

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Socioeconomic and demographic patterning of family uptake of a paediatric electronic patient portal innovation

Ameenat Lola Solebo PhD^{1,2,3,4*}, Lisanne Horvat-Gitsels PhD^{1,3,5}, Christine Twomey BSc², Siegfried Karl Wagner PhD^{6,7}, Jugnoo S Rahi PhD^{1,2,3,4,6,7,8}

1. Population, Policy and Practice Research and Teaching Department, Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, University College London, London, UK
2. Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
3. Ulverscroft Vision Research Group, Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, University College London, London, UK
4. National Institute for Health and Care Research Great Ormond Street Biomedical Research Centre, London, UK
5. Moody's RMS, London, UK
6. Moorfields Eye Hospital, London, UK
7. Institute of Ophthalmology, University College London, London, UK
8. NIHR Moorfields Biomedical Research Centre London, UK

*Corresponding author
Email a.solebo@ucl.ac.uk

25 **Abstract**

26 Introduction

27 Patient portals allowing access to electronic health care records and services can inform and
28 empower, but may widen existing sociodemographic inequities. We aimed to describe
29 associations between activation of a paediatric patient portal and patient race/ethnicity,
30 socioeconomic status and markers of previous engagement with health care.

31 Methods

32 A retrospective single site cross-sectional study was undertaken to examine patient portal
33 adoption amongst families of children receiving care for chronic or complex disorders within
34 the United Kingdom. Descriptive and multivariable regression analysis was undertaken to
35 describe associations between predictors (Race/Ethnicity, age, socio-economic deprivation
36 status based on family residence, and previous non-attendance to outpatient consultations)
37 and outcome.

38 **Results**

39 A sample of 3687 children, representative of the diverse 'real world' patient population, was
40 identified. Of these 37% (1364) were from a White British background, 71% (2631) had
41 English as the primary family spoken language (PSL), 14% (532) lived in areas of high
42 deprivation, and 17% (643) had high (>33%) rates of non-attendance. The families of 73%
43 (2682) had activated the portal. In adjusted analyses, English as a PSL (adjusted odds ratio
44 [aOR] 1.98, 95% confidence interval 1.66-2.36) was positively associated with portal
45 activation, whilst families from British Black African backgrounds (aOR 0.58, 0.44-0.77),
46 those living in areas of deprivation (aOR 0.81, 0.67-0.98) or with high rates of non-
47 attendance (aOR 0.32, 0.27-0.39) were less likely to use the portal.

48 **Conclusions**

49 Socio-economic deprivation, race/ethnicity and previous low engagement with health care
50 services are potentially key drivers of widening inequity in access to health care following the
51 implementation of patient portals, a digital health innovation intended to inform and
52 empower patients. Health care providers should be aware that innovative human-driven
53 engagement approaches, targeted towards under-served communities, are needed to ensure
54 equitable access to high quality patient-centred care.

55

56 **Author Summary**

57 From a retrospective cross-sectional study of 3687 children with complex health disorders
58 within a specialist paediatric care centre, the families of 73% had adopted an electronic
59 patient portal within 2.5 years of portal launch. Relative socio-economic deprivation, family
60 ethnic backgrounds and previous poor engagement with health care services were
61 independently associated with lower odds of family adoption. There was evidence of a
62 potential differential impact of socioeconomic deprivation and spoken language across
63 different ethnic groups. We report that equitable uptake of digital health services by
64 children's families requires health care providers to implement engagement approaches
65 developed in partnership with under-served communities. However, those underserved
66 communities should also have access to alternative patient centred communication pathways
67 to ensure true inclusion in health care provision. Care providers must be particularly careful
68 to offer these alternative pathways to families who have struggled to interact with healthcare
69 in the past.

70 **Introduction**

71 An individual's right to a computable version of their medical records is a central principle in
72 digital health policy.¹ These computable versions can, in some settings, be accessed via a
73 'patient portal' which allows individuals to view, download, contribute to and share their
74 electronic health records, or use those records to self-manage their health conditions and
75 broader wellbeing.²

76
77 Globally, the most common first barrier to this access is the absence of an electronic health
78 record (EHR). In health care settings within higher income countries, many of whom have
79 adopted EHRs,³ the next barrier is the absence of a computable version of a patient's EHR,
80 for example due to the immaturity of the relevant platform.³ Increasingly, these barriers are
81 being addressed in the attempt to improve patient care and experience.⁴⁻⁷

82
83 The positive impact on patient outcomes and experience seen following EHR implementation
84 can be weakest for those individuals in their country's more vulnerable socioeconomic
85 strata.^{3,8,9} There is a real risk that the increasing use of patient portals widens existing
86 socioeconomic and demographic inequalities in health outcomes or access to healthcare.^{10,11}

87 An example of a population for whom there are existing health inequities is children with or
88 at risk of blindness. In the UK, socioeconomic deprivation results in increased risk of
89 childhood blindness,¹² reduced access to innovations in care,¹³ and worse outcomes following
90 interventions.¹⁴ We used the opportunity created by the COVID-19 pandemic, which
91 triggered rapid pivoting to use of patient portals to ensure sustained communications with
92 patients, to test our hypothesis that differential adoption, by socioeconomic status and
93 demographic characteristics, of a patient portal service exists amongst a group of families
94 receiving specialist paediatric care.

