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E-Health / Tele-health

**Kaiser-Permanante - AAPC, 2017**

- 52 percent of the more than 100 million patient encounters at Kaiser take place remotely.
- 95 percent of its nearly 12 million members are covered on a capitated basis.
- Invests about 25 percent of its annual capital spending on IT.

**Additional Kaiser Programs**

- “House calls” for e-health visits
- Secure e-mail usage increases HEDIS scores
- E-health saves $ for Kaiser due to capitated state

- Across all systems in USA, projected to be 25% of outpatients visits by 2025
Drivers for Growth in Tele / Mobile Health
(ATA Survey, 2017)

- Consumer interest 48%
- Value-based care transition 26%
- Reduced cost of care 11%
- Evidence-based practice guidelines 7%
Ongoing current usage

- ROP screening AND monitoring
- Diabetic retinopathy screening and monitoring
- AMD screening and monitoring
- Glaucoma (open-angle / POAG)
- Refractive error
- Initial eye exam for screening and referral

Active exploration

- Emergency room coverage
- Corneal diseases
- Angle closure glaucoma
- Comprehensive eye exam for management
- Others
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Overview / FDA Topics

- Accelerating innovation to encourage digital health – Z Bodnar
- Regulation of digital health – B Patel
- FDA perspectives on mobile medical applications and telemedicine – R. Schuchard
- Medical device data systems – K Yeshwant

Uses in Ophthalmology

- Retinopathy of Prematurity
  – Paul Chan, MD
- Diabetic Retinopathy
  – Ingrid Zimmer-Galler, MD

- Advanced Analytics
  – Michael Chaiang, MD
- Machine Learning
  – Linda Zangwill, PhD
Key Questions

• Patient Interface with Digital Health
  – John Reites

• Digital health device as aid for diagnosis
  – D. Azar; L Bottorff; D Morrison; D Moshfeghi, M Woodward; I Zimmer-Galler // N Afshari and M Trese (moderators)

• Safety and effectiveness for use of ophthalmic device
  – M Abramoff, M Chiang, P Dugel; M Goldbaum; Q Oswald; L Zangwill // M Blumenkranz and K Nischal (moderators)

• Safeguards and methods for mitigating risks
  – L Al-Aswad; N Karandikar; D Myung; J Reites; E Sharon // M Humayun and D Sprunger (moderators)
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Additional Considerations for Use

• **Technical performance**
  – What is the reference standard / “gold standard”
  – Validity
    • Does it reflect or capture the “gold standard” or “truth”
    • Does it achieve the specified purpose
  – Reliability
    • Test-retest – does it provide the same result each time
    • Intra-test – is it consistent internally
    • Inter-rater – if applicable, do different “observers” get same results

• Implementation considerations

• Legal issues

• Payment coverage

ATA Validation Standards

Diabetic Retinopathy

• Level 1 – no or minimal pathology vs worse
• Level 2 – presence or absence of sight-threatening retinopathy (severe NPDR) for screening
• Level 3 – provide clinical recommendations similar to in person exam
• Level 4 – replacement for ETDRS photos for research or clinical work
Comparison of Screening Techniques
Pugh JA, Jacobson JM, van Heuven WAJ, et al, Diab Care 1993;16: 889-95

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ophthalmologists</th>
<th>Miss PDR 50 / 73</th>
<th>“None” when PDR mod-sev 19 / 73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA’s</td>
<td>43 / 51</td>
<td>11 / 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One non-mydriatic</td>
<td>30 / 64</td>
<td>9 / 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three dilated</td>
<td>17 / 68</td>
<td>6 / 68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uses 4 stage system in this analysis
none / mild / moderate - severe / proliferative

Interobserver Differences ≥ 0.2 DD
From Feuer, et al, AJO, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hitchings, et al</td>
<td>3 specialists</td>
<td>8 to 20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tielsch, et al</td>
<td>2 specialists</td>
<td>17 to 19 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varma, et al</td>
<td>6 specialists</td>
<td>19 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrams, et al</td>
<td>6 optometrists</td>
<td>29 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 residents</td>
<td>28 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttleworth</td>
<td>2 ophthalmologists</td>
<td>3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feuer, et al</td>
<td>Reading Center</td>
<td>5 to 7 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meta-Analysis of Comparison In-Person to Remote Care  (Thomas SM et al, PLOS One, 2014)

- Pooled analysis (n=45 included studies)
  - Diagnostic accuracy (n=8) using ONH exams (remote exams)
    • Sensitivity 83%
    • Specificity 79%
  - Diagnostic accuracy (n=2) using VF for suspects (remote exams)
    • Sensitivity 82%
    • Specificity 96%
  - Diagnostic accuracy (n=3) for in-person exam
    • Sensitivity 75% ( +/- 28%)
    • Specificity 89% ( +/- 10%)

Additional Considerations for Use

- Technical performance
- Implementation considerations
  - Use in care continuum
  - Level of autonomy of system
  - Patient acceptance, understanding and use
  - Technical infrastructure
- Legal issues
- Payment coverage
When in Clinical Care is it Used – and what is its purpose?

