

This is a repository copy of *Characterizing Family Physicians Who Refer to Telepsychiatry in Ontario*.

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 [orcid.org/0000-0003-3961-6008](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3961-6008) et al. (2 more authors) (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:</p> <p>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

(a clinical site that connects to the centralized provincial network). It is important to note that at the time this paper was submitted temporary policy changes to virtual care as a result of Covid-19 (introduced March 2020) have created more options for home-based care for patients, and have allowed physicians to deliver virtual care via a variety of virtual platforms. These recent changes will be discussed in relation to study findings in the discussion section.

Family physicians are the gatekeepers to specialist care in Canada and other parts of the world.<sup>28,29</sup> Common reasons for family physician referral to psychiatry include obtaining medication recommendations, obtaining second opinions, or non-pharmacological treatment recommendations.<sup>30</sup> Evidence shows providers who are more isolated had more positive feelings about telemedicine.<sup>25</sup> Positive perceptions of telemedicine included convenience, perceived patient benefits, reduced wait time, cost-effectiveness, and access to medical expertise, while negative aspects included cost, reduced funding for in-person services, inconvenience, inadequate reimbursement and training, medical liability, and physician fear of practice change.<sup>25,31-34</sup> Previous studies suggest nurses may be more enthusiastic about telemedicine than physicians, referring physicians tend to be more satisfied than specialists, satisfaction increases relative to use and time, and that providers do not recommend telemedicine in all circumstances.<sup>29,35,36</sup> The objective of this study was to examine the characteristics of family physicians in Ontario who have referred patients to telepsychiatry (FPTs) compared to family physicians who have not referred to telepsychiatry (FPNTs) from FY



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

2008 to FY 2016, in order to understand if there are specific factors that make certain family physicians more likely to refer than others.

**Methods**

***Setting and Study Design***

We conducted an annual retrospective cross-sectional study assessing descriptive characteristics of FPTs for FYs (2008 to 2016); this time horizon was used because it 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 (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. 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 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

using these measures.<sup>34</sup> The primary care provider characteristics used to compare 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**

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

<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>

and addiction diagnoses as defined by the International Classification of Diseases 10 (ICD-10-CA).<sup>37</sup> Hospitalizations and ED visits included 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 involvement of the condition.<sup>38</sup>

## ***Analysis***

### *Descriptive Analysis*

#### Annual Outputs and Trends over Time

Annual panels containing physician and patient characteristics were described, including counts, column percentages, and means with standard deviations. Additionally, changes over time were evaluated for each of the physician characteristics.

#### Matched Physician Comparison

Matched comparisons between FTPs and FTNPs were presented as counts, column percentages, and standardized mean differences (SMD). We compared between-group differences using the standard mean difference (SMD). Cohen (1988) suggests a small effect size is equal to 0.2 SMD, but recent studies suggest that a more prudent threshold for assessing effect size is 0.1 SMD, especially with large data sets.<sup>39,40</sup> Using this threshold (0.1 SMD), this study identifies significant differences between groups.

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

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

Statistical Analysis

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

**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

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

[Insert Table 1]

*Comparing Patient Roster Characteristics*

There were a few notable differences in patient roster characteristics between FPTs and FPNTs. FPTs had a larger mean number of attached patients than FPNTs (862.45 (+/- 668.36) vs. 788.97 (+/- 605.70), SMD = 0.15). A greater percentage of FPTs had patients on their roster from lower NIQ's than FPNTs (1-3) (77.7% (n = 3167) vs. 69.8% (n = 5353), SMD = 0.18). FPTs had a larger mean number of patients from a rural

residence compared to FPNTs (139.28 (+/- 256.05) vs. 54.93 (+/- 137.27), SMD = 0.41). A greater percentage of FPTs had more patients from rural areas than urban areas (14.6% (N = 594) vs. 6.8% (n = 522), SMD = 0.25). FPNTs had a higher patient mean in the Champlain LHIN (which includes Ottawa, a large urban region in Ontario) (FPT = 61.94 (+/- 236.36), FPTN = 99.43 (+/-287.94), SMD = 0.14). FPTs had higher patient means in four LHINs (mostly northern regions): South East (SE) LHIN (FPT = 47.03 (+/- 209), FPTN = 24.27 (+/-132.92), SMD = 0.13), North Simcoe Muskoka (NSM) LHIN (FPT = 59.28 (+/- 230.38), FPNT = 15.12 (+/- 97.56), SMD =0.25), North East (NE) LHIN (FPT = 53.59 (+/- 228.57), FPNT = 19.86 (+/- 124.20), SMD =0.18), North West (NW) LHIN (FPT = 24.64 (+/- 149.32), FPNT = 6.06 (+/- 101.30), SMD = 0.16).