96 **Results**

97 We identified 3687 eligible patients, of whom 48% were female (table 1).

98 **Table 1. Patient characteristics**

Characteristic	All patients (n=3687)
Sex - no. (%)	
Female	1769 (48)
Male	1919 (52)
Unknown	0
Age - no. (%)	
Under 2 (<2yrs)	331 (9)
Pre-school (2-4)	640 (17)
Early childhood (5-10)	1423 (39)
Late childhood (11-15)	1293 (35)
Unknown	0
Ethnicity – no. (%)	
White British	1364 (37)
Other White background	392 (11)
Asian Bangladeshi	128 (3)
Asian Indian	147 (4)
Asian Pakistani	251 (7)
Other Asian background	189 (5)
Black African	279 (7)
Other Black background	177 (5)
Mixed ethnicity	191 (5)
Prefer not to say / unknown	231 (7)
Primary language spoken – no. (%)	
English	2631 (71)
Other language	826 (23)
Prefer not to say / Not provided	230 (6)
Family residence index of multiple deprivation (IMD) quintile – no. (%)	
Most deprived (1 st quintile)	623 (17)
2 nd quintile	1072 (29)
3 rd quintile	768 (21)
4 th quintile	600 (16)
Least deprived	532 (14)
Unknown (primary residence outside the UK)	98 (3)

100 The median age of the patient cohort was 8 years (interquartile range, IQR 4 to 12, range 0 to
101 18 years). There were a diverse range of eye conditions, including inflammatory ocular
102 disease (796, 22%), cataract (342, 9%), and glaucoma (132, 4%).

103

104 **Cohort sociodemographic characteristics**

105 There was a wide range of ethnicities and languages spoken (Table 1, S1 and S2 tables): 1364
106 children (37%) were of White British ethnicity, and 2631 children (71%) were from families
107 with English as the primary spoken language. Non-attendance to hospital appointments over
108 the preceding year ranged from 0 to 100% (median 0%, IQR 0-20%) and 643 children (17%)
109 had not been brought to more than 33% of their preceding outpatient appointments. A higher
110 percentage of children with English as a primary language had a White British rather than
111 other ethnic background (95% versus 57% from a non-white background, Pearson $\chi^2= 600.1$,
112 $p<0.001$). A higher percentage of children whose primary language was not English lived in a
113 deprived area (20% versus 16% of children with English as a primary language, Pearson
114 $\chi^2=12.6$, $p<0.001$). Deprivation was strongly associated with ethnicity: whilst 11% of families
115 from White British and 9% from Asian Indian backgrounds lived in areas of deprivation
116 (156/1244, and 14/147 respectively), this proportion was 19% in families from Asian
117 Pakistani backgrounds (48/251), 34% in Asian Bangladeshi background families (43/128),
118 33% for Black African background families (93/279), and 30% (66/225) for families from
119 other Black background (Pearson $\chi^2=141.7$, $p<0.001$).

120

121 **Outcomes**

122 Most children (2682, 73%) had families who had activated the patient portal. The median
123 time to activation from portal launch was 13 months (range from 0.5 days to 30 months). A

124 total of 2399 families had used the portal over this period (comprising 65% of the whole
 125 cohort and 90% of those who had activated the portal).

126

127 The unadjusted and adjusted odds of patient activation of the portal for the variables of
 128 interest, as presented in Table 2, were estimated for a total of 3416 children in a complete
 129 case analyses (i.e., at least one covariable was missing in 271/3687 cases).

130

131 **Table 2. Associations between characteristics of the patients and family uptake of the**
 132 **portal**

	Odds Ratio (95% confidence interval), <i>p</i> -value	
	Unadjusted OR	Adjusted OR
Age group		
<i>Children aged under 2</i>	Reference	Reference
<i>Pre-school (2 to under 5yrs)</i>	1.02 (0.77-1.34)	0.89 (0.67-1.21), 0.59
<i>Early childhood (5 to under 11yrs)</i>	1.19 (0.92-1.52)	1.01 (0.78-1.33), 0.46
<i>Late childhood (11yrs and older)</i>	0.93 (0.73-1.20)	1.70 (1.26-2.28), <0.01
Female Sex	0.95 (0.84-1.10)	-
High non-attendance (>33% missed appointments)	0.34 (0.29-0.40)	0.32 (0.27-0.39), <0.001
Ethnicity		
<i>White British</i>	Reference	Reference
<i>Asian Indian</i>	1.29 (0.823-2.00)	1.54 (1.02-2.32), 0.04
<i>Asian Pakistani</i>	0.68 (0.51-0.92)	0.85 (0.62-1.14), 0.30
<i>Asian Bangladeshi</i>	1.14 (0.73-1.79)	1.14 (0.75-1.72), 0.54
<i>Black African</i>	0.59 (0.44-0.78)	0.58 (0.44-0.77), <0.001
<i>Black Other</i>	0.73 (0.54-1.00)	0.77 (0.56-1.05), <0.001
<i>Ethnicity not provided</i>	0.21 (0.16-0.27)	0.34 (0.24-0.46), <0.001
English as primary spoken language	1.80 (1.60-2.20)	1.98 (1.66-2.36) [‡] , <0.001
Residence in area of relative deprivation	0.80 (0.60-0.90)	0.81 (0.67-0.98), 0.04

