = 420) LHINs, with the Central (n = 393) and North East (n = 379) LHIN's family physicians referring 9% each. All LHINs ranged between 4-10% of total telepsychiatry delivery in FY 2016, compared

1  
2  
3 to FY 2008, where the range spread from 0% (in Mississauga Halton LHIN) to 20% (in  
4 the North East LHIN). This shows a more evenly distributed adoption of telepsychiatry  
5 from northern regions to all regions of Ontario, many of which still have highly rural and  
6 remote communities. [Insert Figure 2]  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

## 16 **Comparative Analysis**

### 17 *Family Physician Characteristics*

18  
19  
20  
21  
22 A larger percentage of FPTs were male, compared to FPNTs (59.6% (n = 2427) vs.  
23 53.1% (n = 4075), SD = 0.13). A greater percentage of FPTs were from communities  
24 with a population that had less than 10,000 people (14.9% (n = 608) vs. 8.2% (n = 633),  
25 SMD = 0.21). FPTs had a larger mean number of nurse practitioners and FPNTs (1.71  
26 (+/- 4.02) vs. 1.10 (+/- 3.70), SMD = 0.16), finally, a greater percentage of FPTs  
27 belonged to FHTs than FPNTs (28.1% (n = 1145) vs. 18% (n = 1381), SMD = 0.24).  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 [Insert Table 1]  
37  
38

### 39 *Comparing Patient Roster Characteristics*

40  
41  
42 There were a few notable differences in patient roster characteristics between FPTs and  
43 FPNTs. FPTs had a larger mean number of attached patients than FPNTs (862.45 (+/-  
44 668.36) vs. 788.97 (+/- 605.70), SMD = 0.15). A greater percentage of FPTs had  
45 patients on their roster from lower NIQ's than FPNTs (1-3) (77.7% (n = 3167) vs. 69.8%  
46 (n = 5353), SMD = 0.18). FPTs had a larger mean number of patients from a rural  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 257, and 415+ visits. FPTs had a lower percentage of patients with 60-156 ED visits  
4 than FPNTs (9.5% (n = 387) vs. 17.2% (n = 1320), SMD = 0.23) and patients with 157-  
5  
6 257 visits (12.0% (n = 489) vs. 19.5% (n = 1495), SMD = 0.21). FPTs has a greater  
7  
8 percentage of patients with 415+ ED visits compared to FPNTs (45.6% (n = 1857) vs.  
9  
10 16.7% (n = 1285), SMD = 0.48).  
11  
12  
13

14  
15  
16  
17 FPTs had a larger mean number of MHED visits for rostered patients compared to  
18  
19 FPNTs (18.99 (+/- 29.07) vs. 10.91 (+/- 13.07), SMD = 0.36). Full details within each  
20  
21 category are in Table 1, but the most notable difference was the group that had 0-3 and  
22  
23 20+ MHED visits. FPTs had a lower percentage of patients with 0-3 MHED visits than  
24  
25 FPNTs (16.7% (n = 681) vs. 27.5% (n = 2108), SMD = 0.26) and a higher percentage of  
26  
27 patients with 20+ MHED visits than FPNTs (30.9% (n = 1258) vs. 14.1% (n = 1084),  
28  
29 SMD = 0.41).  
30  
31  
32

33  
34  
35 FPTs had a greater mean of hospitalizations compared to FPNTs (57.05 (+/-47.43) vs.  
36  
37 10.91 (+/-13.07), SMD = 0.36). Full details within each category are in Table 1, but the  
38  
39 most notable difference was that FPTs had a larger percentage of patients with 11+  
40  
41 hospitalizations, compared to FPNTs (85.7% (n = 3491) vs. 78.8% (n = 6044), SMD =  
42  
43 0.18). Of those hospitalizations, mental health specific hospitalizations (MHH) were  
44  
45 measured. FPTs had a greater mean of MHH visits compared to FPNTs (7.01 (+/-13.61)  
46  
47 vs. 3.86 (+/-5.43), SMD = 0.36). The most striking differences were the groups that had  
48  
49 zero visits and those with 11+ visits. FPTs had a lower percentage of patients with zero  
50  
51 MHH visits compared to FPNTs (13.4% (n = 545) vs. 21.9% (n = 1679), SMD = 0.22).  
52  
53  
54

1  
2  
3 FPTs had a higher percentage of patients with 11+ MHH visits compared to FPNTs  
4  
5 (17.8% (n = 725) vs. 6.8% (n = 518), SMD = 0.34).  
6  
7

## 8 **Statistical Modeling**

### 9 *Regression using Generalized Estimating Equations*

10  
11  
12 A full description of the findings is listed in Table 2. Within this model, a number of  
13  
14  
15 significant correlates of FPTs were identified, including physician age group of 55-64  
16  
17 (OR=0.85, CI=0.74-0.97), physician age group of 64+ (OR=0.85, CI=0.62-0.85), and  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
FPTs were more likely to be located in rural areas (OR=1.38, CI=1.17-1.62). Compared  
to patient rosters of FPNTs, FPT rostered patients were: almost half as likely to be  
urban (OR=0.55, CI=0.43-.70), more likely to have psychiatric ADGs (OR=1.2, CI=0.86-  
1.66), and more likely to have 4-9 mental health ED (MHED) visits (OR=1.33, CI=1.03-  
1.72), patients with 10-19 MHED visits (OR=1.54 CI=1.14-2.07), patients with 20+  
MHED visits (OR=2.17, CI=1.60-2.94), patients with 3-5 MHH (OR=1.21, CI=1.08-1.35),  
patients with 6-10 MHH (OR=1.32, CI=1.15-1.51), patients with 11+ MHH (OR=1.77,  
CI=1.28-2.43), patients with 157-257 mental health primary care (MHPC) visits  
(OR=1.24, CI=1.00-1.54), patients with 258-414 MHPC visits (OR=1.38 CI=1.09-1.76),  
patients with 415+ MHPC visits (OR=1.61, CI=01.33-1.94). [Insert Table 2].

## 50 **Discussion**

51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
To our knowledge, this is the first study that investigates trends and predictors of family  
physicians referring to telepsychiatry at a system-level. Between FY 2008 and FY 2016,

1  
2  
3 there was a 9-fold increase in the number of primary care physicians referring to  
4 telepsychiatry and a nearly 15-fold increase in the number of primary care patients  
5 referred to telepsychiatry. 32% of family physicians referred to telepsychiatry, while less  
6 than 1% of patients rostered to FPTs utilized telepsychiatry. While patient adoption of  
7 telepsychiatry continued to increase in Ontario during the study period, it still represents  
8 a very small percentage of patients in Ontario. These visits represent, for the most part,  
9 patients that were required to go to a healthcare site to access care and psychiatrists  
10 that are required to use the provincial telemedicine platform. It is evident that there  
11 remains a large opportunity to increase patient adoption. As discussed in the  
12 introduction, it is likely that the recent Covid-19 related temporary policy changes to  
13 virtual care will present an opportunity for significant growth and adoption of  
14 telepsychiatry. This study provides an essential benchmark for future analyses,  
15 comparing how these policy changes have shifted adoption patterns with patients and  
16 family physician referrals.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 Physicians who referred to telepsychiatry in FY 2008 were mainly from northern  
39 regions, whereas in FY 2016, more referrals from southern regions emerged, many of  
40 which still have rural areas within their catchments. Referral to telepsychiatry was more  
41 evenly distributed throughout the province in FY 2016. While historically telepsychiatry  
42 was used to support rural populations, in later years of the study, there were increasing  
43 provincially funded telepsychiatry projects that aimed to increase adoption of  
44 telepsychiatry within more populous regions. While it is important to create access and  
45 choice for patients in both rural and urban areas, policy-makers and funders should  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 consider aspects of digital health equity<sup>43</sup>, allowing the use of diverse secure virtual  
4  
5 platforms, funding home-based visits and establishing mechanisms to support the  
6  
7 appropriate distribution of virtual care throughout the province.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Past studies have suggested that physicians who were more isolated and were part of an integrated  
13  
14 health system had positive feelings about telemedicine, and that nurses were more enthusiastic about  
15  
16 telemedicine than physicians.<sup>25,36</sup> As such, unsurprisingly, this study found that predictors of family  
17  
18 physician referrals to telepsychiatry include rurality of residence (for both provider and patient), team-  
19  
20 based practice models, nurse practitioners on the team, and clinical complexity of patient rosters.  
21  
22

23  
24 This study has numerous strengths; it utilizes a large, multi-year, linked dataset of family  
25  
26 physician and patient data to help understand important characteristics that are  
27  
28 common in physicians who refer to telepsychiatry. Additionally, since this study uses  
29  
30 administrative data, the study was conducted rapidly using a retrospective analysis.  
31  
32 However, the study also has several limitations. The identification of telepsychiatry visits  
33  
34 is contingent upon psychiatrists using telepsychiatry billing codes and billing fee for  
35  
36 service, so it is possible that there is missing data, or an underrepresentation of visits  
37  
38 completed by physicians paid by salary or alternate funding. Another potential  
39  
40 limitation, is that while this study includes nurse practitioners as a covariate in the  
41  
42 analysis, it does not take into account actual nurse practitioner referrals to  
43  
44 telepsychiatry, which could lead to an underestimate of our total telepsychiatry visits.  
45  
46 We believe, however, that this will have minimal impact on our study because it is likely  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 that nurse practitioner referrals will be captured within total telepsychiatry visits, but  
4  
5 rostered (as defined in our methods) to a family physician instead.  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 **Conclusion**

11  
12 While telepsychiatry has seen continued growth over recent years, there remains  
13  
14 significant opportunities for increased adoption. This study shows that certain factors,  
15  
16 including rurality, provider practice type, the number of nurse practitioners on the  
17  
18 provider's team, as well as patient healthcare and hospital utilization characteristics are  
19  
20 more likely in FPTs than FPNTs. This study provides a baseline from which to assess  
21  
22 recent rapid mobilization of telepsychiatry, and a means of doing so using administrative  
23  
24 health data.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Tables and Figures

Figure 1. Telepsychiatry Adoption by Year (FY2008 and FY2016)




Figure 2. Percentage of Referring Physicians by Region (2008 and 2016)




Table 1. Comparative Analysis of Family Physicians that Refer to Telepsychiatry compared to (2016)