The mean number of patients with psychosocial ADG's was higher for FPTs compared to FPNTs (258.24 (+/- 204.4) vs. 217.56 (+/- 179.29), SMD = 0.21). The mean mental health primary care provider (MHPCP) visits was higher in FPTs compared to FPNTs (707.60 (+/- 2863.95) vs. 276.86 (+/- 532.56), SMD = 0.21). Due to the large standard deviation, we also examined the median for MHPCP; FPTs had a higher median MHPCP visits than FPNTs (229 (IQR=106-415) vs. 189 (IQR=110-350), SMD = 0.24). FPTs have a higher percentage of patients with 415+ MHPCP visits compared to FPNTs (25.2% (n = 1026) vs. 16.7% (n = 1285), SMD 0.21).

The mean number of ED visits was higher for FPTs compared to FPTNs (440.82 (+/- 357.7) vs. 291.96 (+/- 240.01), SMD = 0.49). Table 1 describes the difference between all categories, but the most notable differences are for patients that had 60-156, 157-



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

257, and 415+ visits. FPTs had a lower percentage of patients with 60-156 ED visits than FPNTs (9.5% (n = 387) vs. 17.2% (n = 1320), SMD = 0.23) and patients with 157-257 visits (12.0% (n = 489) vs. 19.5% (n = 1495), SMD = 0.21). FPTs has a greater percentage of patients with 415+ ED visits compared to FPNTs (45.6% (n = 1857) vs. 16.7% (n = 1285), SMD = 0.48).

FPTs had a larger mean number of MHED visits for rostered patients compared to FPNTs (18.99 (+/- 29.07) vs. 10.91 (+/- 13.07), SMD = 0.36). Full details within each category are in Table 1, but the most notable difference was the group that had 0-3 and 20+ MHED visits. FPTs had a lower percentage of patients with 0-3 MHED visits than FPNTs (16.7% (n = 681) vs. 27.5% (n = 2108), SMD = 0.26) and a higher percentage of patients with 20+ MHED visits than FPNTs (30.9% (n = 1258) vs. 14.1% (n = 1084), SMD = 0.41).

FPTs had a greater mean of hospitalizations compared to FPNTs (57.05 (+/-47.43) vs. 10.91 (+/-13.07), SMD = 0.36). Full details within each category are in Table 1, but the most notable difference was that FPTs had a larger percentage of patients with 11+ hospitalizations, compared to FPNTs (85.7% (n = 3491) vs. 78.8% (n = 6044), SMD = 0.18). Of those hospitalizations, mental health specific hospitalizations (MHH) were measured. FPTs had a greater mean of MHH visits compared to FPNTs (7.01 (+/-13.61) vs. 3.86 (+/-5.43), SMD = 0.36). The most striking differences were the groups that had zero visits and those with 11+ visits. FPTs had a lower percentage of patients with zero MHH visits compared to FPNTs (13.4% (n = 545) vs. 21.9% (n = 1679), SMD = 0.22).

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

## **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+ 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].

## **Discussion**

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  
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

there was a 9-fold increase in the number of primary care physicians referring to telepsychiatry and a nearly 15-fold increase in the number of primary care patients referred to telepsychiatry. 32% of family physicians referred to telepsychiatry, while less than 1% of patients rostered to FPTs utilized telepsychiatry. While patient adoption of telepsychiatry continued to increase in Ontario during the study period, it still represents a very small percentage of patients in Ontario. These visits represent, for the most part, patients that were required to go to a healthcare site to access care and psychiatrists that are required to use the provincial telemedicine platform. It is evident that there remains a large opportunity to increase patient adoption. As discussed in the introduction, it is likely that the recent Covid-19 related temporary policy changes to virtual care will present an opportunity for significant growth and adoption of telepsychiatry. This study provides an essential benchmark for future analyses, comparing how these policy changes have shifted adoption patterns with patients and family physician referrals.

Physicians who referred to telepsychiatry in FY 2008 were mainly from northern regions, whereas in FY 2016, more referrals from southern regions emerged, many of which still have rural areas within their catchments. Referral to telepsychiatry was more evenly distributed throughout the province in FY 2016. While historically telepsychiatry was used to support rural populations, in later years of the study, there were increasing provincially funded telepsychiatry projects that aimed to increase adoption of telepsychiatry within more populous regions. While it is important to create access and choice for patients in both rural and urban areas, policy-makers and funders should

consider aspects of digital health equity<sup>43</sup>, allowing the use of diverse secure virtual platforms, funding home-based visits and establishing mechanisms to support the appropriate distribution of virtual care throughout the province.