133 [‡]Interaction terms with ethnicity, and with deprivation, not statistically significant

134

135 Families who had a high non-attendance at outpatient clinics had 3 times lower odds
136 (adjusted odds ratio [aOR] 0.32, 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.27-0.39) of activating the
137 patient portal when compared to other families. Higher odds of activating the portal were
138 associated with having English as a primary language (1.98, 1.66-2.36). Families from an
139 Asian Indian (but not other Asian) background were also more likely to have activated the
140 portal than White British origin families (1.54, 1.02-2.32). However, families from Black
141 African and Black Other backgrounds had lower odds of activation (0.58, 0.44-0.77 and 0.77,
142 0.56-1.05, respectively). Children whose families withheld their ethnicity were also less
143 likely to have an activated patient portal. Families living in an area of relative deprivation had
144 likewise lower odds of activation (0.81, 0.67-0.98), with evidence of differential impact of
145 language and deprivation across different family ethnic groups (Fig 1).

146

147 **Fig 1. Uptake of the patient portal by family socio-demographic characteristics**

148 *Eng PSL: Family with English as primary spoken language; Other PSL: Family with*
149 *language other than English as primary spoken language*

150 A: 95% confidence interval, CI 20 – 94; B: 95% CI 48 – 83; C: 95% CI 25 – 70; D: 95% CI
151 43 – 69; E: 95% CI 51 - 82

152

153 The associations between covariables and the secondary outcome of family use of the portal
154 was estimated for the 2626 families who had activated the protocol (full dataset on
155 covariables missing of 56/2682). On adjusted analysis, the absence of English as a primary
156 family language, high non-attendance rate for previous consultations, and older age of child
157 (11 years and older) were all associated with lower odds of using the portal (Table 3).

158

159 **Table 3. Associations between characteristics of the patients and family use of the portal**
 160 **given uptake**

	Odds Ratio (95% confidence interval), <i>p</i> -value	
	Unadjusted	Adjusted
Age group		
<i>Children aged under 2 (baseline)</i>	Reference	Reference
<i>Pre-school (2 to under 5yrs)</i>	1.54 (0.82-2.88)	1.40 (0.68-1.24), 0.30
<i>Early childhood (5 to under 11yrs)</i>	2.01 (1.15-3.52)	1.11 (1.00-3.23), 0.05
<i>Late childhood (11 to under 15yrs)</i>	0.56 (0.33-0.94)	0.54 (0.31-0.92), 0.02
Female sex	1.09 (0.85-1.40)	-
High non-attendance (>33% missed appointments)	0.56 (0.41-0.78)	0.53 (0.37-0.75), <0.001
Ethnicity		
<i>White British</i>	Reference	Reference
<i>Asian Indian</i>	1.38 (0.65-2.90)	1.71 (0.77-3.78), 0.18
<i>Asian Pakistani</i>	1.05 (0.60-1.86)	1.22 (0.67-2.24), 0.52
<i>Asian Bangladeshi</i>	0.57 (0.32-1.02)	0.80 (0.42-1.54), 0.51
<i>Black African</i>	0.46 (0.30-0.70)	0.62 (0.39-0.99), 0.05
<i>Black Other</i>	0.78 (0.57-1.06)	0.85 (0.56-1.20), 0.35
<i>Ethnicity not provided</i>	0.62 (0.34-1.10)	0.85 (0.44-1.63), 0.62
English as primary spoken language	1.65 (1.27-2.15)	1.77 (1.28-2.43), 0.001
Residence in area of relative deprivation	0.87 (0.63-1.20)	1.04 (0.73-1.49), 0.81

161

162 Discussion

163 From this cross-sectional study based within a specialist paediatric centre serving a diverse
 164 patient population, we report differential adoption of an electronic patient portal by socio-
 165 demographic characteristics and socioeconomic status. In the 30 months following the launch
 166 of the portal, the families of the majority of children had accessed and used the application.
 167 Adoption was higher amongst families with English as a primary spoken language and for
 168 families of older children. Families from Black ethnic backgrounds were less likely to adopt

169 the application, as were those who opted to withhold details of their ethnicity, and those
170 living in areas of relative deprivation. The strongest association with uptake and subsequent
171 use of the portal was with prior poor attendance to outpatient consultations, with three times
172 lower odds of adoption amongst families with high rates of non-attendance, exemplifying an
173 amplification of inequalities in health care use.

174

175 Across the globe, in diverse health care settings, socioeconomic and demographic factors
176 such as income level and ethnicity have a marked influence on access to health services and
177 subsequent health outcomes.^{8,15} Access to digital health services is also dependent on the
178 design of those services, and the degree to which these are centred on the life experience of
179 the patients they serve. The life experiences of those developing and implementing patient
180 applications may differ drastically from many of those accessing these services.⁹ One in six
181 adults resident in Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
182 countries is unable to make the inferences necessary to match short digital or printed text to a
183 piece of information (Level 1 literacy).^{16,17} Digital literacy (confidence in using the
184 technology) is only one of the multiple factors at play when patients or families do not
185 engage with health technology. Digital literacy, in particular, has been identified as a
186 determinant of an individual's physical and mental health and quality of life, and can be
187 improved through education and training (e.g. through online courses, tutoring, and video-
188 based training of children and adults) or through social support from 'digitally confident'
189 peers or family members.¹⁸ Digital access (access to a functional device or the internet) and
190 digital assimilation (awareness and/or trust in the degree to which the technology can have a
191 positive impact on outcomes for the individual patient or family) are also key.¹⁹ Whilst
192 individual care providing professionals may be unable to improve their patient's digital
193 literacy or access, they could and should be aware of these potential obstacles, and amend