Clinical Spectrum
- General information for public
- Self-care and tracking of health
- Entry into system via screening
- Active patient care in system (“new patient”)
- Continuation with care (“return patients” or “active monitoring”)

Level of Autonomy
- Tool to motivate for additional evaluation
- Decision aid for detection of specific finding(s)
- Decision aid for diagnosis and / or management
- Determine diagnosis and / or management
- In lieu of specialist

Patient Willingness to Use Video Care and Other Forms of Care  
(Harris Poll, 2014)

- 64% willing to participate in MD video visit
  - 61% cited convenience
  - 11% aged 18 to 34 would switch to MD doing
- If they or loved one with high fever in middle of night and needed attention
  - 41% go to ER
  - 21% video visits
  - 17% call a 24 hour nurse call line
  - 5% online symptom checker
National Academy of Medicine
Definition of Diagnostic Error

• “… the failure to
• (a) establish an accurate and timely explanation of the patient’s health problem(s) or
• (b) communicate that explanation to the patient
Patient Follow-up of DR Screening

- 5 primary care clinics in rural and underserved populations – 1661 patients
- Impact on DR assessments
  - Pre-implementation 26%
  - After implementations 40%
- Follow-up care
  - 60% completed referral visit

Additional Considerations for Use

- Technical performance
- Implementation considerations
- Legal issues
  - State licensure laws
    • Patient location as “site” of practice
    • “Consultation” exception in many states
  - Corporate practice of medicine restrictions
  - HIPAA issues (e.g., business associate agreement with vendor(s))
  - Legal liability
- Payment coverage
Legal Liability Issues to Review

Questions pertaining to physician

• Is telehealth service covered by insurance policy?
• Is it covered if service is provided to patient in another state?
• Is it within at least a “respectable minority” standard of care?
• Is it consistent with federal and state rules?

Systems issues in e-health

• Is misdiagnosis / mismanagement the responsibility of the system or the physician?
  – Level of autonomy of system
  – Systemic flaw or bias
• What is role, if any, of systems maintenance of technical infrastructure (e.g., display and lighting standards)
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Relationship with Patient Interactions and Health System Design

- Establish relationship
- Acquire data
- Interpret data
- Accurate diagnosis
- Appropriate therapy
- Patient use of care
- Follow-up Care
- Communities / Networks

- Personal to patient and physician
- Instruments
- Algorithms
- Data integration / Analysis
- Point of care support / decision systems
- Leverage technology
- Relationships
New Market Entrants

Private Equity

Value of Diversity in Groups for Complex Tasks
Scott Page, Center for the Study of Complex Systems, Univ. of Michigan

http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=info:doi/10.1371/journal.pone.0071154
Diabetic Retinopathy Analysis Using Machine Learning (DREAM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>SEN (%)</th>
<th>SPEC (%)</th>
<th>AUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MESSIDOR Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchez et.al.[27]</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agurto et.al.[8]</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antal et.al.[33]</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esnaashari et.al.[32]</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89.29</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriga et.al.[34](400 images)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DREAM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53.16</td>
<td>0.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agurto et.al.[35](2247 images)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acharya et.al.[36](300 images)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acharya et.al.[37](331 images)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usher et.al.[38](1273 images)</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Telemedicine - Glaucoma

- PubMed – 73 papers on 7/5/15; 85 papers on 8/7/16; 97 papers on 10/11/17
- First paper (English) in 1998
- Use of teleconsultation enables remote management of 69% of glaucoma and suspects by optometrists, 48% requiring repeat teleconsult
Comparison of Screening Techniques
Pugh JA, Jacobson JM, van Heuven WAJ, et al, Diab Care 1993;16: 889-95

Miss PDR “None” when PDR or mod-sev or mod-severe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ophthalmologists</th>
<th>50 / 73</th>
<th>19 / 73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA’s</td>
<td>43 / 51</td>
<td>11 / 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One non-mydriatic</td>
<td>30 / 64</td>
<td>9 / 64  (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three dilated</td>
<td>17 / 68</td>
<td>6 / 68  (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uses 4 stage system in this analysis
none / mild / moderate - severe / proliferative

Eye Care Use for 260 Patients Seen in Clinic for 2 Years after Teleretinal Screening by Disease
(Chasan JE, et al, JAMA Ophthal  2014)