

Accepted Manuscript

British Journal of General Practice

Unintended consequences of patient online access to health records: a qualitative study in UK primary care

Turner, Andrew; Morris, Rebecca; McDonagh, Lorraine ; Hamilton, Fiona; Blake, Sarah; Farr, Michelle; Stevenson, Fiona; Banks, Jonathan; Atherton, Helen; Rakhra, Dylan; Lasseter, Gemma; Feder, Gene; Ziebland, Sue; Hyde, Emma; Powell, John; Horwood, Jeremy

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3399/BJGP.2021.0720>

To access the most recent version of this article, please click the DOI URL in the line above.

Received 23 December 2021

Revised 22 August 2022

Accepted 28 August 2022

© 2022 The Author(s). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Published by British Journal of General Practice. For editorial process and policies, see: <https://bjgp.org/authors/bjgp-editorial-process-and-policies>

When citing this article please include the DOI provided above.

Author Accepted Manuscript

This is an 'author accepted manuscript': a manuscript that has been accepted for publication in British Journal of General Practice, but which has not yet undergone subediting, typesetting, or correction. Errors discovered and corrected during this process may materially alter the content of this manuscript, and the latest published version (the Version of Record) should be used in preference to any preceding versions

Unintended consequences of patient online access to health records: a qualitative study in UK primary care

Authors

Andrew Turner, BA MA PhD, Senior Research Associate, NIHR ARC West University Hospitals Bristol and Weston NHS Foundation Trust and Centre for Academic Primary Care (CAPC) Population Health Sciences, University of Bristol, UK

andrew.turner@bristol.ac.uk, - <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7121-3121>

Rebecca Morris, BA MA MSc PhD, Research Fellow, NIHR Greater Manchester Patient Safety Translational Research Centre, Centre for Primary Care, University of Manchester, UK

Lorraine McDonagh, BA PhD, Senior Research Fellow, Research Department of Primary Care and Population Health, University College London, UK

Fiona L. Hamilton, PhD FFPH MRCGP, Associate Professor, Research Department of Primary Care & Population Health, University College London, UK

Sarah Blake, BA MSc MRes, PPI Collaborator, UK

Michelle Farr, BSc MPhil PhD, Research Fellow, National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Applied Research Collaboration West (ARC West) at University Hospitals Bristol and Weston NHS Foundation Trust and Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, UK

Fiona Stevenson, PhD, Professor of Medical Sociology, Department of Primary Care and Population Health, University College London, UK

Jon Banks, BA PhD, Research Fellow, Applied Research Collaboration West, University Hospitals Bristol and Weston and Population Health Science, University of Bristol, UK - <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3889-6098>

Helen Atherton, BSc MSc MPH PhD, Associate Professor, Unit of Academic Primary Care, University of Warwick, UK - <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7072-1925>

Dylan Rakhra, BA BDS, Academic Clinical Fellow in Primary Care Dentistry, Department of Philosophy / School of Oral and Dental Sciences, University of Bristol, UK

Gemma Lasseter, PhD, Research Fellow and Programme Manager for the Health Protection Agency in Behavioural Science and Evaluation, and Population Health Sciences, University of Bristol, UK - <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7482-6305>

Gene Feder, MSc, PhD, MB, Professor of Primary Care, NIHR ARC West University Hospitals Bristol and Weston NHS Foundation Trust and Centre for Academic Primary Care (CAPC) Population Health Sciences University of Bristol, UK - <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7890-3926>

Sue Ziebland, MSc, Professor of Medical Sociology, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK

Emma Hyde, BA MSc, Postgraduate Researcher, School of Sociology and Social Policy, University of Leeds, UK - <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7919-1641>

John Powell, PhD MFPHM, Professor of Digital Health Care, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK

Jeremy Horwood, BSc PhD, Professor of Social Sciences and Applied Health Research, NIHR ARC West University Hospitals Bristol and Weston NHS Foundation Trust and Centre for Academic Primary Care (CAPC) Population Health Sciences, University of Bristol, UK - <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7092-4960>

Abstract

Background

Health systems around the world are seeking to harness digital tools to promote patient autonomy and increase the efficiency of care. One example of this policy in England is online patient access to full medical records in primary care. Since April 2019, all NHS England patients have had the right to access their full medical record prospectively, and full record access has been the “default position” since April 2020.

