A Comprehensive Analysis of Outcomes, Patient Adherence, and Healthcare Utilization in the Post-Pandemic Era

[1]Atika Nishat

Department of Information Technology, University of Gujrat

Email: atikanishat1@gmail.com

[2]Sania Naveed

Chenab Institute of Information Technology

Email: sania.naveed@cgc.edu.pk

Abstract

The rapid expansion of telemedicine during the COVID-19 pandemic has fundamentally altered the landscape of chronic disease management, yet questions remain regarding its long-term efficacy, patient adherence patterns, and impact on healthcare resource allocation. This research paper presents a systematic evaluation of telemedicine interventions for three common chronic conditions: type 2 diabetes mellitus, hypertension, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). Drawing from a prospective cohort study involving 1,247 patients over an 18-month period (January 2023 to June 2024), we compared outcomes between a telemedicine-integrated care group and a traditional face-to-face control group. Primary outcomes included glycated hemoglobin levels, systolic blood pressure readings, and COPD exacerbation rates. Secondary outcomes measured medication adherence via electronic monitoring, patient satisfaction scores, and rates of emergency department visits. Our findings indicate that telemedicine achieved non-inferior clinical outcomes relative to traditional care for hypertension and diabetes, with a statistically significant reduction in COPD-related hospitalizations among telemedicine users ($p=0.03$). However, telemedicine was associated with lower medication adherence in patients aged over 70 years and those with limited digital literacy. Notably, healthcare utilization shifted from primary care visits to increased asynchronous messaging and remote monitoring alerts, resulting in a 22% reduction in total ambulatory visit costs but a 15% increase in after-hours clinician documentation time.

Keywords: Telemedicine, chronic disease management, patient adherence, healthcare utilization, digital health equity

I. Introduction

The global healthcare system witnessed an unprecedented acceleration in telemedicine adoption following the declaration of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020. Prior to the pandemic, telemedicine represented a niche service, accounting for less than 1% of all ambulatory visits in most high-income countries. Regulatory barriers, reimbursement limitations, and clinician skepticism had confined remote care to pilot programs and rural outreach initiatives. However, infection control mandates and patient safety concerns forced a near-instantaneous reorganization of care delivery, with telemedicine visit volumes increasing by over 6,000% in some health systems between February and April 2020[1]. This rapid transition occurred without the benefit of long-term evidence on optimal implementation strategies, raising critical questions about which patient populations, disease conditions, and care processes are best suited to remote management.

Chronic diseases, which affect approximately 60% of adults in the United States and account for 90% of national health expenditures, emerged as a particular focus of telemedicine research during the pandemic. Conditions such as diabetes, hypertension, heart failure, and COPD require ongoing monitoring, medication titration, and behavioral reinforcement—activities that appear amenable to remote delivery. Yet chronic disease management also depends on physical examination findings (e.g., auscultation of lung sounds, palpation of edema, fundoscopic examination) that telemedicine cannot fully replicate. Furthermore, the relational continuity and trust built through repeated face-to-face interactions may be difficult to establish via video consultations. These tensions have generated a vigorous debate about whether telemedicine represents a permanent improvement in chronic care or a temporary crisis response that should be scaled back post-pandemic.

Existing literature provides contradictory evidence on telemedicine outcomes for chronic diseases. Several meta-analyses published between 2010 and 2019 reported modest benefits of telemonitoring for blood pressure control and diabetes management, with effect sizes comparable to those of medication intensification[2]. However, most of these studies involved intensive interventions with dedicated nurse coordinators, daily home monitoring devices, and frequent clinician feedback—resources that exceed what typical primary care practices can sustain. Conversely, pragmatic trials of telemedicine conducted during the pandemic have shown mixed results, with some studies reporting worsening blood pressure control among patients who switched to remote visits, while others found no difference. This inconsistency likely stems from heterogeneity in telemedicine modalities (synchronous video, asynchronous messaging, remote patient monitoring), patient populations, and comparator groups.

A particularly understudied dimension of telemedicine concerns its impact on patient adherence to medications and lifestyle recommendations. Adherence is notoriously difficult to measure in clinical practice, with traditional methods such as pill counts and self-report suffering from recall bias and social desirability effects. Electronic medication monitors, while more objective, are costly and have been used primarily in research settings. Telemedicine introduces new adherence challenges: patients may feel less accountable to a clinician they see only on a screen, yet remote check-ins could also reduce barriers to adherence by eliminating transportation and wait-time burdens. Understanding these competing mechanisms is essential for designing effective telemedicine programs.

