

Digital health technology for patient education

Population	Patients with cardiac conditions
Intervention/Exposure	Patient education in a technological form (e.g., multimedia content, patient community forums, facilitation by healthcare professionals)
Comparator	No patient education; current patient education materials/methods
Outcomes	QoL; health behavior change outcomes (e.g., dietary habits, medication adherence); knowledge levels; cardiac/health functions; discharge education, patient knowledge

Interview Details:

Why did you choose this topic and why is it important to you?

- Professional experience in educational technology.
- Lived experience as a patient and has observed gaps during the transition between hospital to home.
 - Education technology (if designed and applied appropriately) would be a benefit to patients; could be used to support patients and for patients to support themselves.

What do you hope to learn from researching this topic?

- Trial a learning program in conjunction with a healthcare institution to learn how educational technology can assist healthcare delivery.
 - Identify what elements of the learning program are effective at the organizational and patient level.
 - Outcomes that can be assessed include the “quadruple aim metrics” (patient experience, healthcare costs, provider experience, population health).

- Patients and caregivers
- Healthcare providers

Is there anything that you feel a panel of patients, caregivers, healthcare providers, and policy-makers should keep in mind when reviewing this topic?

- It is important for healthcare providers and policymakers to consider the thoughtful and intelligent use of existing technology that can make a difference without large costs. This has the potential to:
 - Empower patients;
 - Provide connectedness to other patients and healthcare professionals; and
 - Use technology appropriately and with continuous improvement of existing processes (learning health system).

Who needs to know about the findings?

Feasibility Assessment Results

Summary:

Two systematic reviews were identified during the scoping literature search. The following two reviews by Halldorsdottir et al (2020) and Emmerson et al (2018) were assessed using AMSTAR-2. A summary of the AMSTAR-2 assessments is provided in the table below.

Review #1: Halldorsdottir et al, 2020	Review #2: Emmerson et al, 2018
CRITICALLY LOW quality rating ● ○ ○ ○	LOW quality rating ● ● ○ ○
Critical flaw: Missing 2 checklist items Study design: Systematic review	Critical flaw: Missing 1 checklist item Study design: Systematic review

Conclusion:

This topic has critically low to low quality systematic reviews, which suggests that there is scope to conduct further research in this area.