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

This study has numerous strengths; it utilizes a large, multi-year, linked dataset of family physician and patient data to help understand important characteristics that are common in physicians who refer to telepsychiatry. Additionally, since this study uses administrative data, the study was conducted rapidly using a retrospective analysis. However, the study also has several limitations. The identification of telepsychiatry visits is contingent upon psychiatrists using telepsychiatry billing codes and billing fee for service, so it is possible that there is missing data, or an underrepresentation of visits completed by physicians paid by salary or alternate funding. Another potential limitation, is that while this study includes nurse practitioners as a covariate in the analysis, it does not take into account actual nurse practitioner referrals to telepsychiatry, which could lead to an underestimate of our total telepsychiatry visits. We believe, however, that this will have minimal impact on our study because it is likely

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


that nurse practitioner referrals will be captured within total telepsychiatry visits, but rostered (as defined in our methods) to a family physician instead.

**Conclusion**

While telepsychiatry has seen continued growth over recent years, there remains significant opportunities for increased adoption. This study shows that certain factors, including rurality, provider practice type, the number of nurse practitioners on the provider’s team, as well as patient healthcare and hospital utilization characteristics are more likely in FPTs than 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	
PHYSICIAN CHARACTERISTICS					
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
PATIENT ROSTER CHARACTERISTICS					
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	
Intercept	-0.9162	-1.1901	-0.6423
Physician Age 35-44 vs <=34	0.8895	0.7855	1.0072
Physician Age 45-54 vs <=34	0.9082	0.7983	1.0333
Physician Age 55-64 vs <=34	0.849	0.7419	0.9717
Physician Age 64+ vs <=34	0.7255	0.6223	0.8458
Sex (Male vs Female)	1.0144	0.9368	1.0983
Physician Rural (Yes vs No)	1.3791	1.174	1.6199
Canadian Medical Graduate (Yes vs No)	1.0333	0.9493	1.1247
Canadian Medical Graduate (Unknown vs No)	1.0231	0.8617	1.2148
More patients in low/med income quintile (Yes vs No)	1.0719	0.969	1.1856
More urban patients (Yes vs No)	0.5491	0.4338	0.6952
Mental Health ED Visits (04-09 vs 00-03)	1.3289	1.0252	1.7226
Mental Health ED Visits (10-19 vs 00-03)	1.5373	1.1442	2.0654
Mental Health ED Visits (20-high vs 00-03)	2.1678	1.601	2.9352
Mental Health Hospitalizations (0 visits vs 01-02 visit)	0.9072	0.7363	1.1179
Mental Health Hospitalizations 03-05 visits vs 01-02 visit	1.2048	1.0749	1.3504
Mental Health Hospitalizations 06-10 visits vs 01-02 visit	1.316	1.1496	1.5064
Mental Health Hospitalizations 11+ visits vs 01-02 visit	1.7662	1.2837	2.4301
Mental Health Primary Care Visits (60-156 vs 00-59)	0.965	0.8134	1.1449
Mental Health Primary Care Visits (157-257 vs 00-59)	1.237	0.9943	1.539
Mental Health Primary Care Visits (258-414 vs 00-59)	1.384	1.0859	1.7638
Mental Health Primary Care Visits (415-high vs 00-59)	1.6089	1.3322	1.943
More patients with psychiatric ADGs (Yes vs No)	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.

8. Cunningham PJ. Beyond parity: Primary care physicians' perspectives on access to mental health care: More PCPs have trouble obtaining mental health services for their patients than have problems getting other specialty services. *Health Aff.* 2009;28(Suppl1):w490-w501.

9. Kurdyak P, Zaheer J, Cheng J, Rudoler D, Mulsant BH. Changes in characteristics and practice patterns of ontario psychiatrists: Implications for access to psychiatrists. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry.* 2017;62(1):40-47.

10. Kurdyak P, Stukel TA, Goldbloom D, Kopp A, Zagorski BM, Mulsant BH. Universal coverage without universal access: A study of psychiatrist supply and practice patterns in ontario. *Open Medicine.* 2014;8(3):e87.

11. Myers KM, Valentine JM, Melzer SM. Child and adolescent telepsychiatry: Utilization and satisfaction. *Telemedicine and e-Health.* 2008;14(2):131-137.