Aim

To identify and understand the unintended consequences of online patient access their medical record.

Design and Setting

Qualitative interview study in 10 general practices in South West and North West England.

Method

Semi-structured individual interviews with 13 patients and 16 general practice staff with experience of patient online access to health records.

Results

Online access generated unintended consequences that negatively impacted patients’ understanding of their health care, for example patients discovering surprising information or information that was difficult to interpret. Online access impacted GPs’ documentation practices, such as when GPs pre-emptively attempted to minimise potential misunderstandings to aid patient understanding of their health care, in other cases, negatively impacting the quality of the records and patient safety when GPs avoided documenting their speculations or concerns. Contrary to assumptions that practice workload would be reduced, online access introduced extra work, such as managing and monitoring access and taking measures to prevent possible harm to patients.

Conclusion

The unintended consequences described by both staff and patients show that to achieve the intended consequences set out in NHS policy additional work is necessary to prepare records for

sharing and prepare patients about what to expect. It is crucial that practices are adequately supported and resourced to manage the unintended consequences of online access now that it is the default position. A table of potential unintended consequences and mitigation measures is provided to aid practice managers and clinicians implementing online access.

Keywords

EHR; Unintended consequences; Digital first primary care; Digital health; qualitative interviews

How this fits in

Previous studies of patient online access to their medical records have noted a range of concerns about potential unintended consequences. This study reports real-world experiences of the consequences of online access. We identified unintended consequences that impacted patient autonomy and GP documentation practices, and also increased workload through providing access while avoiding harm to patients. It is crucial that practices are adequately supported and resourced to manage the unintended consequences of online access now that it is the default position.

Accepted Manuscript – BJGP – BJGP:2021.0720

Unintended consequences of patient online access to health records: a qualitative study in UK primary care

Introduction

Political, economic, and social pressures are driving patient access to health records globally.¹⁻⁴ Health care systems in a range of countries make medical records accessible to patients in some form, although there is considerable variability in what and how information is available to patients.⁵

Online patient access to their medical records (henceforth, online access) satisfies the moral argument that the information rightly belongs to the patient and so should be accessible to them.^{4, 6} More instrumentally, online access is intended to enable patients to take greater control of their health, in parallel to increasing the efficiency of care and delivering reductions in GP practice workload.⁷⁻¹² However, these are relatively new roles for medical records to perform in contrast to their traditional roles supporting clinicians in the care of patients and providing evidence for legal matters, audit and research.¹³

In the UK, online access to summary information in primary care records has been available to patients since 2015 and, before this, the right to a copy of one's medical record was part of data protection legislation (typically a print copy). The NHS Long Term plan created the right for patients to access 'digital first' primary care by 2023-24.¹⁰ Although the roll-out of online record access has been delayed, from November 2022 users of the NHS app (or similar apps) should have full record access prospectively, and retrospective access to their coded records in 2023.¹⁴

NHS England patients can be given online access by registering for 'online services' at their GP practice. (Online services also includes other linked services, such as booking appointments and ordering repeat prescriptions, that are not the subject of this study). Patients can access their records online through various providers.¹⁵ Access is available at two levels: a 'detailed coded record' (DCR) and a 'full record'. DCRs contain information about a patient's allergies, immunisations, medications, and test results, as well as coded problems, diagnoses, and procedures, although what is made available from this list varies between practices. Full records contain the DCR, plus free-text clinician consultation notes and other documents such as hospital letters. However, results from recent GP Patient Surveys show that only 7% of patients said they were using online services to access their medical records.^{16, 17}

Studies of online access to medical records have found some evidence it can improve health outcomes and patient safety.^{6, 18} Studies have also found that patients have used online access to better understand and control their health, for example, by allowing them to better prepare for subsequent consultations and correct errors¹⁸⁻²³, while finding the technology "convenient, useful, useable and flexible".^{24, 25}

Evaluations of digital health tools have found that their promise is not always delivered however and real-world implementation frequently produces unintended consequences.²⁶⁻²⁸ That is, positive or negative effects that were not intended at the outset, but which often occur when adopting novel technologies.²⁹ Possible unintended consequences of online access include concerns about confidentiality and risk of patient coercion,^{3, 30} patient confusion and anxiety,^{3, 6, 31} as well as the creation of additional clinician workload²⁴ and widening of health inequalities.^{32, 33} However these are often speculative and hypothetical concerns, with unclear evidence they are realised in practice.³

The aim of this study was to identify and understand the unintended consequences of online access to health records experienced by patients and practices, to inform guidance on mitigation of those consequence at practice and policy levels.