VARIABLE	VALUE	FPT	FPNT	TOTAL	SMD
		N = 4,074	N = 7,674	N = 11,748	
<b>PHYSICIAN CHARACTERISTICS</b>					
Physician Sex	F	1,647 (40.4%)	3,599 (46.9%)	5,246 (44.7%)	0.13
	M	2,427 (59.6%)	4,075 (53.1%)	6,502 (55.3%)	0.13
< 10,000 population in CMA	N	3,466 (85.1%)	7,041 (91.8%)	10,507 (89.4%)	0.21
	Y	608 (14.9%)	633 (8.2%)	1,241 (10.6%)	0.21
Nurse Practitioners on Team	Mean ± SD	1.71 ± 4.02	1.10 ± 3.70	1.31 ± 3.83	0.16
Physician Practice Type	FHT	1,145 (28.1%)	1,381 (18.0%)	2,526 (21.5%)	0.24
	Others	2,929 (71.9%)	6,293 (82.0%)	9,222 (78.5%)	0.24
<b>PATIENT ROSTER CHARACTERISTICS</b>					
Total # of attached patients	Mean ± SD	862.45 ± 668.36	766.97 ± 605.70	800.64 ± 630.13	0.15
# patients in NIQ 1,2&3 > # patients in NIQ 4&5	No	907 (22.3%)	2,127 (27.7%)	3,034 (25.8%)	0.13
	Yes	3,167 (77.7%)	5,353 (69.8%)	8,520 (72.5%)	0.18
Rural Residence	Mean ± SD	139.28 ± 256.05	54.93 ± 137.27	84.67 ± 192.19	0.41
# of patients in urban residence > # of patients in rural residence	No	594 (14.6%)	522 (6.8%)	1,116 (9.5%)	0.25
	Yes	3,480 (85.4%)	6,958 (90.7%)	10,438 (88.8%)	0.16
South East LHIN	Mean ± SD	47.03 ± 209.09	24.27 ± 132.92	32.29 ± 164.22	0.13
Champlain LHIN	Mean ± SD	61.94 ± 263.36	99.43 ± 287.94	86.21 ± 280.09	0.14
North Simcoe Muskoka LHIN	Mean ± SD	59.28 ± 230.38	15.12 ± 97.56	30.69 ± 159.11	0.25
North East LHIN	Mean ± SD	53.59 ± 228.57	19.86 ± 124.20	31.75 ± 169.31	0.18
North West LHIN	Mean ± SD	24.64 ± 149.32	6.06 ± 59.90	12.61 ± 101.30	0.16
# of patients with a psychosocial ADG	Mean ± SD	258.24 ± 204.40	217.56 ± 179.29	231.91 ± 189.52	0.21
Total MH PCP visits	Mean ± SD	707.60 ± 2,863.95	276.86 ± 532.56	428.74 ± 1,765.68	0.21
	Median (IQR)	239 (106-415)	188 (73-335)	204 (82-364)	0.24
	00-59	686 (16.8%)	1,626 (21.2%)	2,312 (19.7%)	0.11
	60-156	702 (17.2%)	1,612 (21.0%)	2,314 (19.7%)	0.1
	157-257	795 (19.5%)	1,512 (19.7%)	2,307 (19.6%)	0

	258-414	865 (21.2%)	1,445 (18.8%)	2,310 (19.7%)	0.06
	415-high	1,026 (25.2%)	1,285 (16.7%)	2,311 (19.7%)	0.21
<b>VARIABLE</b>	<b>VALUE</b>	<b>FPT</b>	<b>FPNT</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>SMD</b>
<b>Total ED visits</b>	Mean ± SD	440.82 ± 357.70	291.96 ± 240.01	344.45 ± 295.74	0.49
	00-59	493 (12.1%)	1,090 (14.2%)	1,583 (13.5%)	0.06
	60-156	387 (9.5%)	1,320 (17.2%)	1,707 (14.5%)	0.23
	157-257	489 (12.0%)	1,495 (19.5%)	1,984 (16.9%)	0.21
	258-414	848 (20.8%)	1,782 (23.2%)	2,630 (22.4%)	0.06
	415-high	1,857 (45.6%)	1,793 (23.4%)	3,650 (31.1%)	0.48
<b>Total MH ED visits</b>	Mean ± SD	18.99 ± 29.07	10.91 ± 13.07	13.75 ± 20.58	0.36
	00-03	681 (16.7%)	2,108 (27.5%)	2,789 (23.7%)	0.26
	04-09	922 (22.6%)	2,275 (29.6%)	3,197 (27.2%)	0.16
	10-19	1,213 (29.8%)	2,013 (26.2%)	3,226 (27.5%)	0.08
	20-high	1,258 (30.9%)	1,084 (14.1%)	2,342 (19.9%)	0.41
<b>Total hospitalizations</b>	Mean ± SD	57.05 ± 47.43	41.75 ± 36.01	47.15 ± 41.06	0.36
	0 visits	116 (2.8%)	286 (3.7%)	402 (3.4%)	0.05
	01-02 visit	133 (3.3%)	287 (3.7%)	420 (3.6%)	0.03
	03-05 visits	131 (3.2%)	374 (4.9%)	505 (4.3%)	0.08
	06-10 visits	203 (5.0%)	489 (6.4%)	692 (5.9%)	0.06
	11+ visits	3,491 (85.7%)	6,044 (78.8%)	9,535 (81.2%)	0.18
<b>Total MH hospitalizations</b>	Mean ± SD	7.01 ± 13.61	3.86 ± 5.43	4.97 ± 9.31	0.3
	0 visits	545 (13.4%)	1,679 (21.9%)	2,224 (18.9%)	0.22
	01-02 visit	768 (18.9%)	2,078 (27.1%)	2,846 (24.2%)	0.2
	03-05 visits	1,072 (26.3%)	1,959 (25.5%)	3,031 (25.8%)	0.02
	06-10 visits	964 (23.7%)	1,246 (16.2%)	2,210 (18.8%)	0.19
	11+ visits	725 (17.8%)	518 (6.8%)	1,243 (10.6%)	0.34

NIQ= Neighbourhood Income Quintiles  
 LHIN=Local Health Integration Networks  
 ADG= Aggregated Diagnosis Groupings  
 MHPCP= Mental Health Primary Care Practitioner  
 ED= Emergency Department  
 MH ED= Mental Health Emergency Department  
 MH= Mental Health

Table 2. Model using Generalized Estimating Equations comparing FPTs vs FPNTs (2016)

Analysis Of GEE Parameter Estimates			
	Estimate	95% Confidence Limits	
<b>Intercept</b>	-0.9162	-1.1901	-0.6423
<b>Physician Age 35-44 vs &lt;=34</b>	0.8895	0.7855	1.0072
<b>Physician Age 45-54 vs &lt;=34</b>	0.9082	0.7983	1.0333
<b>Physician Age 55-64 vs &lt;=34</b>	0.849	0.7419	0.9717
<b>Physician Age 64+ vs &lt;=34</b>	0.7255	0.6223	0.8458
<b>Sex (Male vs Female)</b>	1.0144	0.9368	1.0983
<b>Physician Rural (Yes vs No)</b>	1.3791	1.174	1.6199
<b>Canadian Medical Graduate (Yes vs No)</b>	1.0333	0.9493	1.1247
<b>Canadian Medical Graduate (Unknown vs No)</b>	1.0231	0.8617	1.2148
<b>More patients in low/med income quintile (Yes vs No)</b>	1.0719	0.969	1.1856
<b>More urban patients (Yes vs No)</b>	0.5491	0.4338	0.6952
<b>Mental Health ED Visits (04-09 vs 00-03)</b>	1.3289	1.0252	1.7226
<b>Mental Health ED Visits (10-19 vs 00-03)</b>	1.5373	1.1442	2.0654
<b>Mental Health ED Visits (20-high vs 00-03)</b>	2.1678	1.601	2.9352
<b>Mental Health Hospitalizations (0 visits vs 01-02 visit)</b>	0.9072	0.7363	1.1179
<b>Mental Health Hospitalizations 03-05 visits vs 01-02 visit</b>	1.2048	1.0749	1.3504
<b>Mental Health Hospitalizations 06-10 visits vs 01-02 visit</b>	1.316	1.1496	1.5064
<b>Mental Health Hospitalizations 11+ visits vs 01-02 visit</b>	1.7662	1.2837	2.4301
<b>Mental Health Primary Care Visits (60-156 vs 00-59)</b>	0.965	0.8134	1.1449
<b>Mental Health Primary Care Visits (157-257 vs 00-59)</b>	1.237	0.9943	1.539
<b>Mental Health Primary Care Visits (258-414 vs 00-59)</b>	1.384	1.0859	1.7638
<b>Mental Health Primary Care Visits (415-high vs 00-59)</b>	1.6089	1.3322	1.943
<b>More patients with psychiatric ADGs (Yes vs No)</b>	1.1979	0.8627	1.6634

ED= Emergency Department

ADG= Aggregated Diagnosis Groups

## References

1. Brien S, Grenier L, Kapral M. *Taking stock*. Health Quality Ontario; 2015.
2. Bishop TF, Press MJ, Keyhani S, Pincus HA. Acceptance of insurance by psychiatrists and the implications for access to mental health care. *JAMA psychiatry*. 2014;71(2):176-181.
3. World Health Organization. Mental disorders affect one in four people. *World Health Report*. 2001.
4. Alegría M, Nakash O, NeMoyer A. Increasing equity in access to mental health care: A critical first step in improving service quality. *World Psychiatry*. 2018;17(1):43.
5. Wang PS, Aguilar-Gaxiola S, Alonso J, et al. Use of mental health services for anxiety, mood, and substance disorders in 17 countries in the WHO world mental health surveys. *The Lancet*. 2007;370(9590):841-850.
6. Goldner EM, Jones W, Fang ML. Access to and waiting time for psychiatrist services in a canadian urban area: A study in real time. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*. 2011;56(8):474-480.
7. Meadows GN, Enticott JC, Inder B, Russell GM, Gurr R. Better access to mental health care and the failure of the medicare principle of universality. *Med J Aust*. 2015;202(4):190-194.