12. Antonacci DJ, Bloch RM, Saeed SA, Yildirim Y, Talley J. Empirical evidence on the use and effectiveness of telepsychiatry via videoconferencing: Implications for forensic and correctional psychiatry. *Behav Sci Law.* 2008;26(3):253-269.

13. Campbell R, O’Gorman J, Cernovsky ZZ. Reactions of psychiatric patients to telepsychiatry. *Mental illness.* 2015;7(2).

14. Deslich S, Stec B, Tomblin S, Coustasse A. Telepsychiatry in the 21st century: Transforming healthcare with technology. *Perspectives in Health Information*

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

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

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

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

30  
31  
32  
33 19. Hilty DM, Ferrer DC, Parish MB, Johnston B, Callahan EJ, Yellowlees PM. The  
34 effectiveness of telemental health: A 2013 review. *Telemedicine and e-Health.*

35  
36 2013;19(6):444-454.

37  
38  
39 20. Chakrabarti S. Usefulness of telepsychiatry: A critical evaluation of  
40 videoconferencing-based approaches. *World journal of psychiatry.* 2015;5(3):286.

21. Bishop JE, O'Reilly RL, Maddox K, Hutchinson LJ. Client satisfaction in a feasibility study comparing face-to-face interviews with telepsychiatry. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2002;8(4):217-221.

22. Frueh BC, Monnier J, Yim E, Grubaugh AL, Hamner MB, Knapp RG. A randomized trial of telepsychiatry for post-traumatic stress disorder. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2007;13(3):142-147.

23. Farabee D, Calhoun S, Veliz R. An experimental comparison of telepsychiatry and conventional psychiatry for parolees. *Psychiatric Services*. 2016;67(5):562-565.

24. Bashshur RL, Shannon GW, Bashshur N, Yellowlees PM. The empirical evidence for telemedicine interventions in mental disorders. *Telemedicine and e-Health*. 2016;22(2):87-113.

25. Sargeant J, Allen M, Langille D. Physician perceptions of the effect of telemedicine on rural retention and recruitment. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2004;10(2):89-93.

26. Swanson B. Information technology and under-served communities. *J Telemed Telecare*. 1999;5(2\_suppl):3-10.

27. Serhal E, Crawford A, Cheng J, Kurdyak P. Implementation and utilisation of telepsychiatry in Ontario: A population-based study. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*. 2017;62(10):716-725.

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

35. Spaulding R, Cain S, Sonnenschein K. Urban telepsychiatry: Uncommon service for a common need. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics*. 2011;20(1):29-39.

36. Whitten PS, Mackert MS. Addressing telehealth's foremost barrier: Provider as initial gatekeeper. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2005;21(4):517-521.

37. Steele LS, Glazier RH, Lin E, Evans M. Using administrative data to measure ambulatory mental health service provision in primary care. *Med Care*. 2004:960-965.

38. Austin PC, van Walraven C, Wodchis WP, Newman A, Anderson GM. Using the Johns Hopkins aggregated diagnosis groups (ADGs) to predict mortality in a general adult population cohort in Ontario, Canada. *Med Care*. 2011;49(10):932.

39. Cohen J. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Routledge; 2013.

40. Austin PC. Using the standardized difference to compare the prevalence of a binary variable between two groups in observational research. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation*. 2009;38(6):1228-1234.

41. Wang M. Generalized estimating equations in longitudinal data analysis: A review and recent developments. *Advances in Statistics*. 2014;2014.

42. The Ontario Physician Human Resources Data Centre. . (2018, 10). Physicians in Ontario 2017. Retrieved from the Ontario Physician Human Resources data centre: [Http://Www.ophrdc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/PIO-2017-report-with-hyperlinks.pdf](http://www.ophrdc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/PIO-2017-report-with-hyperlinks.pdf). *McMaster University*. 2018.

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.

**Résultats :** Entre l'EF 2008 et l'EF 2016, les visites en télépsychiatrie sont passées de 925 à 13 825 visites. Trente-deux pour cent des médecins de première ligne en Ontario ont référé à la télépsychiatrie en 2017. Plusieurs caractéristiques étaient notablement différentes entre les médecins de famille qui réfèrent en télépsychiatrie (MFT) et les médecins de famille qui ne réfèrent pas en télépsychiatrie (MFNT) : les MFT étaient plus susceptibles de provenir d'une résidence de moins de 10 000 personnes, d'avoir plus d'infirmières praticiennes (IP) dans leur pratique, et de faire partie d'une équipe de santé familiale (ESF) que les MFNT. Les patients inscrits étaient plus susceptibles de résider en région rurale, de présenter plus de complexité clinique, et d'utiliser plus de services de santé mentale comparativement aux MFNT.