194 their approach accordingly. In a manner analogous to the use of a novel therapy found to be
195 effective at a population level, but also known to have differential effectiveness in certain
196 patient groups, health care professionals should ‘prescribe’ health technology innovations
197 with full awareness of the ‘relative contraindications’ at play for their patient. Non-digital
198 complex interventions and innovation are also needed: care providers (at individual and
199 organisational levels) should develop and deploy other ways of (re)connecting with families
200 who have disengaged to the extent that children are not being brought to clinic appointments,
201 either because of active disengagement with health care provision, or passive disengagement
202 due to difficulties in accessing travel resources, childcare for siblings, or time off work.
203 These children will otherwise be at increasing risk of being further ‘left behind’, with life-
204 long, cumulative negative impact on their adult functioning and quality of life.

205

206 Digital assimilation, i.e. improving the patient’s awareness of the potential positive impact of
207 the digital health service, or increasing their trust in that service, is the area where health care
208 providers can have the greatest positive impact on population adoption of digital health
209 services. Lower levels of trust in the UK’s National Health Service (NHS) are reported from
210 individuals from ethnic minority backgrounds,²⁰ with similar reports from other health care
211 settings.^{21–23} Whilst these under-served communities might believe in principle with using
212 health data to improve health outcomes, their negative experiences of the healthcare system
213 may limit their willingness to engage personally with system-level health innovations. This is
214 likely to be true particularly for Black parents who have had to navigate a health system in
215 which Black infants, and Black mothers, have worse outcomes, such as a mortality rate
216 several times higher than the national average.^{24,25} These differential mortality rates are likely
217 to be accompanied by higher morbidity rates for Black children and mothers. To avoid
218 widening inequity, health services urgently need to implement targeted engagement activities

219 for those communities who have been given good reason to distrust an organisation in which
220 there is longstanding inequity of outcome. These activities might include co-development of
221 dissemination strategies to demonstrate the resultant benefit to care provision for the specific
222 individual, and transparency of any data usage for purposes other than direct clinical care.

223

224 The striking failure of digital patient portals to engage those families who struggled to bring
225 their children to clinic appointments reflects the key importance of assessing and responding
226 to the markers of non-engagement with health care services across different service types. A
227 ‘soft’ marker of non-engagement may be reluctance to self-provide family ethnic
228 background, which may again also be a marker of that family’s lack of trust in care providers.
229 The higher rates of non-engagement with this e-health intervention we report amongst those
230 families who have not self-reported their ethnicity is similar to the association between higher
231 non-attendance (across face to face and telemedicine services) and lack of ethnicity self-
232 reporting reported by other UK groups.²⁶

233

234 Differing degrees of clinical need, and competing health and social needs, may have driven
235 some of the differential patterning of portal activation and portal use. Whilst families of older
236 children were more likely to activate the portal, they were less likely to use the portal once
237 activated. It may be that families of younger children have more competing demands on their
238 time, with a resultant lower likelihood of activating the portal, but once activated, the greater
239 clinical needs of the younger children^{27,28} result in greater use of the portal. Again, awareness
240 of the possible competing needs of the families accessing these digital health services is
241 necessary to ensure the development of approaches in communicating the potential benefit of
242 these services to those families in order to support digital assimilation.

243

244 **Limitations**

245 This work is limited by its single centre setting, as such work may result in findings which
246 are not generalizable to other health care settings. However, as an early adopter (within the
247 UK) of the increasingly used patient portal applications,³ this setting is well placed to report
248 on key patterns of health technology use for families. Moreover, as a tertiary and quaternary
249 healthcare centre providing specialist care to a national population, it is the ideal setting for
250 studying the uptake of digital interventions by families of children with disorders sufficiently
251 rare and complex as to require co-ordinated care across medical specialities and providers.
252 Additionally, as care is provided to a national rather than regional population, a diverse
253 patient cohort has been achieved, with a resultant representation of those groups who are
254 often under-represented in work on electronic health applications. However, it should be
255 stressed that the patterning reported here around ethnicity and use of the portal (i.e., different
256 directions of association for those from Asian Indian versus Asian Pakistani or Black African
257 backgrounds) does not obviate the likelihood of significant heterogeneity of use within these
258 groups. Whilst this has been addressed in part through the use of covariables on language and
259 residence-based (area-level) socioeconomic status, we are missing more granular (individual-
260 level) detail such as parental income and education. We also lack a metric of the family's
261 self-perceived need of, or benefit from, the use of the portal. It may be that particular families
262 had children with unstable or severe disorders, or a high degree of patient anxiety and care-
263 seeking behaviour, affecting their likelihood of adopting the portal. Conversely, it is possible
264 that data on family PSL and ethnicity were not missing at random, and therefore reflected
265 another aspect of family disengagement with health care services. Nevertheless, our study
266 findings of differential adoption and lower adoption amongst under-served groups remain
267 robust to these limitations, highlighting a service gap which needs to be addressed.