- 1  
2  
3 8. Cunningham PJ. Beyond parity: Primary care physicians' perspectives on access to  
4 mental health care: More PCPs have trouble obtaining mental health services for their  
5 patients than have problems getting other specialty services. *Health Aff.*  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 2009;28(Suppl1):w490-w501.  
11  
12  
13 9. Kurdyak P, Zaheer J, Cheng J, Rudoler D, Mulsant BH. Changes in characteristics  
14 and practice patterns of ontario psychiatrists: Implications for access to psychiatrists.  
15  
16  
17  
18 *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry.* 2017;62(1):40-47.  
19  
20  
21 10. Kurdyak P, Stukel TA, Goldbloom D, Kopp A, Zagorski BM, Mulsant BH. Universal  
22 coverage without universal access: A study of psychiatrist supply and practice patterns  
23 in ontario. *Open Medicine.* 2014;8(3):e87.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29 11. Myers KM, Valentine JM, Melzer SM. Child and adolescent telepsychiatry:  
30 Utilization and satisfaction. *Telemedicine and e-Health.* 2008;14(2):131-137.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35 12. Antonacci DJ, Bloch RM, Saeed SA, Yildirim Y, Talley J. Empirical evidence on the  
36 use and effectiveness of telepsychiatry via videoconferencing: Implications for forensic  
37 and correctional psychiatry. *Behav Sci Law.* 2008;26(3):253-269.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 13. Campbell R, O'Gorman J, Cernovsky ZZ. Reactions of psychiatric patients to  
44 telepsychiatry. *Mental illness.* 2015;7(2).  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 14. Deslich S, Stec B, Tomblin S, Coustasse A. Telepsychiatry in the 21st century:  
50 Transforming healthcare with technology. *Perspectives in Health Information*  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *Management/AHIMA, American Health Information Management Association.*

4  
5 2013;10(Summer).

6  
7  
8  
9 15. Fleming DA, Edison KE, Pak H. Telehealth ethics. *Telemedicine and e-Health.*

10  
11 2009;15(8):797-803.

12  
13  
14 16. Saeed SA, Diamond J, Bloch RM. Use of telepsychiatry to improve care for people  
15 with mental illness in rural North Carolina. *NC Med J.* 2011;72(3):219-222.

16  
17  
18 17. Ulzen T, Williamson L, Foster PP, Parris-Barnes K. The evolution of a community-  
19 based telepsychiatry program in rural alabama: Lessons learned—a brief report.

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 *Community Ment Health J.* 2013;49(1):101-105.

26  
27  
28 18. Lyketsos CG, Roques C, Hovanec L, Jones III BN. Telemedicine use and the  
29 reduction of psychiatric admissions from a long-term care facility. *J Geriatr Psychiatry*  
30  
31  
32  
33 *Neurol.* 2001;14(2):76-79.

34  
35  
36 19. Hilty DM, Ferrer DC, Parish MB, Johnston B, Callahan EJ, Yellowlees PM. The  
37 effectiveness of telemental health: A 2013 review. *Telemedicine and e-Health.*

38  
39  
40 2013;19(6):444-454.

41  
42  
43 20. Chakrabarti S. Usefulness of telepsychiatry: A critical evaluation of  
44 videoconferencing-based approaches. *World journal of psychiatry.* 2015;5(3):286.

- 1  
2  
3 21. Bishop JE, O'Reilly RL, Maddox K, Hutchinson LJ. Client satisfaction in a feasibility  
4 study comparing face-to-face interviews with telepsychiatry. *J Telemed Telecare*.  
5  
6 2002;8(4):217-221.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 22. Frueh BC, Monnier J, Yim E, Grubaugh AL, Hamner MB, Knapp RG. A randomized  
12 trial of telepsychiatry for post-traumatic stress disorder. *J Telemed Telecare*.  
13  
14 2007;13(3):142-147.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 23. Farabee D, Calhoun S, Veliz R. An experimental comparison of telepsychiatry and  
20 conventional psychiatry for parolees. *Psychiatric Services*. 2016;67(5):562-565.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 24. Bashshur RL, Shannon GW, Bashshur N, Yellowlees PM. The empirical evidence  
26 for telemedicine interventions in mental disorders. *Telemedicine and e-Health*.  
27  
28 2016;22(2):87-113.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 25. Sargeant J, Allen M, Langille D. Physician perceptions of the effect of telemedicine  
34 on rural retention and recruitment. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2004;10(2):89-93.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39 26. Swanson B. Information technology and under-served communities. *J Telemed*  
40  
41 *Telecare*. 1999;5(2\_suppl):3-10.  
42  
43  
44  
45 27. Serhal E, Crawford A, Cheng J, Kurdyak P. Implementation and utilisation of  
46 telepsychiatry in Ontario: A population-based study. *The Canadian Journal of*  
47  
48 *Psychiatry*. 2017;62(10):716-725.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 28. Grumbach K, Selby JV, Damberg C, et al. Resolving the gatekeeper conundrum:  
4  
5 What patients value in primary care and referrals to specialists. *JAMA*.  
6  
7 1999;282(3):261-266.  
8  
9  
10  
11 29. Norton PG, Dunn EV, Bestvater D. Referrals in primary care: Is the family physician  
12  
13 a "Gatekeeper"? *Canadian Family Physician*. 1989;35:1776.  
14  
15  
16  
17 30. Steele M, Zayed R, Davidson B, et al. Referral patterns and training needs in  
18  
19 psychiatry among primary care physicians in canadian rural/remote areas. *Journal of*  
20  
21 *the Canadian Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*. 2012;21(2):111.  
22  
23  
24  
25 31. Spaulding RJ, Russo T, Cook DJ, Doolittle GC. Diffusion theory and telemedicine  
26  
27 adoption by kansas health-care providers: Critical factors in telemedicine adoption for  
28  
29 improved patient access. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2005;11(1\_suppl):107-109.  
30  
31  
32  
33 32. Whitten P, Franken EA. Telemedicine for patient consultation: Factors affecting use  
34  
35 by rural primary-care physicians in kansas. *J Telemed Telecare*. 1995;1(3):139-144.  
36  
37  
38  
39 33. LeRouge C, Garfield M. Crossing the telemedicine chasm: Have the US barriers to  
40  
41 widespread adoption of telemedicine been significantly reduced? *International journal of*  
42  
43 *environmental research and public health*. 2013;10(12):6472-6484.  
44  
45  
46  
47 34. Moore MA, Coffman M, Jetty A, Klink K, Petterson S, Bazemore A. Family  
48  
49 physicians report considerable interest in, but limited use of, telehealth services. *The*  
50  
51 *Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*. 2017;30(3):320-330.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 35. Spaulding R, Cain S, Sonnenschein K. Urban telepsychiatry: Uncommon service for  
4 a common need. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics*. 2011;20(1):29-39.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 36. Whitten PS, Mackert MS. Addressing telehealth's foremost barrier: Provider as initial  
10 gatekeeper. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2005;21(4):517-521.  
11  
12  
13  
14 37. Steele LS, Glazier RH, Lin E, Evans M. Using administrative data to measure  
15 ambulatory mental health service provision in primary care. *Med Care*. 2004:960-965.  
16  
17  
18  
19 38. Austin PC, van Walraven C, Wodchis WP, Newman A, Anderson GM. Using the  
20 Johns Hopkins aggregated diagnosis groups (ADGs) to predict mortality in a general  
21 adult population cohort in Ontario, Canada. *Med Care*. 2011;49(10):932.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 39. Cohen J. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Routledge; 2013.  
29  
30  
31  
32 40. Austin PC. Using the standardized difference to compare the prevalence of a binary  
33 variable between two groups in observational research. *Communications in Statistics-  
34 Simulation and Computation*. 2009;38(6):1228-1234.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 41. Wang M. Generalized estimating equations in longitudinal data analysis: A review  
41 and recent developments. *Advances in Statistics*. 2014;2014.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46 42. The Ontario Physician Human Resources Data Centre. . (2018, 10). Physicians in  
47 Ontario 2017. Retrieved from the Ontario Physician Human Resources data centre:  
48 [Http://Www.ophrdc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/PIO-2017-report-with-](http://www.ophrdc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/PIO-2017-report-with-hyperlinks.pdf)  
49 [hyperlinks.pdf](http://www.ophrdc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/PIO-2017-report-with-hyperlinks.pdf). *McMaster University*. 2018.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 43. Crawford, A., & Serhal, E. (2020). Digital Health Equity and COVID-19: The  
4  
5 Innovation Curve Cannot Reinforce the Social Gradient of Health. *Journal of Medical*  
6  
7 *Internet Research*, 22(6), e19361.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60


# Characterizing Family Physicians Who Refer to Telepsychiatry in Ontario

## Figure Legends

Figure 1. Telepsychiatry Adoption by Year (FY2008 and FY2016)


Figure 2. Percentage of Referring Physicians by Region (FY 2008 and FY2016)

Figure 1. Telepsychiatry Adoption by Year (FY2008 and FY2016)



## Characterizing Family Physicians Who Refer to Telepsychiatry in Ontario

Figure 2. Percentage of Referring Physicians by Region (2008 and 2016)



## CARACTÉRISATION DES MÉDECINS DE FAMILLE QUI RÉFÈRENT À LA TÉLÉPSYCHIATRIE EN ONTARIO

**Introduction** : La télépsychiatrie peut améliorer l'accès aux services psychiatriques pour ceux qui autrement ne peuvent accéder aux soins facilement. Les médecins de famille sont les gardiens des soins spécialisés en Ontario, alors il est essentiel de comprendre les prédicteurs en rapport avec les références à la télépsychiatrie pour mieux planifier les services et stimuler l'adoption de la télépsychiatrie.

**Méthodes** : La présente étude a utilisé une méthodologie d'étude transversale rétrospective annuelle pour comparer les médecins qui référaient leurs patients en télépsychiatrie chaque année de l'exercice financier (EF) de 2008 à l'EF de 2016. Une comparaison d'un an (EF 2016) des médecins de famille qui référaient en télépsychiatrie avec les médecins de famille qui ne référaient pas en télépsychiatrie, appariés (1:2) par région, a aussi été menée. Enfin, nous avons utilisé une modélisation statistique pour comprendre les prédicteurs de la référence en télépsychiatrie chez les médecins.