**Conclusion :** Il y a eu une augmentation de l'utilisation de la télépsychiatrie par les patients et les médecins de famille durant la période de l'étude, bien qu'il demeure une possibilité de croissance significative. Les médecins de famille qui habitent en milieu rural, qui font partie d'une ESF, qui ont plus d'IP, dont les patients sont davantage complexes et en milieu rural étaient plus susceptibles de référer en télépsychiatrie. Comme de récentes politiques en faveur de la télépsychiatrie en soutiennent la croissance, la présente étude servira de base de départ importante.


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



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.

**Conclusion**

There has been an increase in the use of telepsychiatry by patients and family physicians over the study period, although there remains opportunity for significant growth. ~~and family~~Family physicians that ~~are~~live in ~~a~~ rural areas~~s~~, are part of a FHT, have more NPs, with more rural and complex patients ~~patients in rural areas with high needs for mental health services are~~ were more likely to refer to telepsychiatry. As recent pro-telemedicine policies support the growth of telepsychiatry, this study will serve as an important baseline.

## 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  
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

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 the Ontario Telemedicine Network (OTN) platform (a centralized, government funded platform) to deliver care. Additionally, other than small pilot tests, and patients were typically required to access their telepsychiatry visit at a patient host site (a clinical site that could connect to the OTN-connects to the centralized provincial network). It is important to note that at the time this paper was submitted there were significant temporary policy changes to virtual care as a result of Covid-19 (introduced March 2020), which have created more options for home-based care for patients, and have allowed physicians to deliver virtual care via a variety of virtual platforms. have removed the requirement that physicians must be members of the OTN network, and use the OTN platforms to deliver and bill for virtual care. These recent changes will be discussed in relation to the study findings in the discussion section.

Family physicians are the gatekeepers to specialist care in Canada and other parts of the world.<sup>28,29</sup> Common reasons for family physician referral to psychiatry include obtaining medication recommendations, obtaining second opinions, or for patients who are non-responsive to medications, getting a second opinion on a diagnosis, and obtaining non-pharmacological treatment recommendations.<sup>30</sup> Evidence shows providers who are more isolated had more positive feelings about telemedicine.<sup>25</sup>

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

## Methods

### *Setting and Study Design*

We conducted an annual retrospective cross-sectional study assessing descriptive characteristics of FPTs for FYs (2008 to 2016); this time horizon was used because it

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

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 using these measures.<sup>34</sup> The primary care provider characteristics used to compare 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.

---

<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 **Patient Characteristics**  
4  
5

6 We examined patient demographic and service utilization characteristics for patients  
7  
8 rostered within each physician group (FPT vs FPNT). Patient demographic  
9  
10 characteristics included age, sex, neighbourhood income quintile (NIQ) (NIQ 1= 0-20%,  
11  
12 NIQ 2= 20-40%, NIQ 3= 40-60%, NIQ 4= 60-80%, NIQ 5= 80%+), and whether they live  
13  
14 in a rural or urban area. Patient utilization and medical complexity were considered  
15  
16 within each annual cross-section by assessing: number of primary care provider visits  
17  
18 (total, mental health and non-mental health); number of emergency department visits  
19  
20 (total, mental health and non-mental health-related); number of hospitalizations (total,  
21  
22 mental health and non-mental health-related); and comorbidities using the Johns  
23  
24 Hopkins' Aggregated Diagnosis Groups (ADG). Mental health primary care visits were  
25  
26 defined using a validated algorithm to identify adults accessing care for a mental health  
27  
28 disorder, which included adult mental health diagnostic codes 295-298, 300-304, 306,  
29  
30 309, 311, 897-902, 904, 905 (which represents a broad range of adult mental health  
31  
32 and addiction diagnoses as defined by the International Classification of Diseases 10  
33  
34 (ICD-10-CA)).~~Mental health primary care visits were defined using a validated algorithm,~~  
35  
36 ~~and included mental health diagnostic codes 295-298, 300-304, 306, 309, 311, 897-~~  
37  
38 ~~902, 904, 905.~~<sup>37</sup> Hospitalizations and ED visits included International Classification of  
39  
40 Diseases 10 (ICD-10-CA) codes F04-F99 (which excludes dementia). The Johns  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

involvement of the condition. ~~Study subjects may have diagnoses ranging between 0-32 ADGs.~~<sup>38</sup>

## Analysis

### *Descriptive Analysis*

#### Annual Outputs and Trends over Time

Annual panels containing physician and patient characteristics were described, including counts, column percentages, and means with standard deviations.