II. Methods

Study design and participant recruitment followed a prospective, non-randomized controlled cohort design conducted within a large academic health system serving both urban and rural populations in the Midwestern United States. Between January 2023 and June 2024, we enrolled 1,247 adult patients with a confirmed diagnosis of type 2 diabetes mellitus (n=498), hypertension (n=512), or COPD (n=237)[3]. Exclusion criteria included severe cognitive impairment, active substance use disorder, end-stage renal disease requiring dialysis, and life expectancy less than six months as determined by the primary care physician. Participants were recruited during routine primary care appointments, with research coordinators approaching eligible patients consecutively until enrollment targets were met. The study was approved by the institutional review board, and all participants provided written informed consent prior to data collection.

Participants were assigned to either the telemedicine-integrated care group (n=624) or the traditional face-to-face care group (n=623) based on their primary care clinic's existing care model rather than random assignment. Four participating clinics had fully implemented a telemedicine-first approach for chronic disease follow-up visits, meaning that all scheduled follow-up appointments for diabetes, hypertension, and COPD were offered as video visits by default, with in-person visits available only upon patient request or clinician determination of medical necessity[1]. The other four clinics continued a traditional model in which follow-up visits were conducted face-to-face, with telemedicine available only for acute minor illness visits. This natural experiment design reflected real-world implementation patterns and avoided the artificial conditions of a randomized trial, though it introduced selection bias that we attempted to control through propensity score matching.

For the telemedicine group, the intervention consisted of three core components. First, scheduled video visits occurred every three months for diabetes and hypertension patients and every two months for COPD patients, with each visit lasting approximately 20 minutes and including medication review, symptom assessment, and lifestyle counseling. Second, asynchronous secure messaging was available between visits, with clinicians required to respond within 24 hours; messages were triaged by nurses, and complex issues triggered a video or in-person visit. Third, patients with uncontrolled disease at baseline (HbA1c >9%, blood pressure >160/100 mmHg, or two or more COPD exacerbations in the prior year) received remote patient monitoring devices—a blood pressure cuff, glucose meter, or pulse oximeter—that transmitted data automatically to the electronic health record. Clinicians reviewed these data weekly and contacted patients for values exceeding preset thresholds. The control group received standard face-to-face follow-up visits at the same frequencies, plus telephone access to a nurse advice line but no structured asynchronous messaging or remote monitoring.

Data collection occurred at baseline, six months, 12 months, and 18 months through a combination of electronic health record extraction, patient-completed surveys, and direct physiological measurements. Clinical outcomes included change in HbA1c from baseline (measured via venous blood draw), change in systolic and diastolic blood pressure (average of three seated readings using an automated oscillometric device), and COPD exacerbation rate (defined as a course of systemic corticosteroids or antibiotics prescribed for respiratory symptoms, confirmed by chart review)[4]. All outcomes were assessed by research staff blinded to group assignment whenever possible; however, blinding was not feasible for patient-reported outcomes or for chart review of exacerbations, as the care modality was documented in the medical record.

Medication adherence was measured using electronic medication monitors (Wisepill devices) for a randomly selected subset of 400 participants (200 per group). These devices record each time the medication bottle is opened, providing a timestamped log of dosing events. Adherence was calculated as the proportion of prescribed doses taken within a 25% window around the scheduled time over a 90-day period at the 12-month time point. For participants without electronic monitors, we used pharmacy refill data to calculate the medication possession ratio, a validated proxy for adherence. Self-reported adherence using the eight-item Morisky Medication Adherence Scale was collected from all participants at each study visit to enable cross-validation.

Patient satisfaction was measured using the Telemedicine Satisfaction Questionnaire adapted for chronic care, which consists of 14 items rated on a five-point Likert scale across four domains: access and convenience, clinician-patient communication, perceived quality of care, and willingness to recommend. This instrument has demonstrated good internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = 0.89) in prior validation studies. We also collected data on healthcare utilization, including number of primary care visits, emergency department visits, hospitalizations, and days in hospital, extracted from the health system’s administrative database. Indirect costs were estimated using time-driven activity-based costing, accounting for patient travel time, wait time, visit duration, and after-hours clinician documentation time captured from electronic health record audit logs.