1  
2  
3 **Résultats** : Entre l'EF 2008 et l'EF 2016, les visites en télépsychiatrie sont passées de  
4  
5 925 à 13 825 visites. Trente-deux pour cent des médecins de première ligne en Ontario  
6  
7 ont référé à la télépsychiatrie en 2017. Plusieurs caractéristiques étaient notablement  
8  
9 différentes entre les médecins de famille qui réfèrent en télépsychiatrie (MFT) et les  
10  
11 médecins de famille qui ne réfèrent pas en télépsychiatrie (MFNT) : les MFT étaient  
12  
13 plus susceptibles de provenir d'une résidence de moins de 10 000 personnes, d'avoir  
14  
15 plus d'infirmières praticiennes (IP) dans leur pratique, et de faire partie d'une équipe de  
16  
17 santé familiale (ESF) que les MFNT. Les patients inscrits étaient plus susceptibles de  
18  
19 résider en région rurale, de présenter plus de complexité clinique, et d'utiliser plus de  
20  
21 services de santé mentale comparativement aux MFNT.  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 **Conclusion** : Il y a eu une augmentation de l'utilisation de la télépsychiatrie par les  
28  
29 patients et les médecins de famille durant la période de l'étude, bien qu'il demeure une  
30  
31 possibilité de croissance significative. Les médecins de famille qui habitent en milieu  
32  
33 rural, qui font partie d'une ESF, qui ont plus d'IP, dont les patients sont davantage  
34  
35 complexes et en milieu rural étaient plus susceptibles de référer en télépsychiatrie.  
36  
37 Comme de récentes politiques en faveur de la télépsychiatrie en soutiennent la  
38  
39 croissance, la présente étude servira de base de départ importante.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60


# Characterizing Family Physicians Who Refer to Telepsychiatry in Ontario

## Figure Legends

Figure 1. Telepsychiatry Adoption by Year (FY2008 and FY2016)


Figure 2. Percentage of Referring Physicians by Region (FY 2008 and FY2016)

Figure 1. Telepsychiatry Adoption by Year (FY2008 and FY2016)



## Characterizing Family Physicians Who Refer to Telepsychiatry in Ontario

Figure 2. Percentage of Referring Physicians by Region (2008 and 2016)



## CHARACTERIZING FAMILY PHYSICIANS WHO REFER TO TELEPSYCHIATRY IN ONTARIO

### Authors:

Eva Serhal<sup>1,2</sup>, Tomisin Iwajomo<sup>1,3</sup>, Claire de Oliveira<sup>1-3</sup>, Allison Crawford<sup>1,4</sup>, Paul

Kurdyak<sup>1-3</sup>

### Affiliations

1. The Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, Toronto, Ontario
2. The Institute for Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario
3. ICES, Toronto, Ontario
4. Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario

### Corresponding Author:

Eva Serhal, MBA, PhD  
Director, Virtual Mental Health and Outreach & ECHO Ontario  
Centre for Addiction and Mental Health  
821-250 College Street, Toronto, Ontario  
M5T1R8

## **Abstract**

### ***Introduction***

Telepsychiatry can improve access to psychiatric services for those who otherwise cannot easily access care. Family physicians are gatekeepers to specialized care in Ontario, so it is essential to understand predictors relating to referrals to telepsychiatry to better plan services and increase telepsychiatry adoption.

### ***Methods***

This study used an annual retrospective cross-sectional study design to compare physicians who referred their patients to telepsychiatry each year from fiscal year (FY) 2008 to FY 2016. A one year (FY 2016) comparison of family physicians who referred to telepsychiatry compared to family physicians who did not refer to telepsychiatry matched (1:2) by region was also conducted. Finally, we used statistical modelling to understand the predictors of referring to telepsychiatry among physicians.

### ***Results***

Between FY 2008 to FY 2016, telepsychiatry visits increased from 925 visits to 13,825 visits. Thirty-two percent of Ontario primary care physicians referred to telepsychiatry in 2017. Several characteristics were notably different between family physicians who refer to telepsychiatry (FPTs) and family physicians who do not refer to telepsychiatry (FPNTs): FPTs were more likely to be from a residence with less than 10,000 people, to have more nurse practitioners in the practice, and to be from a family health team than

1  
2  
3 FPNTs. Rostered patients of FPTs were more likely to reside in rural areas, have more  
4  
5 clinical complexity, and to utilize more mental health services compared to FPNTs.  
6  
7

### 8 **Conclusion**

9  
10  
11  
12 There has been an increase in the use of telepsychiatry by patients and family  
13  
14 physicians over the study period, although there remains opportunity for significant  
15  
16 growth. and familyFamily physicians that ~~are~~ live in ~~a~~ rural areas, are part of a FHT,  
17  
18 have more NPs, with more rural and complex patients ~~patients in rural areas with high~~  
19  
20 ~~needs for mental health services are~~ were more likely to refer to telepsychiatry. As  
21  
22 recent pro-telemedicine policies support the growth of telepsychiatry, this study will  
23  
24 serve as an important baseline.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

## Introduction

Mental illness is among the world's leading causes of sickness and disability; one in five Canadians (two million Ontarians) and one in four people internationally will experience mental illness or addiction ~~at some point in their life, and one in four people internationally will be affected by a mental or neurological disorder.~~<sup>1-3</sup> However, only one-third of Ontario patients ~~requiring mental health and addiction services~~ reported having their mental health needs met or partially met within primary care.<sup>1</sup> Patients ~~Similar international studies found that at least two thirds of people with common mental disorders do not receive treatment and patients~~ from lower-income countries and socially disadvantaged groups had lower rates of mental health service utilization.<sup>4-6</sup> Access to quality mental health services is ~~limited in many parts of the world, including Canada often limited,~~ due to rurality, physician shortages and variation in the availability of mental health services ~~from primary care providers and outpatient psychiatrists.~~<sup>1,5,7-10</sup>

Telepsychiatry, ~~which is~~ the delivery of psychiatry via secure videoconferencing, can reduce access barriers such as distance, cost of travel, weather, and workforce shortages.<sup>11-17</sup> In particular, telepsychiatry can provide access to outpatient psychiatric care for patients who otherwise are not able to easily access services, potentially reducing unnecessary hospitalizations and ED visits.<sup>18,19</sup> Several studies have deemed telepsychiatry effective for various mental health conditions and populations.<sup>20-24</sup> Telemedicine has been shown to reduce isolation and increase the morale of rural primary care practitioners.<sup>25,26</sup> While there is significant potential for telepsychiatry to

1  
2  
3 connect patients to psychiatrists throughout Ontario, recent evidence has shown  
4 minimal adoption by patients.<sup>27</sup> In Ontario during the time of this study, in order to  
5 deliver and bill for telepsychiatry, psychiatrists were typically required to use a  
6 centralized government funded telemedicine platform ~~the Ontario Telemedicine~~  
7 Network (OTN) platform (a centralized, government funded platform) to deliver care.  
8 Additionally, other than small pilot tests, and patients were typically required to access  
9 their telepsychiatry visit at a patient host site (a clinical site that ~~could connect to the~~  
10 OTN-connects to the centralized provincial network). It is important to note that at the  
11 time this paper was submitted ~~there were significant~~ temporary policy changes to virtual  
12 care as a result of Covid-19 (introduced March 2020), ~~which~~ have created more options  
13 for home-based care for patients, and ~~have allowed physicians to deliver virtual care via~~  
14 a variety of virtual platforms. ~~have removed the requirement that physicians must be~~  
15 members of the OTN network, and use the OTN platforms to deliver and bill for virtual  
16 care. These recent changes will be discussed in relation to the study findings in the  
17 discussion section.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Family physicians are the gatekeepers to specialist care in Canada and other parts of  
41 the world.<sup>28,29</sup> Common reasons for family physician referral to psychiatry include  
42 obtaining medication recommendations, obtaining second opinions, or ~~for patients who~~  
43 are non-responsive to medications, getting a second opinion on a diagnosis, and  
44 obtaining non-pharmacological treatment recommendations.<sup>30</sup> Evidence shows  
45 providers who are more isolated had more positive feelings about telemedicine.<sup>25</sup>  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Positive perceptions of telemedicine included convenience, perceived patient benefits,  
4 reduced wait time, cost-effectiveness, and access to medical expertise,<sup>25</sup> while negative  
5 aspects included cost, reduced funding for in-person services, inconvenience ~~to~~  
6 ~~doctors~~, inadequate reimbursement, ~~inadequate~~ and training, medical liability, ~~issues~~  
7 ~~with referral patterns~~, and physician fear of practice change.<sup>25,31-34</sup> Previous studies  
8 suggest nurses ~~are more~~ may be more enthusiastic about telemedicine than physicians,  
9 referring physicians ~~are more~~ tend to be more satisfied than ~~the referred~~ specialists,  
10 satisfaction increases relative to use and time, and that providers do not recommend  
11 telemedicine in all circumstances.<sup>29,35,36</sup> ~~Understanding if there are differences in family~~  
12 ~~physicians who refer to telepsychiatry, compared to those who do not, is an important~~  
13 ~~step to understanding how telepsychiatry is currently being used, and how it can be~~  
14 ~~deployed more effectively throughout the province.~~ The objective of this study was to  
15 examine the characteristics of family physicians in Ontario who have referred patients to  
16 telepsychiatry (FPTs) compared to family physicians who have not referred to  
17 telepsychiatry (FPNTs) from FY 2008 to FY 2016, in order to understand if there are  
18 specific factors that make certain family physicians more likely to refer than others.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

## 42 **Methods**

### 43 ***Setting and Study Design***

44  
45  
46 We conducted an annual retrospective cross-sectional study assessing descriptive  
47 characteristics of FPTs for FYs (2008 to 2016); this time horizon was used because it  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

1  
2  
3 includes data from when the Ontario Health Insurance Plan (OHIP) physician fee  
4 schedule telemedicine codes were introduced until the most recent data available from  
5 ICES. Referring physician and patient information were ascertained using the OHIP  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

includes data from when the Ontario Health Insurance Plan (OHIP) physician fee schedule telemedicine codes were introduced until the most recent data available from ICES. Referring physician and patient information were ascertained using the OHIP claims database; if referral information was not available, we looked back within the past 12 months to identify the most frequently seen family physician and, if not available, the most recently seen family physician. These data were linked to population-level health administrative databases held at ICES. Additionally, a one year (FY2016) comparison of FPTs vs FPNTs matched (1:2) by the 14 Local Health Integration Networks ~~(the region in which they work) was conducted~~(LHIN). [LHINs are artificially divided regions of Ontario which were designed to support local approaches to strategic planning, funding and regional coordination of clinical care, and are used in administrative data to classify provincial regions.](#) ~~We matched by these 14 LHINs only, and not age or sex because we wanted to ensure we were able to explore differences in age and sex between the groups.~~ This study was approved by the Research Ethics Board of Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, Toronto.