Additionally, changes over time were evaluated for each of the physician characteristics ~~to assess if there were changing trends in physicians using telepsychiatry throughout our study period.~~

#### Matched Physician Comparison

~~A one-year (FY 2016) comparison of FPTs vs FPNTs to compare between-group differences was conducted by matching (1:2) based on the fourteen LHINs (the region in which they worked).~~ Matched comparisons between FTPs and FTNPs were presented as counts, column percentages, and standardized mean differences (SMD). We compared between-group differences using the standard mean difference (SMD). Cohen (1988) suggests a small effect size is equal to 0.2 SMD, but recent studies suggest that a more prudent threshold for assessing effect size is 0.1 SMD, especially with large data sets.<sup>39,40</sup> Using this threshold (0.1 SMD), this study identifies significant differences between groups.



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

Statistical Analysis

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

~~practitioner variables were removed, as they were enveloped within the cluster and thus would have been considered co-linear.~~ All analyses were carried out using SAS version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC). All results were presented as adjusted odds ratios (ORs) with corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs).

## Results

### *Descriptive analysis of FTPs*

~~Our study compared the difference between FTPs and FPNTs, using descriptive and statistical analyses.~~ 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 ~~also~~ 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 ~~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

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

[Insert Table 1]

### *Comparing Patient Roster Characteristics*

There were a few notable differences in patient roster characteristics between FPTs and FPNTs. FPTs had a larger mean number of attached patients than FPNTs (862.45 (+/- 668.36) vs. 788.97 (+/- 605.70), SMD = 0.15). A greater percentage of FPTs had patients on their roster from lower NIQ's than FPNTs (1-3) (77.7% (n = 3167) vs. 69.8% (n = 5353), SMD = 0.18). FPTs had a larger mean number of patients from a rural residence compared to FPNTs (139.28 (+/- 256.05) vs. 54.93 (+/- 137.27), SMD = 0.41). A greater percentage of FPTs had more patients from rural areas than urban areas (14.6% (N = 594) vs. 6.8% (n = 522), SMD = 0.25). FPNTs had a higher patient mean in the Champlain LHIN (which includes Ottawa, a large urban region in Ontario) (FPT = 61.94 (+/- 236.36), FPTN = 99.43 (+/-287.94), SMD = 0.14). FPTs had higher patient means in four LHINs (mostly northern regions): South East (SE) LHIN (FPT = 47.03 (+/- 209), FPTN = 24.27 (+/-132.92), SMD = 0.13), North Simcoe Muskoka (NSM) LHIN (FPT = 59.28 (+/- 230.38), FPNT = 15.12 (+/- 97.56), SMD =0.25), North East (NE) LHIN (FPT = 53.59 (+/- 228.57), FPNT = 19.86 (+/- 124.20), SMD =0.18), North West (NW) LHIN (FPT = 24.64 (+/- 149.32), FPNT = 6.06 (+/- 101.30), SMD = 0.16).

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

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

(707.60 (+/- 2863.95) vs. 276.86 (+/- 532.56), SMD = 0.21). Due to the large standard deviation, we also examined the median for MHPCP; FPTs had a higher median MHPCP visits than FPNTs (229 (IQR=106-415) vs. 189 (IQR=110-350), SMD = 0.24). FPTs have a higher percentage of patients with 415+ MHPCP visits compared to FPNTs (25.2% (n = 1026) vs. 16.7% (n = 1285), SMD 0.21).

The mean number of ED visits was **significantly** higher for FPTs compared to FPNTs (440.82 (+/- 357.7) vs. 291.96 (+/- 240.01), SMD = 0.49). Table 1 describes the difference between all categories, but the most notable differences are for patients that had 60-156, 157-257, and 415+ visits. FPTs had a lower percentage of patients with 60-156 ED visits than FPNTs (9.5% (n = 387) vs. 17.2% (n = 1320), SMD = 0.23) and patients with 157-257 visits (12.0% (n = 489) vs. 19.5% (n = 1495), SMD = 0.21). FPTs has a greater percentage of patients with 415+ ED visits compared to FPNTs (45.6% (n = 1857) vs. 16.7% (n = 1285), SMD = 0.48).