268

269 An additional element of the setting of this work is the time during which it occurred. The
270 study period includes March 2020 to August 2021, during which time the United Kingdom
271 was under ‘lockdown’ conditions to control viral transmission during the global pandemic.
272 Patient portal services for access to EHRs were likely to have played a vital role during the
273 pandemic by preventing disengagement with treatment or health care providers and
274 supporting care coordination and telemedicine care delivery.^{29,30} However, if the pandemic
275 did result in higher overall rates of adoption and use of the patient portal, the differential
276 adoption by different groups remains notable.

277

278 **Conclusion**

279 In summary, care providers, from individual professionals to health care organisations, must
280 remain aware of digital literacy and digital access constraints amongst the patients and
281 families they serve, and work to support digital assimilation. Future national and global risks
282 to care delivery are expected, and health care providers must ensure that those digital
283 interventions implemented to address these risks do not lead to a widening of health
284 inequities. They should also be aware of the valid concerns of underserved patient
285 populations around trust and transparency. ‘Non-digital’ or human-based innovations, such as
286 patient peer support networks and patient liaison teams, must continue to play a role in
287 empowering and informing those in need. These patient and community centred approaches
288 are also likely to be effective in addressing the ‘paradox’ of health innovations holding
289 transformational potential for care delivery for those underserved population groups who are
290 most likely to be excluded from the digital world.¹⁸

291

292 **Materials and methods**

293 The institutional approvals necessary to undertake this project (defined as a service
294 evaluation study by the Institutional Clinical Quality Project board) were obtained, and this
295 work adheres to the Helsinki Declaration recommendations.

296

297 **Study design**

298 This retrospective, observational cross-sectional study included families of patients aged 18
299 years or younger managed by the ophthalmology specialities at an international centre of
300 clinical excellence, a hospital which provides tertiary and quaternary level care to children
301 with complex and or rare diseases. The hospital-developed patient portal, “MyGOSH”, is
302 integrated with the hospital EHR (Epic©, Epic Systems Corporation), allowing parents and
303 young people to access a subset of their clinical records, manage personal information, and
304 send direct messages and images (e.g., reporting clinical change, querying prescriptions) to
305 managing clinicians or administrative teams. MyGOSH launched in March 2019,³¹ with
306 invitations to adopt the portal sent to parents postally alongside physical displays of
307 information throughout hospital grounds and informative videos on the hospital internet
308 pages.

309

310 **Inclusion/exclusion criteria**

311 Paediatric ophthalmology was chosen as an ‘exemplar’ field, as the patient population is
312 typified by the need for sustained communication co-ordinated across specialties and
313 specialist care centres. The complex and rare childhood eye disorders managed in this care
314 centre are managed nationally by only a small number of specialist centres,³² limiting the
315 pool of informed health professionals available for consultation with families. These eye
316 disorders are typically chronic, impactful and associated with other impairments and multi-
317 system disorders,^{12,27} requiring co-ordination of care across multiple disciplines.²⁷ Primary

318 care health professionals report a lack of confidence in managing even common eye disorders
319 in these children,^{33,34} with affected families relying heavily on their specialist ophthalmology
320 care team. There are socioeconomic and demographic inequalities in disease risk,¹² access to
321 novel therapies,¹³ and treatment outcomes in paediatric ophthalmology.¹⁴ Consequently this
322 population has the most to gain from innovations aimed at improving health experiences and
323 outcomes.

324

325 All families who received ongoing care from the ophthalmology team from the time of the
326 launch of the patient portal (March 2019) up until the end of the 30 months study period
327 (September 2021) were included in this study. Families who had not received care (defined as
328 inpatient or outpatient attendance) during the 6 months prior to the patient portal launch were
329 excluded.

330

331 **Data collection**

332 Data were collected from the electronic health record system, using the Epic SlicerDicerTM
333 tool to develop the extraction report. The data extracted comprised the activation status of the
334 MyGOSH patient application (i.e., whether or not the parent or guardian of the child had
335 activated the portal to enable their use of the service; the study's primary outcome), deeper
336 engagement with the patient portal (defined as the generation or submission of data by the
337 patient, or a request for services; the study's secondary outcome), time to family activation
338 from launch of the portal (in months), age (categorized into children aged under 2 years, pre-
339 school {2 to under 5 years}, early childhood {5 to under 11 years}, late childhood {11 years
340 and older}), sex at birth and race/ethnicity of patient (as defined by parents and as recorded at
341 patient registration), postcode (zip code) of family residence, primary language spoken by
342 primary care giver(s), and attendance rate at booked outpatient clinic appointments over the

343 preceding year (categorized using an *a priori* determined threshold of 33% non-attendance to
344 differentiate between high and low rates of non-attendance).³⁵

345

346 Socioeconomic status (SES) was derived using postcode conversion to an Indices of Multiple
347 Deprivation (IMD) 2019 ranking. The IMD, the official measure of relative deprivation in
348 England, capture relative levels of deprivation in 32,844 small areas in England across seven
349 domains comprising income, employment, general health/disability, education, crime,
350 barriers to housing and services, and living environment.³⁶ IMD ranking was then organized
351 into deciles, and binarized using the lowest whole population based quintile: children resident
352 in those areas were categorised as living in relative deprivation. Race/ethnicity was analysed
353 using the original variable, and also binarized using the largest single group, thus into White
354 British versus all other minority ethnicity groups, in order to examine patterns both by
355 race/ethnic category (grouped using the United Kingdom Office of National Statistics, ONS,
356 categories) and by whether or not the individual's family self-reported membership of an
357 ethnic minority group. Primary spoken language was also binarized into English versus other
358 language.