Methods

Semi-structured individual interviews with patients and staff from GP practices in South West and North West England in 2019 and 2020. This article reports results from the DECODE study, which examined the unintended consequences of three types of digital health tool in primary care: online consultation tools; patient online access to health records; and smartphone apps to help patients manage long-term conditions. Only results about online access to health records are reported here. Results about online consultations are published elsewhere.³⁴

We define unintended consequences in contrast to the intended consequences set out in policy documents. NHS England policy documents suggest that there are two main intended consequences of providing streamlined access to information about one's health through online access to health records:^{7-10, 12}

Intended consequence 1: Enable patients to take greater control of their health. Providing "information about their condition and history" to support more "personalised care [...] wellbeing and independence",⁸ helping patients "manage [their] own health and care better" and enabling "more informed discussions and genuine involvement in decisions about our health and care."⁷

Intended consequences 2: Improve the efficiency of care or improve practice workload. Creating "significant increases in productivity that far outweigh the initial investment" through, for example, "reductions in ad hoc contacts with some patients"⁷ and enabling "care to be designed and delivered in the place that is most appropriate for [patients, clinicians and their carers]."¹⁰

In this study consequences are labelled as unintended if they did not fall under the intended consequences given above. Unintended consequences could be positive or negative or could be anticipated or not.

Sampling and Recruitment

Research active practices in 8 Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) areas in the South West and North West were provided with study information by the NIHR Clinical Research Network. Expressions of interest were received and practices were selected according their level of experience with the three types of digital health tool being investigated in the DECODE study [by AT RM JH]. Where possible, practices were selected to provide a mix in relation to size, urban/rural location, and indices of area-level socioeconomic scores for the practice population,³⁵ although these characteristics are not evenly represented in the final sample. (See Table 1.)

Practice staff were recruited through the practice manager or research lead. Patients were eligible to take part if they were registered for online services, or were known to staff as having requested full-record access. When large numbers of patients met these criteria, the set of those invited was targeted by age, ethnicity, and long-term condition to try to maximise diversity. Eligible patients were sent invitation letters by participating practices or were opportunistically provided with study information by clinical staff.

The concept of 'information power'³⁶ informed analysis, sampling and participant recruitment, which were conducted in parallel to allow sampling to be refined as the project developed. Information power is a guiding principle in qualitative research, suggesting that studies with broad aims and exploratory analysis may need larger samples, while smaller samples can be sufficient if data is focused and if participants have rich experiences relevant to the research question.

Data collection

Topic guides were developed by the study team and informed by a stakeholder workshop held in 2018 to explore possible unintended consequences of digital health technology.^{37, 38} Topic guides were refined iteratively as interviews and preliminary analysis progressed. Interviews were conducted between February 2019 and January 2020 by [AT and RM] (face-to-face or by telephone) and lasted 20-60 minutes (average 38 minutes).

Analysis

Interviews were fully transcribed and coded using QSR NVivo 12 software. Thematic analysis³⁹ was used to explore staff and patients' descriptions of the consequences of online record access. Initial noting of ideas was followed by line-by-line examination and inductive coding by AT and RM. The first 3 transcripts were coded independently [JH AT] and discrepancies discussed to contribute to the generation and refinement of codes to maximise rigour. The coding frame was further refined through discussion with the whole study team, including PPI contributors. Themes were examined to determine whether the consequences being described were in line with the intended consequences outlined above, or were unintended consequences [JH RM DR AT].

Results

Practice and participant characteristics

Interviews were conducted before April 2020, so practices that participated were not yet obliged to offer full-record access to existing patients. Characteristics of the 10 practices are shown in Table 1 and 29 participants interviewed in Table 2.

TABLE 1: Practice Characteristics

TABLE 2: Participant Characteristics

Findings are presented according to the pre-defined intended consequences (see above), illustrated with anonymised verbatim quotes. We note how the intended consequences were achieved, before considering unintended consequences.