### **Data Sources**

This study used province-wide health administrative databases that were linked using unique encoded identifiers and analyzed at ICES. OHIP data were used to collect family physician details, including physician number, fee code, service date, and location of service provided, and patient information, including patient ID, diagnosis, service date, and location. The National Ambulatory Care Reporting System was used to collect data on emergency department visits. The Ontario Mental Health Reporting System was

1  
2  
3 used to obtain information on psychiatric hospitalizations. The ICES Physician  
4  
5 Database and the Primary Care Population database were used to analyze data on  
6  
7 primary care providers and teams, including the number of years since medical school  
8  
9 graduation, years of practice since graduation, provider type, interprofessional team  
10  
11 details, and total physicians per practice. The Client Agency Program Enrolment  
12  
13 database was used to analyze data on physician practice type (defined as patient  
14  
15 enrollment type). The Ontario Census Area Profiles and the Registered Persons  
16  
17 Database were used to analyze patient-level demographic variables (such as age, sex,  
18  
19 the region of residence), as well as geographic details (rurality, income quintiles).  
20  
21 Primary care providers who had missing age or sex data, and patients with missing  
22  
23 health card numbers, missing age or missing sex were excluded from the analysis.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

### 29 ***Provider Characteristics***

30  
31  
32 We selected primary care provider characteristics based on two things: availability  
33  
34 within the ICES dataset, and previous literature within the field that assessed predictors  
35  
36 using these measures.<sup>34</sup> The primary care provider characteristics used to compare  
37  
38 FPTs vs FPNTs included age group, sex, number of years since medical school  
39  
40 graduation, years of practice since graduation, rurality of residence, physician practice  
41  
42 type (Family Health Team<sup>1</sup> or other), average number of nurse practitioners within the  
43  
44 practice, and average number of social workers within the practice.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

---

50  
51 <sup>1</sup> Family health teams are different from many primary care practices because they are funded to include an  
52 interprofessional team within the practice, and are also paid via a blended capitation model (where physicians are  
53 paid primarily through capitation fees based on a defined basket of services delivered to enrolled patients) or a  
54 salary model).<sup>163</sup>  
55

### ***Patient Characteristics***

We examined patient demographic and service utilization characteristics for patients rostered within each physician group (FPT vs FPNT). Patient demographic characteristics included age, sex, neighbourhood income quintile (NIQ) (NIQ 1= 0-20%, NIQ 2= 20-40%, NIQ 3= 40-60%, NIQ 4= 60-80%, NIQ 5= 80%+), and whether they live in a rural or urban area. Patient utilization and medical complexity were considered within each annual cross-section by assessing: number of primary care provider visits (total, mental health and non-mental health); number of emergency department visits (total, mental health and non-mental health-related); number of hospitalizations (total, mental health and non-mental health-related); and comorbidities using the Johns Hopkins' Aggregated Diagnosis Groups (ADG). [Mental health primary care visits were defined using a validated algorithm to identify adults accessing care for a mental health disorder, which included adult mental health diagnostic codes 295-298, 300-304, 306, 309, 311, 897-902, 904, 905 \(which represents a broad range of adult mental health and addiction diagnoses as defined by the International Classification of Diseases 10 \(ICD-10-CA\)\).](#) ~~Mental health primary care visits were defined using a validated algorithm, and included mental health diagnostic codes 295-298, 300-304, 306, 309, 311, 897-902, 904, 905.~~<sup>37</sup> Hospitalizations and ED visits included [International Classification of Diseases 10 \(ICD-10-CA\)](#) codes F04-F99 (which excludes dementia). The Johns Hopkins ADG's are categorized based on five clinical dimensions, including the duration, the severity, the etiology, the diagnostic certainty and the specialty care

1  
2  
3 involvement of the condition. ~~Study subjects may have diagnoses ranging between 0-32~~  
4  
5 ~~ADGs.~~<sup>38</sup>  
6  
7

## 8 9 **Analysis**

### 10 11 *Descriptive Analysis*

#### 12 13 Annual Outputs and Trends over Time

14  
15 Annual panels containing physician and patient characteristics were described,  
16  
17 including counts, column percentages, and means with standard deviations.  
18  
19

20  
21 Additionally, changes over time were evaluated for each of the physician characteristics  
22  
23 ~~to assess if there were changing trends in physicians using telepsychiatry throughout~~  
24  
25 ~~our study period.~~  
26  
27  
28  
29

#### 30 31 Matched Physician Comparison

32  
33 ~~A one-year (FY 2016) comparison of FPTs vs FPNTs to compare between-group~~  
34  
35 ~~differences was conducted by matching (1:2) based on the fourteen LHINs (the region~~  
36  
37 ~~in which they worked).~~ Matched comparisons between FTPs and FTNPs were  
38  
39 presented as counts, column percentages, and standardized mean differences (SMD).  
40  
41 We compared between-group differences using the standard mean difference (SMD).  
42  
43 Cohen (1988) suggests a small effect size is equal to 0.2 SMD, but recent studies  
44  
45 suggest that a more prudent threshold for assessing effect size is 0.1 SMD, especially  
46  
47 with large data sets.<sup>39,40</sup> Using this threshold (0.1 SMD), this study identifies significant  
48  
49 differences between groups.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The model covariates included physician age (categorical; <34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64,  
4 64+), sex (Male/Female), number of years after graduation (categorical; 1-10, 11-20,  
5 21-30, 31-40, 41+ years), rural residence (living in community with less than 10,000  
6 people- Yes/No), total nurse practitioner on the team (continuous), total social workers  
7 on the team (continuous), if the family physician is a Canadian Medical Graduate  
8 (Yes/No), the physician practice type (FHT/Other), patient age (categorical; 0-10, 11-20,  
9 21-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, 61-70, 71-80, 81+ years), patient sex (Male/Female),  
10 patient NIQ (categorical; 1-5), if the FP has more patients in low NIQ areas (Yes/No),  
11 patient residence (Urban/Rural), if the FP has more urban patients than rural (Yes/No),  
12 if the FP has more patients with at least one psychosocial ADG (Yes/No), patient region  
13 (categorical; LHIN1-14), total number of ED visits (categorical; 0-59, 60-156, 157-257,  
14 258-414, 415+), total number of mental health ED visits (categorical; 0-3, 4-9, 10-19,  
15 20+ visits), total hospitalizations (categorical; 0, 1-2, 3-5, 6-10, 11+), total mental health  
16 hospitalizations (categorical; 0, 1-2, 3-5, 6-10, 11+), total primary care visits  
17 (categorical; 0-59, 60-156, 157-257, 258-414, 415+) and total mental health primary  
18 care provider visits (categorical; 0-59, 60-156, 157-257, 258-414, 415+).

### 39 Statistical Analysis

40  
41 We used statistical modeling to understand the predictors of referring to telepsychiatry  
42 among physicians. We used GEE for the statistical model, as it accounts for patient  
43 clustering at the provider level.<sup>41</sup> ~~The outcome variable was a referral to telepsychiatry~~  
44 ~~(Yes/No) and the covariates are the same as those described in the comparison above,~~  
45 ~~however, whether they were part of a family health team or not, and number of nurse~~  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

1  
2  
3 ~~practitioner variables were removed, as they were enveloped within the cluster and thus~~  
4 ~~would have been considered co-linear.~~ All analyses were carried out using SAS version  
5  
6 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC). All results were presented as adjusted odds ratios (ORs)  
7  
8 with corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs).  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

## 14 **Results**

### 15 *Descriptive analysis of FTPs*

16  
17  
18  
19 ~~Our study compared the difference between FTPs and FPNTs, using descriptive and~~  
20 ~~statistical analyses.~~ In FY 2016, there were 13,290 family physicians in Ontario; this  
21  
22 analysis includes a subset of those family physicians who have referred to  
23  
24 telepsychiatry.<sup>42</sup>  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

### 30 *Increase in Patients Accessing and Family Physicians Referring to Telepsychiatry*

31  
32 The number of patients receiving telepsychiatry increased from 925 patients in FY 2008  
33  
34 to 13,825 patients in FY 2016, which represents approximately a fifteen-fold increase  
35  
36 (see Table 1). There was ~~also~~ substantial growth in the number of FPTs from 474 to  
37  
38 4,224, which represents a nine-fold increase from FY 2008 to FY 2016 (see Table 1). Of  
39  
40 all physicians in Ontario, 32% referred to telepsychiatry in FY 2016 (4224/13290). Less  
41  
42 than 1% of total patients rostered to FPTs had a telepsychiatry visit in FY 2018 (n=  
43  
44 12,449/3,513,638). [Insert Figure 1]  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### *Physician Rurality*

In FY 2008, the percentage of total telepsychiatry visits was highest in the North East LHIN (20%, n = 94), followed by the North West LHIN (16%, n = 74) (Ontario's most northern regions), followed by the South West LHIN (15%, n = 70). In FY 2016, those numbers shifted so ~~that~~ the highest percentage of telepsychiatry referrals came from family physicians in ~~more-central~~ regions such as Hamilton Niagara Haldimand Brant (10%, n = 433), Central East (10%, n = 421), and Toronto Central (10%, n = 420) LHINs, with the Central (n = 393) and North East (n = 379) LHIN's family physicians referring 9% each. All LHINs ranged between 4-10% of total telepsychiatry delivery in FY 2016, compared to FY 2008, where the range spread from 0% (in Mississauga Halton LHIN) to 20% (in the North East LHIN). This shows a more evenly distributed adoption of telepsychiatry from ~~strictly~~ northern regions to all regions of Ontario, many of which still have highly rural and remote communities. [Insert Figure 2]

### ***Comparative Analysis***

#### *Family Physician Characteristics*

A larger percentage of FPTs were male, compared to FPNTs (59.6% (n = 2427) vs. 53.1% (n = 4075), SD = 0.13). A greater percentage of FPTs were from communities with a population that had less than 10,000 people (14.9% (n = 608) vs. 8.2% (n = 633), SMD = 0.21). FPTs had a larger mean number of nurse practitioners and FPNTs (1.71 (+/- 4.02) vs. 1.10 (+/- 3.70), SMD = 0.16), finally, a greater percentage of FPTs

1  
2  
3 belonged to FHTs than FPNTs (28.1% (n = 1145) vs. 18% (n = 1381), SMD = 0.24).