359

360 **Statistical analyses**

361 We used descriptive statistics (frequency and proportion) to characterize the cohort. Missing
362 data were investigated to understand potential bias in the cohort by testing their association
363 with the other variables (χ^2). Logistic regression models of portal activation status (uptake,
364 primary outcome) and deeper engagement (use, secondary outcome) were fitted to assess
365 associations with sociodemographic factors, specifically race/ethnicity, language, IMD
366 derived deprivation binarized rank, sex, age and clinic attendance. These models were fitted
367 on complete cases. First, unadjusted associations were estimated. Multicollinearity of the

368 independent variables was investigated using non-parametric tests (χ^2 , Spearman's rank
369 correlation coefficient) with alpha level set to 5% ($p < 0.05$ considered to be supportive of a
370 correlation). Adjusted associations were then estimated, with the final adjusted models being
371 derived using backward elimination to obtain the most parsimonious model possible without
372 weakening model fit. Where multicollinearity was present, the weakest association of the two
373 relevant variables was removed from the adjusted model. We tested for interactions by
374 incorporating two-factor interaction terms between included independent variables, with
375 interactions retained if found to be statistically significant using the Wald test. All analyses
376 were undertaken in Stata (Stata, version. 17.0; StataCorp).

377

378 **Ethics statement**

379 The institutional approvals necessary to undertake this project were obtained from the Great
380 Ormond Street Hospital Institutional Review Board (Institutional Clinical Quality Project
381 board, ICQB). As the project was defined as a service evaluation study by the board, ethical
382 approval was waived.

383

384 **Acknowledgments**

385 We are grateful to the patients and staff of the Ophthalmology and Rheumatology
386 Departments at Great Ormond Street Hospital, with particular thanks to Mr Harry Petrushkin
387 (Consultant Ophthalmologist), Ms Reshma Pattani (Specialised Optometrist) and Ilaria Testi
388 (Consultant Ophthalmologist).

389

390 **References**

- 391 1. Salmi L, Blease C, Häggglund M, Walker J, DesRoches CM. US policy requires immediate
392 release of records to patients. *BMJ*. Published online February 18, 2021:n426.
393 doi:10.1136/bmj.n426
- 394 2. Steitz BD, Turer RW, Lin CT, et al. Perspectives of Patients About Immediate Access to
395 Test Results Through an Online Patient Portal. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2023;6(3):e233572.
396 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.3572
- 397 3. Slawomirski L, Lindner L, de Bienassis K, et al. *Progress on Implementing and Using*
398 *Electronic Health Record Systems: Developments in OECD Countries as of 2021.; 2023*.
- 399 4. Barker W, Richwine C. Patient Usage of Apps to Access Online Medical Records. *JAMA*
400 *Netw Open*. 2023;6(11):e2343312. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.43312
- 401 5. Kujala S, Simola S, Wang B, et al. Benchmarking usability of patient portals in Estonia,
402 Finland, Norway, and Sweden. *Int J Med Inform*. 2024;181:105302.
403 doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2023.105302
- 404 6. Alturkistani A, Beaney T, Greenfield G, Costelloe CE. Patient portal registration and
405 healthcare utilisation in general practices in England. *BJGP Open*. Published online
406 December 21, 2023. doi:10.3399/BJGPO.2023.0106
- 407 7. Johnson KB, Ibrahim SA, Rosenbloom ST. Ensuring Equitable Access to Patient
408 Portals—Closing the “Techquity” Gap. *JAMA Health Forum*. 2023;4(11):e233406.
409 doi:10.1001/jamahealthforum.2023.3406
- 410 8. Cebul RD, Love TE, Jain AK, Hebert CJ. Electronic Health Records and Quality of
411 Diabetes Care. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2011;365(9):825-833.
412 doi:10.1056/NEJMsa1102519
- 413 9. Goedhart NS, Zuiderent-Jerak T, Woudstra J, Broerse JEW, Betten AW, Dedding C.
414 Persistent inequitable design and implementation of patient portals for users at the
415 margins. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2021;28(2):276-
416 283. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocaa273
- 417 10. Menon DU, Belcher HME. COVID-19 Pandemic Health Disparities and Pediatric Health
418 Care—The Promise of Telehealth. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2021;175(4):345.
419 doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.5097
- 420 11. Hadjiat Y. Healthcare inequity and digital health—A bridge for the divide, or further
421 erosion of the chasm? *PLOS Digital Health*. 2023;2(6):e0000268.
422 doi:10.1371/journal.pdig.0000268
- 423 12. Teoh LJ, Solebo AL, Rahi JS, et al. Visual impairment, severe visual impairment, and
424 blindness in children in Britain (BCVIS2): a national observational study. *Lancet Child*
425 *Adolesc Health*. 2021;5(3):190-200. doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30366-7
- 426 13. Solebo AL, Cumberland P, Rahi JS, British Isles Congenital Cataract Interest Group. 5-
427 year outcomes after primary intraocular lens implantation in children aged 2 years or
428 younger with congenital or infantile cataract: findings from the IoLunder2 prospective
429 inception cohort study. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health*. 2018;2(12):863-871.
430 doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(18)30317-1