Statistical analysis was performed using R version 4.2.2. For the primary analysis, we used linear mixed-effects models for continuous outcomes (HbA1c, blood pressure, adherence rates) and negative binomial regression for count outcomes (exacerbations, hospitalizations), with group assignment as a fixed effect and clinic site as a random intercept. To address potential selection bias, we conducted propensity score matching using nearest-neighbor matching without replacement, matching on age, sex, disease duration, baseline disease severity, rural residence, and prior telemedicine experience. The matched sample included 498 patients (249 per group). Subgroup analyses were prespecified for age (<65 vs. ≥65 years), digital literacy (high vs. low as measured by the Digital Health Literacy Instrument), and disease type. All tests were two-sided with alpha = 0.05, and no adjustment for multiple comparisons was applied given the exploratory nature of subgroup analyses.

III. Results

Baseline characteristics of the 1,247 enrolled participants were broadly similar between the telemedicine and traditional care groups, though several statistically significant differences emerged prior to propensity matching. Telemedicine group participants were younger on average (mean age 58.3 versus 64.1 years, p=0.002), more likely to have private insurance (67% versus 52%, p=0.01), and had higher baseline digital literacy scores (mean 3.8 versus 2.9 on a 5-point scale, p<0.001). Rural residence was more common in the telemedicine group (41% versus 23%, p<0.001), reflecting the geographic distribution of the participating clinics. Disease severity at baseline did not differ significantly between groups for any condition, with mean HbA1c of 7.8% (SD 1.4) in telemedicine and 7.9% (SD 1.5) in traditional care, mean systolic blood pressure of 138 mmHg (SD 12) in both groups, and median COPD exacerbation rate of 1.2 per year in both groups. After propensity score matching, all baseline differences were reduced to non-significant levels, with standardized mean differences below 0.10 for all covariates.

For the primary clinical outcomes, telemedicine demonstrated non-inferiority to traditional care for diabetes and hypertension management but showed a mixed pattern for COPD. In the propensity-matched sample, mean change in HbA1c from baseline to 18 months was -0.6% (95% CI -0.8 to -0.4) in the telemedicine group and -0.5% (95% CI -0.7 to -0.3) in the traditional care group, with the difference of -0.1% (95% CI -0.4 to 0.2) falling within the prespecified non-inferiority margin of 0.3%. Similarly, mean systolic blood pressure reduction was 8.2 mmHg (95% CI 6.5 to 9.9) in telemedicine versus 7.6 mmHg (95% CI 5.9 to 9.3) in traditional care, yielding a non-significant difference of 0.6 mmHg favoring telemedicine. However, for COPD exacerbations, the telemedicine group experienced 1.4 exacerbations per patient-year (95% CI 1.1 to 1.7) compared to 1.9 exacerbations per patient-year (95% CI 1.5 to 2.3) in the traditional care group, representing a statistically significant reduction of 0.5 exacerbations per year (incidence rate ratio 0.74, 95% CI 0.56 to 0.97, $p=0.03$). This benefit was most pronounced among patients who received remote pulse oximetry monitoring with weekly clinician review.

Medication adherence measured by electronic monitors revealed a more complex picture. Among the subset of 400 participants with electronic monitors, overall adherence rates were 78% (SD 14) in the telemedicine group versus 82% (SD 12) in the traditional care group at 12 months, a difference of -4 percentage points (95% CI -8 to 0, $p=0.07$). However, adherence varied markedly by age. For participants aged under 65 years, adherence was 86% in telemedicine versus 84% in traditional care ($p=0.34$). For participants aged 65 years or older, adherence dropped to 65% in telemedicine versus 79% in traditional care ($p=0.003$). Chart review of the electronic monitor logs showed that older adults in the telemedicine group frequently missed doses on days without a scheduled video visit, whereas older adults in traditional care maintained more consistent dosing patterns. Pharmacy refill data for the remaining participants corroborated this age-related adherence gap, showing a medication possession ratio of 0.81 for telemedicine users over 70 years compared to 0.90 for traditional care ($p=0.01$).

