





Evaluation of eHealth assistance in hospital care for improved quality of life in patients

Oto Potluka^{1,4}, Lenka Švecová¹, Viktor Kubát¹, Veronika Liskova-Nedbalova³, Lenka Lhotská^{1,2}, Tomáš Nečas³ (¹Faculty of Biomedical Engineering, Czech Technical University in Prague, ²Czech Institute of Informatics, Robotics and Cybernetics, Czech Technical University in Prague, ³Tomas Bata Hospital in Zlin; ⁴CEPS, University of Basel)

Acknowledgement

The work is supported by the project Utilization of social innovations using assistive technologies in Zlin region, project reg. No. CZ.03.3.X/0.0/0.0/15_018/0015477

Evaluation Design



- The evaluation is still on-going
- Theory of Change a project of introducing eHealth technologies in a hospital, home care, and social services
- eHealth technologies selection
 - 1st step of selection laboratory
 - 2nd step of selection hospital
- Data collection RCT (an a plan B)
- Current results



Evaluation question	ns E	Evaluation methodology			
 Do eHealth technolog provide better and mo effective care that rec health risks? How do assistive tech affect clients' psycholo well-being and social i What factors influence attitude of other acto towards technologies 	ore duces nologies ogical inclusion? e the rs	n clients (randomized approach), staff of ns, families of clients, neighbours and other are, , data from technologies. h regard to the evolution of their values using nd reporting to the implementation team.		 Technical solutions reducing health risks for clients. eHealt technologies contributing to the psychological well-being of clients and stakeholders. Verifying affects of eHealth technologies on the social inclusion of clients. 	
Needs	Inputs / Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Impacts	
 Growing disparity between supply and demand for specialised facilities due to an ageing population. Increasing workload of staff in specialised facilities. 	 Definition of typical health limitations of clients. Determination of parameters. Defining the target groups, including diagnoses and the values to be monitored. Evaluating data over long time and in the context of the client/patient's life. Refinement of algorithms, and measured parameters. Implementation of the technical solutions. 	 Description of the process of wiring the developed and tested system. Round tables with stakeholders (information transfer). Conferences on assistive technologies. 	• A system that will help people in nee their family members and specialist workers, to achieve a bette quality of life and greater safety.	ed, and health care settings. Increasing the quality and accessibility of	



Step 1: Selection of technologies

- March November 2020: Included 26 technologies
 Criteria:
 - Reliability (accuracy and quality of outputs from the technologies)
 - Repeatability of measurement
 - User-friendly control and installation
 - Low energy consumption
 - Open data format, availability of data to save
 - Possibility to transfer data (Wi-Fi, cable, necessity of connection to a server, non-standard connection)



Step 2: Selection of technologies

- Testing in partners' premises (staff)
- Final selection of HW solution
- Implementation of SW system
- Criteria:
 - Does the technology saves time and effort of the staff?
 - Is the technology comfortable for patients?
 - Quality and accuracy of measurement in comparison to standard processes.



Selected technologies

- The step shows that majority of technologies are not reliable or appropriate to institutional care.
- Our evaluation study tested five **oximeters** (heart pulse + saturation).
- five **thermometers** in the covid-19 unit
- together with a centralized application showing heart rate, temperature, and saturation online.
- Who was in a Czech hospital, knows that the staff measures temperature when the night and day services change – it means very early in the morning.

Data collection



- RCT through a survey
- A Random selection at the end of the questionnaire.
 Questions intended to
 - (a) get know better the characteristics of the sample and
 - (b) use it for the propensity score matching if the RCT approach fails
- Availability of documentation about health risks to patients and burden to the staff
- Number of patients: 51
- All the data is anonymised, only staff knows the identity.

The sample



	Supported	Not supported	p-value	
Ν	22	24		
Average length of stay in hospital (days)	15.1	16.9	0.351 (t-test)	
Reason for ending health care:				
Patient died	2	5	0 5 4 0	
Institutional care	4	4	0.540 (chi-square)	
Released home	16	15	(cm-square)	
Smokers	1	1		
Breathing problems	13	16		
University degree	2	7		
Men	13	14		

Results



	Change of burden to staff		Patient died	
	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value
Constant	-453.909	0.823	4.551	0.639
Support by eHealth	14.834	0.479	-0.086	0.481
Year of birth	0.242	0.817	-0.002	0.704
Gender	-6.836	0.737	-0.100	0.400
University degree	-10.767	0.669	-0.187	0.274
Length of stay	-0.140	0.902	-0.014	0.069
Problems with breathing	-7.728	0.700	0.139	0.269
Smoker	-32.654	0.321	-0.071	0.815
Diabetes	-7.034	0.693	0.051	0.690
Contact without limitations	-7.879	0.755	-0.402	0.053
Initial burden to staff			-0.002	0.432

Results



- We have not proved that using eHealth technologies neither improves survival chances of covid-patients nor decreases burden of the staff.
- The staff confirmed satisfaction with the software solution in interveiws.
- eHealth technologies have contributed to saving the time of the healthcare staff.
- The evaluation design is based on RCT approach which is not a common approach in Czech circumstances.

Lessons learned



- On-line collection of data (the survey and measuring heart pulse, temperature, saturation).
- Adding randomization question at the end of the questionnaire helps to keep RCT clear (no cheating).
- Only a small sample
- Thermometers are small (staff took them with dead bodies without noticing it).
- Thermometers used to check changes in the temperature not to measure exact temperature.

Lessons learned



- Valuable feedback from all partners
- Patient-centered and user-centered approach
- Unobtrusive solutions
- User acceptance
- Connected issues data privacy, ethics, legal regulations
- The Covid-19 situation highlighted the urgency of applications providing the described functionalities, including telemedicine and telehealth services.





Thank you for your attention!

Oto Potluka. oto.potluka@unibas.ch

www.ceps.unibas.ch

Das Center for Philanthropy Studies (CEPS) ist ein Institut der Universität Basel. das auf Initiative von SwissFoundations gegründet worden ist. Folgende Organisationen tragen zur Grundfinanzierung bei: Age Stiftung. arcas foundation. Avina Stiftung. Ernst Göhner Stiftung. Gebert Rüf Stiftung. Ria und Arthur Dietschweiler Stiftung. Sophie und Karl Binding Stiftung. Stiftung Mercator Schweiz. VELUX Stiftung