- 431 14. Solebo AL, Rahi JS, British Congenital Cataract Interest Group. Visual Axis Opacity after
432 Intraocular Lens Implantation in Children in the First 2 Years of Life: Findings from the
433 IoLunder2 Cohort Study. *Ophthalmology*. 2020;127(9):1220-1226.
434 doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2020.02.038
- 435 15. Lyles C, Schillinger D, Sarkar U. Connecting the Dots: Health Information Technology
436 Expansion and Health Disparities. *PLoS Med*. 2015;12(7):e1001852.
437 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001852
- 438 16. Sanders LM, Federico S, Klass P, Abrams MA, Dreyer B. Literacy and Child Health. *Arch*
439 *Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2009;163(2):131. doi:10.1001/archpediatrics.2008.539
- 440 17. Shahid R, Shoker M, Chu LM, Frehlick R, Ward H, Pahwa P. Impact of low health
441 literacy on patients' health outcomes: a multicenter cohort study. *BMC Health Serv*
442 *Res*. 2022;22(1):1148. doi:10.1186/s12913-022-08527-9
- 443 18. Arias López M del P, Ong BA, Borrat Frigola X, et al. Digital literacy as a new
444 determinant of health: A scoping review. *PLOS Digital Health*. 2023;2(10):e0000279.
445 doi:10.1371/journal.pdig.0000279
- 446 19. Litchfield I, Shukla D, Greenfield S. Impact of COVID-19 on the digital divide: a rapid
447 review. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11(10):e053440. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2021-053440
- 448 20. Paul E, Fancourt D, Razai M. Racial discrimination, low trust in the health system and
449 COVID-19 vaccine uptake: a longitudinal observational study of 633 UK adults from
450 ethnic minority groups. *J R Soc Med*. 2022;115(11):439-447.
451 doi:10.1177/01410768221095241
- 452 21. Williamson LD, Smith MA, Bigman CA. Does Discrimination Breed Mistrust? Examining
453 the Role of Mediated and Non-Mediated Discrimination Experiences in Medical
454 Mistrust. *J Health Commun*. 2019;24(10):791-799.
455 doi:10.1080/10810730.2019.1669742
- 456 22. Garcia RS, Hollis T, Baratta J, et al. Building Trust and Partnership with Black Pediatric
457 Patients and their Caregivers. *Acad Pediatr*. Published online August 2023.
458 doi:10.1016/j.acap.2023.08.016
- 459 23. Pugh M, Perrin PB, Rybarczyk B, Tan J. Racism, Mental Health, Healthcare Provider
460 Trust, and Medication Adherence Among Black Patients in Safety-Net Primary Care. *J*
461 *Clin Psychol Med Settings*. 2021;28(1):181-190. doi:10.1007/s10880-020-09702-y
- 462 24. Williams C, McKail R, Arshad R. "We need to be heard. We need to be seen": A
463 thematic analysis of Black maternal experiences of birthing and postnatal care in
464 England within the context of Covid-19. *Midwifery*. 2023;127:103856.
465 doi:10.1016/j.midw.2023.103856
- 466 25. Sheikh J, Allotey J, Kew T, et al. Effects of race and ethnicity on perinatal outcomes in
467 high-income and upper-middle-income countries: an individual participant data meta-
468 analysis of 2 198 655 pregnancies. *Lancet*. 2022;400(10368):2049-2062.
469 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(22)01191-6

- 470 26. Wagner SK, Raja L, Cortina-Borja M, et al. Determinants of non-attendance at face-to-
471 face and telemedicine ophthalmic consultations. *British Journal of Ophthalmology*.
472 Published online May 22, 2023:bjo-2022-322389. doi:10.1136/bjo-2022-322389
- 473 27. Solebo AL, Rahi J. Epidemiology, aetiology and management of visual impairment in
474 children. *Arch Dis Child*. 2014;99(4):375-379. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2012-303002
- 475 28. Solebo AL, Teoh L, Sargent J, Rahi JS. Avoidable childhood blindness in a high-income
476 country: findings from the British Childhood Visual Impairment and Blindness Study 2.
477 *British Journal of Ophthalmology*. Published online October 13, 2022:bjophthalmol-
478 2022-321718. doi:10.1136/bjo-2022-321718
- 479 29. Ohannessian R, Duong TA, Odone A. Global Telemedicine Implementation and
480 Integration Within Health Systems to Fight the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Call to Action.
481 *JMIR Public Health Surveill*. 2020;6(2):e18810. doi:10.2196/18810
- 482 30. Hollander JE, Carr BG. Virtually Perfect? Telemedicine for Covid-19. *New England*
483 *Journal of Medicine*. 2020;382(18):1679-1681. doi:10.1056/NEJMp2003539
- 484 31. Priestman W, Sridharan S, Vigne H, Collins R, Seamer L, Sebire NJ. What to expect
485 from electronic patient record system implementation: lessons learned from
486 published evidence. *BMJ Health Care Inform*. 2018;25(2):92-104.
487 doi:10.14236/jhi.v25i2.1007
- 488 32. Solebo AL, Rahi JS, Edelsten C, Ashworth JL, Dick AD. Management of paediatric ocular
489 inflammatory disease in the UK: national survey of practice. *Eye*. 2020;34(3):591-592.
490 doi:10.1038/s41433-019-0518-8
- 491 33. Teo MAL. Improving acute eye consultations in general practice: a practical approach.
492 *BMJ Qual Improv Rep*. 2014;3(1):u206617.w2852.
493 doi:10.1136/bmjquality.u206617.w2852
- 494 34. Kilduff C, Lois C. Red eyes and red-flags: improving ophthalmic assessment and
495 referral in primary care. *BMJ Qual Improv Rep*. 2016;5(1):u211608.w4680.
496 doi:10.1136/bmjquality.u211608.w4680
- 497 35. Dantas LF, Fleck JL, Cyrino Oliveira FL, Hamacher S. No-shows in appointment
498 scheduling – a systematic literature review. *Health Policy (New York)*.
499 2018;122(4):412-421. doi:10.1016/j.healthpol.2018.02.002
- 500 36. Jordan H. The Index of Multiple Deprivation 2000 and accessibility effects on health. *J*
501 *Epidemiol Community Health (1978)*. 2004;58(3):250-257.
502 doi:10.1136/jech.2003.013011