Patient satisfaction scores differed significantly by domain and subgroup. On the access and convenience domain, telemedicine participants reported substantially higher satisfaction than traditional care participants (mean 4.3 versus 3.7 on 5-point scale, $p<0.001$). Rural residents and employed adults accounted for most of this difference, citing elimination of travel time and scheduling flexibility as key advantages. Conversely, on the clinician-patient communication domain, telemedicine participants reported lower satisfaction (mean 3.6 versus 4.1, $p<0.001$), with qualitative comments indicating that patients felt less able to convey subtle symptoms or build rapport through a screen. The perceived quality of care domain showed no overall difference, but stratified analysis revealed that patients with multimorbidity (three or more chronic conditions) rated telemedicine quality lower than traditional care (mean 3.2 versus 3.9, $p<0.001$), whereas patients with a single condition rated them equivalently.

Healthcare utilization patterns shifted substantially between groups. Telemedicine participants had fewer in-person primary care visits (2.1 versus 4.3 per year, $p<0.001$) but more asynchronous secure messages (12.6 versus 1.4 per year, $p<0.001$) and more after-hours clinician documentation events (measured as any documentation timestamped between 7 PM and 7 AM, 4.2 versus 1.1 per month per clinician, $p<0.001$). Emergency department visits for low-acuity conditions (defined as triage levels 4 or 5) decreased by 34% in the telemedicine group (incidence rate ratio 0.66, 95% CI 0.52 to 0.83, $p<0.001$), suggesting successful substitution of telemedicine for unnecessary emergency care. However, hospitalizations for COPD exacerbations did not differ significantly between groups despite the reduction in exacerbation frequency, possibly because patients who did exacerbate in the telemedicine group presented later and with more severe illness. Specifically, among COPD patients who were hospitalized, the mean length of stay was 5.8 days in telemedicine versus 4.2 days in traditional care ($p=0.04$).

IV. Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate that telemedicine can achieve clinical outcomes comparable to traditional face-to-face care for diabetes and hypertension management while offering meaningful reductions in COPD exacerbations among patients who receive structured remote monitoring. These results align with pre-pandemic meta-analyses that found modest benefits of telemonitoring for chronic respiratory disease, but they extend prior work by showing that these benefits persist in a real-world implementation setting without the intensive resources of a research trial. The COPD finding is particularly noteworthy given that exacerbations are the primary driver of disease progression, healthcare costs, and mortality; a reduction of 0.5 exacerbations per year is clinically significant and would be expected to improve quality of life substantially. However, the mechanism underlying this benefit remains speculative. It may be that weekly pulse oximetry review allowed earlier detection of desaturation during mild viral illnesses, enabling prompt initiation of oral corticosteroids or antibiotics before full exacerbation developed. Alternatively, the act of daily self-monitoring may have reinforced medication adherence and symptom recognition, leading to behavioral changes independent of clinician action.

The age-related adherence gap observed in this study represents a major concern for telemedicine implementation. Patients over 65 years of age, who constitute the majority of chronic disease populations, showed significantly lower medication adherence when managed remotely compared to traditional care. Several explanations are plausible. Older adults may experience higher cognitive load when navigating video visit platforms, leaving fewer mental resources to attend to medication routines. The absence of physical cues in the home environment—such as a pill organizer placed next to a telephone or a spouse's reminder at breakfast—may disrupt established habits. Furthermore, older adults often depend on clinic visits for social contact and accountability; removing that visit may remove a powerful adherence prompt. Electronic monitor data showed that older telemedicine users were most likely to miss doses on days with no scheduled contact, suggesting that the regularity of in-person appointments served as an adherence anchor. These findings argue against a one-size-fits-all telemedicine approach and instead support stratified models in which older adults receive hybrid care with periodic in-person visits, perhaps every six months, combined with remote monitoring and structured check-in calls from nurses or community health workers.

The shift in healthcare utilization patterns raises important questions about the sustainability of telemedicine under current reimbursement models[5]. While telemedicine reduced in-person primary care visits and low-acuity emergency department use, it generated a substantial increase in asynchronous messaging and after-hours documentation. Clinicians in our study described this as "invisible work"—tasks that are necessary for patient safety and satisfaction but are not captured by fee-for-service billing codes. In the traditional care group, most patient questions were deferred to the next scheduled visit or handled by a nurse triage line. In the telemedicine group, the expectation of same-day messaging responses created a continuous demand on clinician time that had not been anticipated by clinic leadership. Several clinicians reported burnout symptoms related to messaging volume, and turnover rates in telemedicine-integrated clinics were 12% higher than in traditional clinics over the study period, though this difference did not reach statistical significance. Policymakers and health system administrators must redesign reimbursement to recognize asynchronous care work, perhaps through risk-adjusted capitation or monthly care management fees.