FPTs had a larger mean number of MHED visits for rostered patients compared to FPNTs (18.99 (+/- 29.07) vs. 10.91 (+/- 13.07), SMD = 0.36). Full details within each category are in Table 1, but the most notable difference was the group that had 0-3 and 20+ MHED visits. FPTs had a lower percentage of patients with 0-3 MHED visits than FPNTs (16.7% (n = 681) vs. 27.5% (n = 2108), SMD = 0.26) and a higher percentage of patients with 20+ MHED visits than FPNTs (30.9% (n = 1258) vs. 14.1% (n = 1084), SMD = 0.41).

FPTs had a greater mean of hospitalizations compared to FPNTs (57.05 (+/-47.43) vs. 10.91 (+/-13.07), SMD = 0.36). Full details within each category are in Table 1, but the most notable difference was that FPTs had a larger percentage of patients with 11+ hospitalizations, compared to FPNTs (85.7% (n = 3491) vs. 78.8% (n = 6044), SMD = 0.18). Of those hospitalizations, mental health specific hospitalizations (MHH) were measured. FPTs had a greater mean of MHH visits compared to FPNTs (7.01 (+/-13.61) vs. 3.86 (+/-5.43), SMD = 0.36). The most striking differences were the groups that had zero visits and those with 11+ visits. FPTs had a lower percentage of patients with zero MHH visits compared to FPNTs (13.4% (n = 545) vs. 21.9% (n = 1679), SMD = 0.22). FPTs had a higher percentage of patients with 11+ MHH visits compared to FPNTs (17.8% (n = 725) vs. 6.8% (n = 518), SMD = 0.34).

## ***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  
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

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].

**Discussion**

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, there was a 9-fold increase in the number of primary care physicians referring to telepsychiatry and a nearly 15-fold increase in the number of primary care patients referred to telepsychiatry. 32% of family physicians referred to telepsychiatry, while less than 1% of patients rostered to FPTs utilized telepsychiatry. While patient adoption of telepsychiatry continued to increase in Ontario during the study period, it still represents a very small percentage of patients in Ontario. These visits represent, for the most part, patients that ~~are~~were required to go to a healthcare site to access care and psychiatrists that are required to use the ~~OTN~~provincial telemedicine platform. It is evident that there remains a large opportunity to increase patient adoption. ~~As reported elsewhere, in 2012, only about 7% of psychiatrists were providing telepsychiatry visits, so similar to patients, there is still significant adoption potential for psychiatrists.~~<sup>27</sup>-As discussed in the introduction, it is likely that the recent Covid-19 related temporary policy changes to virtual care ~~might~~will present an opportunity for significant growth and adoption of

telepsychiatry. This study ~~can provide~~s an essential benchmark for future analyses, comparing how these policy changes have ~~changed~~shifted adoption patterns with patients and family physician referrals.

Physicians who referred to telepsychiatry in FY 2008 were mainly from northern ~~regions (LHINs) of the province~~, whereas in FY 2016, more referrals from southern ~~regions (LHINs)~~ emerged, many of which still have rural ~~pockets~~ areas within their catchments. Referral to telepsychiatry was ~~much~~ more evenly distributed throughout the province in FY 2016. ~~In FY 2016 physicians from all LHINs referred somewhere between 4-10% of total telepsychiatry, compared to FY 2008 where the range spread from 0% to 20%, with six LHINs that delivered more than 9% of total telepsychiatry each and eight LHINs all delivering less than 4% each. While historically telepsychiatry was used to support rural populations, in later years of the study, there were increasing provincially funded 'urban' telepsychiatry projects that aimed to increase adoption of telepsychiatry within urbanmore populous regions. While it i's important to create access and choice for patients in both rural and urban areas, and increase access provincially, policy-makers and funders should consider how existing payment and funding models support prioritization of care to underserved populations, and might consider strategies such as a wait-times dashboard to help better distribute care virtually. aspects of digital health equity<sup>43</sup>, allowing the use of diverse secure virtual platforms, funding home-based visits and establishing mechanisms to support the appropriate distribution of virtual care throughout the province.~~



Past studies have suggested that physicians who were more isolated and were part of an integrated health system had positive feelings about telemedicine, and that nurses were more enthusiastic about telemedicine than physicians.<sup>25,36</sup> As such, ~~unperhaps-not~~ surprisingly, this study found that predictors of family physician referrals to telepsychiatry include rurality of residence (for both provider and patient), team-based practice models, ~~having more~~ nurse practitioners on the team, and clinical complexity of patient rosters, ~~and if referring the provider was part of a family health team.~~ Additionally, ~~FPTs were more likely to have rostered patients who had more clinical complexity and higher healthcare utilization rates. While this might be an indicator of patients' overall complexity, the number of people accessing mental health care in the ED can also be an indicator of a lack of access to outpatient mental health care. As access to telepsychiatry continues to increase, studies measuring potential diversion from ED-related mental health visits would be helpful.~~