4  
5 [Insert Table 1]

### 6 7 8 *Comparing Patient Roster Characteristics*

9  
10  
11  
12 There were a few notable differences in patient roster characteristics between FPTs and  
13  
14 FPNTs. FPTs had a larger mean number of attached patients than FPNTs (862.45 (+/-  
15  
16 668.36) vs. 788.97 (+/- 605.70), SMD = 0.15). A greater percentage of FPTs had  
17  
18 patients on their roster from lower NIQ's than FPNTs (1-3) (77.7% (n = 3167) vs. 69.8%  
19  
20 (n = 5353), SMD = 0.18). FPTs had a larger mean number of patients from a rural  
21  
22 residence compared to FPNTs (139.28 (+/- 256.05) vs. 54.93 (+/- 137.27), SMD = 0.41).  
23  
24 A greater percentage of FPTs had more patients from rural areas than urban areas  
25  
26 (14.6% (N = 594) vs. 6.8% (n = 522), SMD = 0.25). FPNTs had a higher patient mean in  
27  
28 the Champlain LHIN (which includes Ottawa, a large urban region in Ontario) (FPT =  
29  
30 61.94 (+/- 236.36), FPTN = 99.43 (+/-287.94), SMD = 0.14). FPTs had higher patient  
31  
32 means in four LHINs (mostly northern regions): South East (SE) LHIN (FPT = 47.03 (+/-  
33  
34 209), FPTN = 24.27 (+/-132.92), SMD = 0.13), North Simcoe Muskoka (NSM) LHIN  
35  
36 (FPT = 59.28 (+/- 230.38), FPNT = 15.12 (+/- 97.56), SMD =0.25), North East (NE)  
37  
38 LHIN (FPT = 53.59 (+/- 228.57), FPNT = 19.86 (+/- 124.20), SMD =0.18), North West  
39  
40 (NW) LHIN (FPT = 24.64 (+/- 149.32), FPNT = 6.06 (+/- 101.30), SMD = 0.16).  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 The mean number of patients with psychosocial ADG's was higher for FPTs compared  
50  
51 to FPNTs (258.24 (+/- 204.4) vs. 217.56 (+/- 179.29), SMD = 0.21).The mean mental  
52  
53 health primary care provider (MHPCP) visits was higher in FPTs compared to FPNTs  
54  
55

1  
2  
3 (707.60 (+/- 2863.95) vs. 276.86 (+/- 532.56), SMD = 0.21). Due to the large standard  
4  
5 deviation, we also examined the median for MHPCP; FPTs had a higher median  
6  
7 MHPCP visits than FPNTs (229 (IQR=106-415) vs. 189 (IQR=110-350), SMD = 0.24).  
8  
9  
10 FPTs have a higher percentage of patients with 415+ MHPCP visits compared to  
11  
12 FPNTs (25.2% (n = 1026) vs. 16.7% (n = 1285), SMD 0.21).  
13  
14  
15  
16

17 The mean number of ED visits was **significantly** higher for FPTs compared to FPNTs  
18  
19 (440.82 (+/- 357.7) vs. 291.96 (+/- 240.01), SMD = 0.49). Table 1 describes the  
20  
21 difference between all categories, but the most notable differences are for patients that  
22  
23 had 60-156, 157-257, and 415+ visits. FPTs had a lower percentage of patients with 60-  
24  
25 156 ED visits than FPNTs (9.5% (n = 387) vs. 17.2% (n = 1320), SMD = 0.23) and  
26  
27 patients with 157-257 visits (12.0% (n = 489) vs. 19.5% (n = 1495), SMD = 0.21). FPTs  
28  
29 has a greater percentage of patients with 415+ ED visits compared to FPNTs (45.6% (n  
30  
31 = 1857) vs. 16.7% (n = 1285), SMD = 0.48).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 FPTs had a larger mean number of MHED visits for rostered patients compared to  
39  
40 FPNTs (18.99 (+/- 29.07) vs. 10.91 (+/- 13.07), SMD = 0.36). Full details within each  
41  
42 category are in Table 1, but the most notable difference was the group that had 0-3 and  
43  
44 20+ MHED visits. FPTs had a lower percentage of patients with 0-3 MHED visits than  
45  
46 FPNTs (16.7% (n = 681) vs. 27.5% (n = 2108), SMD = 0.26) and a higher percentage of  
47  
48 patients with 20+ MHED visits than FPNTs (30.9% (n = 1258) vs. 14.1% (n = 1084),  
49  
50 SMD = 0.41).  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 FPTs had a greater mean of hospitalizations compared to FPNTs (57.05 (+/-47.43) vs.  
4 10.91 (+/-13.07), SMD = 0.36). Full details within each category are in Table 1, but the  
5  
6 most notable difference was that FPTs had a larger percentage of patients with 11+  
7  
8 hospitalizations, compared to FPNTs (85.7% (n = 3491) vs. 78.8% (n = 6044), SMD =  
9  
10 0.18). Of those hospitalizations, mental health specific hospitalizations (MHH) were  
11  
12 measured. FPTs had a greater mean of MHH visits compared to FPNTs (7.01 (+/-13.61)  
13  
14 vs. 3.86 (+/-5.43), SMD = 0.36). The most striking differences were the groups that had  
15  
16 zero visits and those with 11+ visits. FPTs had a lower percentage of patients with zero  
17  
18 MHH visits compared to FPNTs (13.4% (n = 545) vs. 21.9% (n = 1679), SMD = 0.22).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ***Statistical Modeling***

### *Regression using Generalized Estimating Equations*

A full description of the findings is listed in Table 2. Within this model, a number of significant correlates of FPTs were identified, including physician age group of 55-64 (OR=0.85, CI=0.74-0.97), physician age group of 64+ (OR=0.85, CI=0.62-0.85), and FPTs were more likely to be located in rural areas (OR=1.38, CI=1.17-1.62). Compared to patient rosters of FPNTs, FPT rostered patients were: almost half as likely to be urban (OR=0.55, CI=0.43-.70), more likely to have psychiatric ADGs (OR=1.2, CI=0.86-1.66), and more likely to have 4-9 mental health ED (MHED) visits (OR=1.33, CI=1.03-1.72), patients with 10-19 MHED visits (OR=1.54 CI=1.14-2.07), patients with 20+

1  
2  
3 MHED visits (OR=2.17, CI=1.60-2.94), patients with 3-5 MHH (OR=1.21, CI=1.08-1.35),  
4  
5 patients with 6-10 MHH (OR=1.32, CI=1.15-1.51), patients with 11+ MHH (OR=1.77,  
6  
7 CI=1.28-2.43), patients with 157-257 mental health primary care (MHPC) visits  
8  
9 (OR=1.24, CI=1.00-1.54), patients with 258-414 MHPC visits (OR=1.38 CI=1.09-1.76),  
10  
11 patients with 415+ MHPC visits (OR=1.61, CI=01.33-1.94). [Insert Table 2].  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

## 17 Discussion

18  
19 To our knowledge, this is the first study that investigates trends and predictors of family  
20  
21 physicians referring to telepsychiatry at a system-level. Between FY 2008 and FY 2016,  
22  
23 there was a 9-fold increase in the number of primary care physicians referring to  
24  
25 telepsychiatry and a nearly 15-fold increase in the number of primary care patients  
26  
27 referred to telepsychiatry. 32% of family physicians referred to telepsychiatry, while less  
28  
29 than 1% of patients rostered to FPTs utilized telepsychiatry. [While patient adoption of](#)  
30  
31 [telepsychiatry continued to increase in Ontario during the study period, it still represents](#)  
32  
33 [a very small percentage of patients in Ontario. These visits represent, for the most part,](#)  
34  
35 [patients that ~~are~~ were required to go to a healthcare site to access care and psychiatrists](#)  
36  
37 [that are required to use the ~~OTN~~ provincial telemedicine platform. It is evident that there](#)  
38  
39 [remains a large opportunity to increase patient adoption. ~~As reported elsewhere, in~~](#)  
40  
41 [2012, only about 7% of psychiatrists were providing telepsychiatry visits, so similar to](#)  
42  
43 [patients, there is still significant adoption potential for psychiatrists.<sup>27</sup>-As discussed in](#)  
44  
45 [the introduction, it is likely that the recent Covid-19 related temporary policy changes to](#)  
46  
47 [virtual care ~~might~~ will present an opportunity for significant growth and adoption of](#)  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 telepsychiatry. This study can provides an essential benchmark for future analyses,  
4 comparing how these policy changes have changedshifted adoption patterns with  
5 patients and family physician referrals.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Physicians who referred to telepsychiatry in FY 2008 were mainly from northern regions  
13 (LHINs) of the province, whereas in FY 2016, more referrals from southern regions  
14 (LHINs) emerged, many of which still have rural pockets areas within their catchments.  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 Referral to telepsychiatry was much more evenly distributed throughout the province in  
20 FY 2016. In FY 2016 physicians from all LHINs referred somewhere between 4-10% of  
21 total telepsychiatry, compared to FY 2008 where the range spread from 0% to 20%,  
22 with six LHINs that delivered more than 9% of total telepsychiatry each and eight LHINs  
23 all delivering less than 4% each. While historically telepsychiatry was used to support  
24 rural populations, in later years of the study, there were increasing provincially funded  
25 'urban' telepsychiatry projects that aimed to increase adoption of telepsychiatry within  
26 urbanmore populous regions. While it i's important to create access and choice for  
27 patients in both rural and urban areas, and increase access provincially, policy-makers  
28 and funders should consider how existing payment and funding models support  
29 prioritization of care to underserved populations, and might consider strategies such as  
30 a wait-times dashboard to help better distribute care virtually. aspects of digital health  
31 equity<sup>43</sup>, allowing the use of diverse secure virtual platforms, funding home-based visits  
32 and establishing mechanisms to support the appropriate distribution of virtual care  
33 throughout the province.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Past studies have suggested that physicians who were more isolated and were part of  
4 an integrated health system had positive feelings about telemedicine, and that nurses  
5 were more enthusiastic about telemedicine than physicians.<sup>25,36</sup> As such, ~~unperhaps not~~  
6 surprisingly, this study found that predictors of family physician referrals to  
7 telepsychiatry include rurality of residence (for both provider and patient), ~~team-based~~  
8 ~~practice models, having more~~ nurse practitioners on the team, ~~and clinical complexity~~  
9 ~~of patient rosters, and if referring the provider was part of a family health team.~~  
10 Additionally, ~~FPTs were more likely to have rostered patients who had more clinical~~  
11 ~~complexity and higher healthcare utilization rates. While this might be an indicator of~~  
12 ~~patients' overall complexity, the number of people accessing mental health care in the~~  
13 ~~ED can also be an indicator of a lack of access to outpatient mental health care. As~~  
14 ~~access to telepsychiatry continues to increase, studies measuring potential diversion~~  
15 ~~from ED-related mental health visits would be helpful.~~  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 This study has numerous strengths; it utilizes a large, multi-year, linked dataset of family  
38 physician and patient data to help understand important characteristics that are  
39 common in physicians who refer to telepsychiatry. Additionally, since this study uses  
40 administrative data, the study was conducted rapidly using a retrospective analysis.  
41  
42 ~~However, t~~~~he~~is study also has several limitations. The identification of telepsychiatry  
43 visits is contingent upon psychiatrists using telepsychiatry billing codes and billing fee  
44 for service, so it is possible that there is missing data, or an underrepresentation of  
45 visits completed by physicians paid by salary or alternate funding. Another potential  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 limitation, is that while this study includes nurse practitioners as a covariate in the  
4  
5 analysis, it does not take into account actual nurse practitioner referrals to  
6  
7 telepsychiatry, which could lead to an underestimate of our total telepsychiatry visits.  
8  
9 We believe, however, that this will have minimal impact on our study because it is likely  
10  
11 that nurse practitioner referrals will be captured within total telepsychiatry visits, but  
12  
13 rostered (as defined in our methods) to a family physician instead.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