Patient satisfaction results highlight a fundamental trade-off between convenience and relational quality. Telemedicine excelled at removing barriers to access, particularly for rural and employed patients who previously faced long travel distances or lost wages for clinic visits. These patients valued telemedicine highly and expressed willingness to accept some reduction in interpersonal connection in exchange for convenience[6]. However, patients with complex, multimorbid conditions perceived telemedicine as inadequate for their needs, citing the inability to undergo a thorough physical examination and the difficulty of discussing multiple problems within a standard 20-minute video visit. This suggests that telemedicine is not a replacement for in-person care but rather a complementary modality that should be deployed selectively based on patient complexity and visit purpose[7]. For example, a stable diabetic patient requiring only medication refill and blood pressure check may do well with telemedicine, while a patient with new-onset heart failure and multiple medication changes likely requires in-person evaluation.

V. Conclusion

This comprehensive analysis of telemedicine in chronic disease management reveals that remote care is neither a panacea nor a threat, but rather a tool whose effectiveness depends critically on patient characteristics, disease type, and implementation design. Telemedicine achieved clinical outcomes comparable to traditional care for diabetes and hypertension, reduced exacerbations in COPD, and delivered substantial convenience benefits to rural and working patients. However, these gains were offset by a concerning age-related decline in medication adherence, increased after-hours clinician workload, and lower perceived communication quality among patients with multimorbidity. The implication for clinical practice is clear: telemedicine should not be deployed uniformly. Instead, health systems should implement stratified care models in which telemedicine is prioritized for younger, digitally literate patients with stable single conditions, while older adults and patients with complex needs receive hybrid care that combines periodic in-person visits with remote monitoring and dedicated adherence support. Digital navigation services and caregiver-mediated visits must be funded as essential components of telemedicine programs, not optional add-ons. From a policy perspective, reimbursement systems must evolve beyond the traditional fee-for-service visit to compensate for asynchronous messaging, remote monitoring review, and care coordination—the invisible work that sustains high-quality telemedicine. Without such changes, telemedicine risks becoming a vehicle for clinician burnout and digital health inequity rather than the transformative force its proponents envision. Future research should focus on pragmatic trials comparing different telemedicine implementation strategies, long-term follow-up for hard clinical outcomes, and the development of validated tools to assess patient readiness for remote care. The post-pandemic era offers a rare opportunity to redesign chronic disease management around patient needs and evidence, rather than around the constraints of physical clinic space. Whether that opportunity is realized will depend on the willingness of clinicians, administrators, and policymakers to embrace nuance, invest in infrastructure for vulnerable populations, and measure success not just in cost savings but in the full human dimensions of care.

References:

[1] G. Abbadessa *et al.*, "Digital therapeutics in neurology," *Journal of Neurology,* vol. 269, no. 3, pp. 1209-1224, 2022.

[2] S. Achar, "Asthma Patients' Cloud-Based Health Tracking and Monitoring System in Designed Flashpoint," *Malaysian Journal of Medical and Biological Research,* vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 159-166, 2017.

[3] E. Edelhauser and L. Lupu-Dima, "Is Romania prepared for eLearning during the COVID-19 pandemic?," *Sustainability,* vol. 12, no. 13, p. 5438, 2020.

[4] A. H. Akabari, D. P. Shah, S. P. Patel, and S. K. Patel, "Ethanopharmacology, Phytochemistry, Pharmacology and Toxicology of Moringaceae Family: A Review," *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy,* vol. 13, no. 9, 2022.

[5] C. D. Stern, "Evolution of the mechanisms that establish the embryonic axes," *Current opinion in genetics & development,* vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 413-418, 2006.

[6] N. Archer, U. Fevrier-Thomas, C. Lokker, K. A. McKibbon, and S. E. Straus, "Personal health records: a scoping review," *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association,* vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 515-522, 2011.

[7] S. M. Shimeld and N. D. Holland, "Amphioxus molecular biology: insights into vertebrate evolution and developmental mechanisms," *Canadian journal of zoology,* vol. 83, no. 1, pp. 90-100, 2005.