This study has numerous strengths; it utilizes a large, multi-year, linked dataset of family physician and patient data to help understand important characteristics that are common in physicians who refer to telepsychiatry. Additionally, since this study uses administrative data, the study was conducted rapidly using a retrospective analysis. ~~However, t~~Theis study also has several limitations. The identification of telepsychiatry visits is contingent upon psychiatrists using telepsychiatry billing codes and billing fee for service, so it is possible that there is missing data, or an underrepresentation of visits completed by physicians paid by salary or alternate funding. Another potential

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 practice type, the number of nurse practitioners on the provider's team, as well as  
32  
33 patient healthcare and hospital utilization characteristics are more likely in FPTs than  
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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

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



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

*Management/AHIMA, American Health Information Management Association.*  
2013;10(Summer).

15. Fleming DA, Edison KE, Pak H. Telehealth ethics. *Telemedicine and e-Health.*  
2009;15(8):797-803.

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

17. Ulzen T, Williamson L, Foster PP, Parris-Barnes K. The evolution of a community-  
based telepsychiatry program in rural alabama: Lessons learned—a brief report.  
*Community Ment Health J.* 2013;49(1):101-105.

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

19. Hilty DM, Ferrer DC, Parish MB, Johnston B, Callahan EJ, Yellowlees PM. The  
effectiveness of telemental health: A 2013 review. *Telemedicine and e-Health.*  
2013;19(6):444-454.

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

21. Bishop JE, O'Reilly RL, Maddox K, Hutchinson LJ. Client satisfaction in a feasibility study comparing face-to-face interviews with telepsychiatry. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2002;8(4):217-221.
22. Frueh BC, Monnier J, Yim E, Grubaugh AL, Hamner MB, Knapp RG. A randomized trial of telepsychiatry for post-traumatic stress disorder. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2007;13(3):142-147.
23. Farabee D, Calhoun S, Veliz R. An experimental comparison of telepsychiatry and conventional psychiatry for parolees. *Psychiatric Services*. 2016;67(5):562-565.
24. Bashshur RL, Shannon GW, Bashshur N, Yellowlees PM. The empirical evidence for telemedicine interventions in mental disorders. *Telemedicine and e-Health*. 2016;22(2):87-113.
25. Sargeant J, Allen M, Langille D. Physician perceptions of the effect of telemedicine on rural retention and recruitment. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2004;10(2):89-93.
26. Swanson B. Information technology and under-served communities. *J Telemed Telecare*. 1999;5(2\_suppl):3-10.
27. Serhal E, Crawford A, Cheng J, Kurdyak P. Implementation and utilisation of telepsychiatry in Ontario: A population-based study. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*. 2017;62(10):716-725.

28. Grumbach K, Selby JV, Damberg C, et al. Resolving the gatekeeper conundrum: What patients value in primary care and referrals to specialists. *JAMA*. 1999;282(3):261-266.

29. Norton PG, Dunn EV, Bestvater D. Referrals in primary care: Is the family physician a “Gatekeeper”? *Canadian Family Physician*. 1989;35:1776.

30. Steele M, Zayed R, Davidson B, et al. Referral patterns and training needs in psychiatry among primary care physicians in canadian rural/remote areas. *Journal of the Canadian Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*. 2012;21(2):111.

31. Spaulding RJ, Russo T, Cook DJ, Doolittle GC. Diffusion theory and telemedicine adoption by kansas health-care providers: Critical factors in telemedicine adoption for improved patient access. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2005;11(1\_suppl):107-109.

32. Whitten P, Franken EA. Telemedicine for patient consultation: Factors affecting use by rural primary-care physicians in kansas. *J Telemed Telecare*. 1995;1(3):139-144.

33. LeRouge C, Garfield M. Crossing the telemedicine chasm: Have the US barriers to widespread adoption of telemedicine been significantly reduced? *International journal of environmental research and public health*. 2013;10(12):6472-6484.

34. Moore MA, Coffman M, Jetty A, Klink K, Petterson S, Bazemore A. Family physicians report considerable interest in, but limited use of, telehealth services. *The Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*. 2017;30(3):320-330.

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

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.