## 19 Conclusion

20  
21 ~~Over the study period, the number of patients receiving and providers referring to~~  
22 ~~telepsychiatry has increased by fifteen-fold and nine-fold, While telepsychiatry has seen~~  
23 ~~continued growth over recent years, respectively there remains significant opportunities~~  
24 ~~for increased adoption.~~ This study shows that certain factors, including rurality, provider  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

FPNTs. This study provides a baseline from which to assess recent rapid mobilization of telepsychiatry, and a means of doing so using administrative health data.

Tables and Figures

Figure 1. Telepsychiatry Adoption by Year (FY2008 and FY2016)




Figure 2. Percentage of Referring Physicians by Region (2008 and 2016)




Table 1. Comparative Analysis of Family Physicians that Refer to Telepsychiatry compared to (2016)

VARIABLE	VALUE	FPT	FPNT	TOTAL	SMD
		N = 4,074	N = 7,674	N = 11,748	
<b>PHYSICIAN CHARACTERISTICS</b>					
Physician Sex	F	1,647 (40.4%)	3,599 (46.9%)	5,246 (44.7%)	0.13
	M	2,427 (59.6%)	4,075 (53.1%)	6,502 (55.3%)	0.13
< 10,000 population in CMA	N	3,466 (85.1%)	7,041 (91.8%)	10,507 (89.4%)	0.21
	Y	608 (14.9%)	633 (8.2%)	1,241 (10.6%)	0.21
Nurse Practitioners on Team	Mean ± SD	1.71 ± 4.02	1.10 ± 3.70	1.31 ± 3.83	0.16
Physician Practice Type	FHT	1,145 (28.1%)	1,381 (18.0%)	2,526 (21.5%)	0.24
	Others	2,929 (71.9%)	6,293 (82.0%)	9,222 (78.5%)	0.24
<b>PATIENT ROSTER CHARACTERISTICS</b>					
Total # of attached patients	Mean ± SD	862.45 ± 668.36	766.97 ± 605.70	800.64 ± 630.13	0.15
# patients in NIQ 1,2&3 > # patients in NIQ 4&5	No	907 (22.3%)	2,127 (27.7%)	3,034 (25.8%)	0.13
	Yes	3,167 (77.7%)	5,353 (69.8%)	8,520 (72.5%)	0.18
Rural Residence	Mean ± SD	139.28 ± 256.05	54.93 ± 137.27	84.67 ± 192.19	0.41
# of patients in urban residence > # of patients in rural residence	No	594 (14.6%)	522 (6.8%)	1,116 (9.5%)	0.25
	Yes	3,480 (85.4%)	6,958 (90.7%)	10,438 (88.8%)	0.16
South East LHIN	Mean ± SD	47.03 ± 209.09	24.27 ± 132.92	32.29 ± 164.22	0.13
Champlain LHIN	Mean ± SD	61.94 ± 263.36	99.43 ± 287.94	86.21 ± 280.09	0.14
North Simcoe Muskoka LHIN	Mean ± SD	59.28 ± 230.38	15.12 ± 97.56	30.69 ± 159.11	0.25
North East LHIN	Mean ± SD	53.59 ± 228.57	19.86 ± 124.20	31.75 ± 169.31	0.18
North West LHIN	Mean ± SD	24.64 ± 149.32	6.06 ± 59.90	12.61 ± 101.30	0.16
# of patients with a psychosocial ADG	Mean ± SD	258.24 ± 204.40	217.56 ± 179.29	231.91 ± 189.52	0.21
Total MH PCP visits	Mean ± SD	707.60 ± 2,863.95	276.86 ± 532.56	428.74 ± 1,765.68	0.21
	Median (IQR)	239 (106-415)	188 (73-335)	204 (82-364)	0.24
	00-59	686 (16.8%)	1,626 (21.2%)	2,312 (19.7%)	0.11
	60-156	702 (17.2%)	1,612 (21.0%)	2,314 (19.7%)	0.1
157-257	795 (19.5%)	1,512 (19.7%)	2,307 (19.6%)	0	

	258-414	865 (21.2%)	1,445 (18.8%)	2,310 (19.7%)	0.06
	415-high	1,026 (25.2%)	1,285 (16.7%)	2,311 (19.7%)	0.21
<b>VARIABLE</b>	<b>VALUE</b>	<b>FPT</b>	<b>FPNT</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>SMD</b>
<b>Total ED visits</b>	Mean ± SD	440.82 ± 357.70	291.96 ± 240.01	344.45 ± 295.74	0.49
	00-59	493 (12.1%)	1,090 (14.2%)	1,583 (13.5%)	0.06
	60-156	387 (9.5%)	1,320 (17.2%)	1,707 (14.5%)	0.23
	157-257	489 (12.0%)	1,495 (19.5%)	1,984 (16.9%)	0.21
	258-414	848 (20.8%)	1,782 (23.2%)	2,630 (22.4%)	0.06
	415-high	1,857 (45.6%)	1,793 (23.4%)	3,650 (31.1%)	0.48
<b>Total MH ED visits</b>	Mean ± SD	18.99 ± 29.07	10.91 ± 13.07	13.75 ± 20.58	0.36
	00-03	681 (16.7%)	2,108 (27.5%)	2,789 (23.7%)	0.26
	04-09	922 (22.6%)	2,275 (29.6%)	3,197 (27.2%)	0.16
	10-19	1,213 (29.8%)	2,013 (26.2%)	3,226 (27.5%)	0.08
	20-high	1,258 (30.9%)	1,084 (14.1%)	2,342 (19.9%)	0.41
<b>Total hospitalizations</b>	Mean ± SD	57.05 ± 47.43	41.75 ± 36.01	47.15 ± 41.06	0.36
	0 visits	116 (2.8%)	286 (3.7%)	402 (3.4%)	0.05
	01-02 visit	133 (3.3%)	287 (3.7%)	420 (3.6%)	0.03
	03-05 visits	131 (3.2%)	374 (4.9%)	505 (4.3%)	0.08
	06-10 visits	203 (5.0%)	489 (6.4%)	692 (5.9%)	0.06
	11+ visits	3,491 (85.7%)	6,044 (78.8%)	9,535 (81.2%)	0.18
<b>Total MH hospitalizations</b>	Mean ± SD	7.01 ± 13.61	3.86 ± 5.43	4.97 ± 9.31	0.3
	0 visits	545 (13.4%)	1,679 (21.9%)	2,224 (18.9%)	0.22
	01-02 visit	768 (18.9%)	2,078 (27.1%)	2,846 (24.2%)	0.2
	03-05 visits	1,072 (26.3%)	1,959 (25.5%)	3,031 (25.8%)	0.02
	06-10 visits	964 (23.7%)	1,246 (16.2%)	2,210 (18.8%)	0.19
	11+ visits	725 (17.8%)	518 (6.8%)	1,243 (10.6%)	0.34

NIQ= Neighbourhood Income Quintiles  
 LHIN=Local Health Integration Networks  
 ADG= Aggregated Diagnosis Groupings  
 MHPCP= Mental Health Primary Care Practitioner  
 ED= Emergency Department  
 MH ED= Mental Health Emergency Department  
 MH= Mental Health

Table 2. Model using Generalized Estimating Equations comparing FPTs vs FPNTs (2016)

Analysis Of GEE Parameter Estimates			
	Estimate	95% Confidence Limits	
<b>Intercept</b>	-0.9162	-1.1901	-0.6423
<b>Physician Age 35-44 vs &lt;=34</b>	0.8895	0.7855	1.0072
<b>Physician Age 45-54 vs &lt;=34</b>	0.9082	0.7983	1.0333
<b>Physician Age 55-64 vs &lt;=34</b>	0.849	0.7419	0.9717
<b>Physician Age 64+ vs &lt;=34</b>	0.7255	0.6223	0.8458
<b>Sex (Male vs Female)</b>	1.0144	0.9368	1.0983
<b>Physician Rural (Yes vs No)</b>	1.3791	1.174	1.6199
<b>Canadian Medical Graduate (Yes vs No)</b>	1.0333	0.9493	1.1247
<b>Canadian Medical Graduate (Unknown vs No)</b>	1.0231	0.8617	1.2148
<b>More patients in low/med income quintile (Yes vs No)</b>	1.0719	0.969	1.1856
<b>More urban patients (Yes vs No)</b>	0.5491	0.4338	0.6952
<b>Mental Health ED Visits (04-09 vs 00-03)</b>	1.3289	1.0252	1.7226
<b>Mental Health ED Visits (10-19 vs 00-03)</b>	1.5373	1.1442	2.0654
<b>Mental Health ED Visits (20-high vs 00-03)</b>	2.1678	1.601	2.9352
<b>Mental Health Hospitalizations (0 visits vs 01-02 visit)</b>	0.9072	0.7363	1.1179
<b>Mental Health Hospitalizations 03-05 visits vs 01-02 visit</b>	1.2048	1.0749	1.3504
<b>Mental Health Hospitalizations 06-10 visits vs 01-02 visit</b>	1.316	1.1496	1.5064
<b>Mental Health Hospitalizations 11+ visits vs 01-02 visit</b>	1.7662	1.2837	2.4301
<b>Mental Health Primary Care Visits (60-156 vs 00-59)</b>	0.965	0.8134	1.1449
<b>Mental Health Primary Care Visits (157-257 vs 00-59)</b>	1.237	0.9943	1.539
<b>Mental Health Primary Care Visits (258-414 vs 00-59)</b>	1.384	1.0859	1.7638
<b>Mental Health Primary Care Visits (415-high vs 00-59)</b>	1.6089	1.3322	1.943
<b>More patients with psychiatric ADGs (Yes vs No)</b>	1.1979	0.8627	1.6634