503

504

505

506 **Figures**

507 Fig 1. Uptake of the patient portal by family socio-demographic characteristics



508

509 *Eng PSL: Family with English as primary spoken language; Other PSL: Family with language other than English as primary spoken language*

510 A: 95% confidence interval, CI 20 – 94; B: 95% CI 48 – 83; C: 95% CI 25 – 70; D: 95% CI 43 – 69; E: 95% CI 51 - 82

511 **Supporting information**

512 **S1 Table. Characteristics of included children by patient portal activation status**

513 Table S1. Characteristics of included children by patient portal activation status.

Characteristic	Portal activated n=2682	Portal not activated n=1005	Total (n=3687)
Sex - no. (%)			
Female	1302 (49)	466 (46)	1769 (48)
Male	1380 (52)	539 (53)	1919 (52)
Unknown	0	0	0
Age - no. (%) ^a			
Under 2 (<2yrs)	231 (9)	100 (10)	331 (9)
Pre-school (2-4)	437 (16)	203 (20)	640 (17)
Early childhood (5-10)	1010 (38)	413 (41)	1423 (39)
Late childhood (11+)	1004 (37)	289 (29)	1293 (35)
Unknown	0	0	0
Ethnicity – no. (%) ^b			
White British	1056 (40)	308 (31)	1364 (37)
Other White background	320 (12)	72 (7)	392 (11)
Asian Bangladeshi	102 (4)	26 (3)	128 (3)
Asian Indian	120 (5)	27 (3)	147 (4)
Asian Pakistani	176 (7)	75 (7)	251 (7)
Other Asian background	136 (5)	53 (6)	189 (5)
Black African	170 (6)	77 (7)	279 (7)
Other Black background	124 (5)	63 (6)	177 (5)
Mixed / other ethnicity	141 (5)	50 (5)	191 (5)
Prefer not to say / Not provided	121 (5)	109 (11)	230 (6)
Primary language spoken – no. (%) ^c			
English	2010 (78)	621 (71)	2631 (71)
Other language	571 (21)	257 (26)	826 (23)

	Unknown	101 (4)	127 (13)	230 (6)
Family residence index of multiple deprivation (IMD) quintile – no. (%) ^d				
	Most deprived (1 st quintile)	426 (16)	197 (20)	623 (17)
	2 nd quintile	765 (29)	307 (32)	1072 (29)
	3 rd quintile	562 (21)	206 (21)	768 (21)
	4 th quintile	477 (18)	123 (13)	600 (16)
	Least deprived	393 (15)	133 (14)	526 (14)
	Unknown	59 (2)	39 (4)	98 (3)

514 a. Pearson χ^2 for difference in portal adoption across patient age categories =35.1, $p<0.001$

515 b. Pearson χ^2 for difference in portal adoption across ethnicity categories =45.0, $p<0.001$

516 c. Pearson χ^2 for difference in portal adoption across family primary spoken language =61.9, $p<0.001$

517 d. Pearson χ^2 for difference in portal adoption across family residence deprivation index categories =21.9, $p<0.001$

518

519

520

521 **S2 Table. Primary spoken languages for families of children within study population**

Language	Number of families
English	2631
Arabic	142
Urdu	115
Bengali	76
Somali	59
Turkish	54
Polish	41
Romanian	36
Panjabi	25
Portuguese	24
Tamil	21
French	20
Albanian	16
Hindi	15
Gujarati	14
Spanish	14
British Sign Language	13
Persian	13
Bulgarian	11
Greek	9
Lithuanian	8
Italian	7
Pushto	<7
Chinese Mandarin	<7

Primary spoken language for $n \leq 3$ families: Afrikaans; Akan; American Sign Language; Amharic; Bosnian; Braille; Cantonese; Czech; Dutch; German; Hausa; Hebrew; Hungarian; Igbo; Irish; Kurdish; Latvian; Lingala; Nepali; Romansh; Russian; Serbian; Slovak; Swahili; Telugu; Tigrinya; Twi; Ukrainian; Vietnamese; Wolof; Yiddish; Yoruba