ED= Emergency Department

ADG= Aggregated Diagnosis Groups

## References

1. Brien S, Grenier L, Kapral M. *Taking stock*. Health Quality Ontario; 2015.
2. Bishop TF, Press MJ, Keyhani S, Pincus HA. Acceptance of insurance by psychiatrists and the implications for access to mental health care. *JAMA psychiatry*. 2014;71(2):176-181.
3. World Health Organization. Mental disorders affect one in four people. *World Health Report*. 2001.
4. Alegría M, Nakash O, NeMoyer A. Increasing equity in access to mental health care: A critical first step in improving service quality. *World Psychiatry*. 2018;17(1):43.
5. Wang PS, Aguilar-Gaxiola S, Alonso J, et al. Use of mental health services for anxiety, mood, and substance disorders in 17 countries in the WHO world mental health surveys. *The Lancet*. 2007;370(9590):841-850.
6. Goldner EM, Jones W, Fang ML. Access to and waiting time for psychiatrist services in a canadian urban area: A study in real time. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*. 2011;56(8):474-480.
7. Meadows GN, Enticott JC, Inder B, Russell GM, Gurr R. Better access to mental health care and the failure of the medicare principle of universality. *Med J Aust*. 2015;202(4):190-194.

- 1  
2  
3 8. Cunningham PJ. Beyond parity: Primary care physicians' perspectives on access to  
4 mental health care: More PCPs have trouble obtaining mental health services for their  
5 patients than have problems getting other specialty services. *Health Aff.*  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 2009;28(Suppl1):w490-w501.  
11
- 12  
13 9. Kurdyak P, Zaheer J, Cheng J, Rudoler D, Mulsant BH. Changes in characteristics  
14 and practice patterns of ontario psychiatrists: Implications for access to psychiatrists.  
15  
16  
17  
18 *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry.* 2017;62(1):40-47.  
19
- 20  
21 10. Kurdyak P, Stukel TA, Goldbloom D, Kopp A, Zagorski BM, Mulsant BH. Universal  
22 coverage without universal access: A study of psychiatrist supply and practice patterns  
23 in ontario. *Open Medicine.* 2014;8(3):e87.  
24  
25  
26  
27
- 28  
29 11. Myers KM, Valentine JM, Melzer SM. Child and adolescent telepsychiatry:  
30 Utilization and satisfaction. *Telemedicine and e-Health.* 2008;14(2):131-137.  
31  
32  
33
- 34  
35 12. Antonacci DJ, Bloch RM, Saeed SA, Yildirim Y, Talley J. Empirical evidence on the  
36 use and effectiveness of telepsychiatry via videoconferencing: Implications for forensic  
37 and correctional psychiatry. *Behav Sci Law.* 2008;26(3):253-269.  
38  
39  
40  
41
- 42  
43 13. Campbell R, O'Gorman J, Cernovsky ZZ. Reactions of psychiatric patients to  
44 telepsychiatry. *Mental illness.* 2015;7(2).  
45  
46  
47  
48
- 49 14. Deslich S, Stec B, Tomblin S, Coustasse A. Telepsychiatry in the 21st century:  
50 Transforming healthcare with technology. *Perspectives in Health Information*  
51  
52  
53  
54

1  
2  
3 *Management/AHIMA, American Health Information Management Association.*

4  
5 2013;10(Summer).

6  
7  
8  
9 15. Fleming DA, Edison KE, Pak H. Telehealth ethics. *Telemedicine and e-Health.*

10  
11 2009;15(8):797-803.

12  
13  
14 16. Saeed SA, Diamond J, Bloch RM. Use of telepsychiatry to improve care for people  
15 with mental illness in rural North Carolina. *NC Med J.* 2011;72(3):219-222.

16  
17  
18 17. Ulzen T, Williamson L, Foster PP, Parris-Barnes K. The evolution of a community-  
19 based telepsychiatry program in rural alabama: Lessons learned—a brief report.

20  
21  
22 *Community Ment Health J.* 2013;49(1):101-105.

23  
24  
25 18. Lyketsos CG, Roques C, Hovanec L, Jones III BN. Telemedicine use and the  
26 reduction of psychiatric admissions from a long-term care facility. *J Geriatr Psychiatry*  
27 *Neurol.* 2001;14(2):76-79.

28  
29  
30 19. Hilty DM, Ferrer DC, Parish MB, Johnston B, Callahan EJ, Yellowlees PM. The  
31 effectiveness of telemental health: A 2013 review. *Telemedicine and e-Health.*

32  
33 2013;19(6):444-454.

34  
35  
36 20. Chakrabarti S. Usefulness of telepsychiatry: A critical evaluation of

37  
38  
39 videoconferencing-based approaches. *World journal of psychiatry.* 2015;5(3):286.

- 1  
2  
3 21. Bishop JE, O'Reilly RL, Maddox K, Hutchinson LJ. Client satisfaction in a feasibility  
4 study comparing face-to-face interviews with telepsychiatry. *J Telemed Telecare*.  
5  
6 2002;8(4):217-221.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 22. Frueh BC, Monnier J, Yim E, Grubaugh AL, Hamner MB, Knapp RG. A randomized  
12 trial of telepsychiatry for post-traumatic stress disorder. *J Telemed Telecare*.  
13  
14 2007;13(3):142-147.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 23. Farabee D, Calhoun S, Veliz R. An experimental comparison of telepsychiatry and  
20 conventional psychiatry for parolees. *Psychiatric Services*. 2016;67(5):562-565.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 24. Bashshur RL, Shannon GW, Bashshur N, Yellowlees PM. The empirical evidence  
26 for telemedicine interventions in mental disorders. *Telemedicine and e-Health*.  
27  
28 2016;22(2):87-113.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 25. Sargeant J, Allen M, Langille D. Physician perceptions of the effect of telemedicine  
34 on rural retention and recruitment. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2004;10(2):89-93.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39 26. Swanson B. Information technology and under-served communities. *J Telemed*  
40  
41 *Telecare*. 1999;5(2\_suppl):3-10.  
42  
43  
44  
45 27. Serhal E, Crawford A, Cheng J, Kurdyak P. Implementation and utilisation of  
46 telepsychiatry in Ontario: A population-based study. *The Canadian Journal of*  
47  
48 *Psychiatry*. 2017;62(10):716-725.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 28. Grumbach K, Selby JV, Damberg C, et al. Resolving the gatekeeper conundrum:  
4  
5 What patients value in primary care and referrals to specialists. *JAMA*.  
6  
7 1999;282(3):261-266.  
8  
9  
10  
11 29. Norton PG, Dunn EV, Bestvater D. Referrals in primary care: Is the family physician  
12  
13 a "Gatekeeper"? *Canadian Family Physician*. 1989;35:1776.  
14  
15  
16  
17 30. Steele M, Zayed R, Davidson B, et al. Referral patterns and training needs in  
18  
19 psychiatry among primary care physicians in canadian rural/remote areas. *Journal of*  
20  
21 *the Canadian Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*. 2012;21(2):111.  
22  
23  
24  
25 31. Spaulding RJ, Russo T, Cook DJ, Doolittle GC. Diffusion theory and telemedicine  
26  
27 adoption by kansas health-care providers: Critical factors in telemedicine adoption for  
28  
29 improved patient access. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2005;11(1\_suppl):107-109.  
30  
31  
32  
33 32. Whitten P, Franken EA. Telemedicine for patient consultation: Factors affecting use  
34  
35 by rural primary-care physicians in kansas. *J Telemed Telecare*. 1995;1(3):139-144.  
36  
37  
38  
39 33. LeRouge C, Garfield M. Crossing the telemedicine chasm: Have the US barriers to  
40  
41 widespread adoption of telemedicine been significantly reduced? *International journal of*  
42  
43 *environmental research and public health*. 2013;10(12):6472-6484.  
44  
45  
46  
47 34. Moore MA, Coffman M, Jetty A, Klink K, Petterson S, Bazemore A. Family  
48  
49 physicians report considerable interest in, but limited use of, telehealth services. *The*  
50  
51 *Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*. 2017;30(3):320-330.  
52  
53  
54

- 1  
2  
3 35. Spaulding R, Cain S, Sonnenschein K. Urban telepsychiatry: Uncommon service for  
4 a common need. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics*. 2011;20(1):29-39.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 36. Whitten PS, Mackert MS. Addressing telehealth's foremost barrier: Provider as initial  
10 gatekeeper. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2005;21(4):517-521.  
11  
12  
13  
14 37. Steele LS, Glazier RH, Lin E, Evans M. Using administrative data to measure  
15 ambulatory mental health service provision in primary care. *Med Care*. 2004:960-965.  
16  
17  
18  
19 38. Austin PC, van Walraven C, Wodchis WP, Newman A, Anderson GM. Using the  
20 Johns Hopkins aggregated diagnosis groups (ADGs) to predict mortality in a general  
21 adult population cohort in Ontario, Canada. *Med Care*. 2011;49(10):932.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 39. Cohen J. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Routledge; 2013.  
29  
30  
31  
32 40. Austin PC. Using the standardized difference to compare the prevalence of a binary  
33 variable between two groups in observational research. *Communications in Statistics-  
34 Simulation and Computation*. 2009;38(6):1228-1234.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 41. Wang M. Generalized estimating equations in longitudinal data analysis: A review  
41 and recent developments. *Advances in Statistics*. 2014;2014.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46 42. The Ontario Physician Human Resources Data Centre. . (2018, 10). Physicians in  
47 Ontario 2017. Retrieved from the Ontario Physician Human Resources data centre:  
48 [Http://Www.ophrdc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/PIO-2017-report-with-](http://www.ophrdc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/PIO-2017-report-with-hyperlinks.pdf)  
49 [hyperlinks.pdf](http://www.ophrdc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/PIO-2017-report-with-hyperlinks.pdf). *McMaster University*. 2018.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

43. Crawford, A., & Serhal, E. (2020). Digital Health Equity and COVID-19: The Innovation Curve Cannot Reinforce the Social Gradient of Health. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 22(6), e19361.