Intended consequence 1: Enable patients to take greater control of their health

Staff and patients described online access primarily provided a more convenient way for patients to view information about their health care. Patients reported that this enabled patients to check test results, treatment plans or remind themselves about the content of previous consultations or occasionally equipped them to challenge their GP or take more control in subsequent consultations. For example, as one patient explained:

“my last consultation [...] I just took him [the GP] a list of about 15 questions about my condition [... record access has] certainly helped me to ask more questions or to know a bit more about [my condition]” (Patient-2, Practice-6)

Unintended consequences

Patients and staff highlighted unintended consequences of online access that challenged the intended goal of supporting patient ‘well-being and independence’ and enabling their ‘genuine involvement’ in their health and care (see the definitions of intended consequences above). First, some patients described discovering information in their health records that had surprised and distressed them, and which their original consultation had not prepared them for.

“I went onto the patient record [...] to look for if any of the blood test results had come back [...and it] said, ‘urgent referral request: suspected breast cancer’. [...] You’re instantly like, Christ! The doctor thinks that I’ve got breast cancer.” (Patient-1, Practice-2)

GPs and administrative and managerial staff had little awareness of whether patients experienced this kind of unintended consequence, despite their *concern* that online access could cause patients distress if they learned something of which they were previously unaware.

Second, patients noted that simple access to information did not necessarily equate to greater involvement or better management of their own health and care. Some patients explained that “sometimes too much information can be unhelpful.” (Patient-1, Practice-2) or that “a little bit of knowledge is a dangerous thing” (Patient-2, Practice-10), especially if they did not have sufficient context to interpret it and searched online about the “disadvantages or drawbacks” (Patient-2, Practice-6) of a condition. One GP described a conversation with a patient who no longer wanted online access because they did not want to read about their growing medical problems.

“There were two or three things that [the patient] had to remember [following the consultation] and so for me it’s always been natural, ‘just go online and check so you can remind yourself’. [...] And she was like ‘oh, I don’t really look at my records anymore’, I said, ‘why not?’, ‘Well, because I don’t want to... I’m scared of seeing something that means I’ve got another problem on top’” (GP-1, Practice-9)

Third, GPs suggested that information in the record was not tailored to the needs of patients which could lead to misunderstandings or misinterpretation. For example, GPs noted that patients could struggle to interpret test results, particularly when clinically unimportant information was also visible. GPs thought that their own documentation practices could be a source of difficulty for patients, explaining that consultation notes were written using abbreviations, jargon, and in a time-constrained context where accuracy of spelling was not always prioritised.

“there’s a heck of a lot of spelling mistakes we make in our notes. [...A patient] who requested all her notes, I did have that conversation with her, I said, ‘there will be lots of spelling mistakes and things’ and forewarned her.” (GP-1, Practice-4)

Fourth, online access could have wider medico-legal or patient safety consequences when concern about how information might be interpreted by patients affected the content of consultation notes. For example, some GPs described the difficulty of recording their concerns in notes that would be visible to patients.

“[if] you’re worried about domestic violence or drug use or something like that and you’re not necessarily firm enough, you might have tried to explore it [... but the patient is] coming in and doctor hopping [...] you can put on a note [in the record] to that effect [...] but you know I’d be very wary of doing that now. I might go and phone the [other] doctor myself if I know they [the patient] were coming in and have a chat with them [the doctor]. But I definitely feel you have to be careful about what you’re putting down in the record” (GP-1, Practice-10)

Notes about possible diagnoses or GP “gut feelings” were described in similar terms: such speculation was thought to leave “hostages to fortune” (GP-3, Practice-1) if made visible to patients, particularly when the pressures of consultations meant that it was not possible or practical to discuss an issue thoroughly with them. In these cases, speculative but important information was either not documented or shifted to less formal channels.

GPs suggested that mitigating all four kinds of unintended consequence could be achieved through their already cautious and transparent documentation practices. GPs described how their notes were “factual” (GP-1, Practice-4), “objective [... and] defensive” (GP-2, Practice-2) to minimise potential issues for patients viewing them. One GP explained how they write notes without jargon to aid patient understanding.

“[For a female patient] for instance, [the] instructions I wrote was written in a way so I knew, if she reads it, she will be able to understand, rather than using shorthand”. (GP-1, Practice-9)

Another GP described how they had adapted the terminology they use: avoiding “normal” in test results and instead calling statistically abnormal but clinically normal results “satisfactory” (GP-1, Practice-2) to avoid confusion. GPs also gave examples of writing notes “transparently” and “jointly” with patients by explaining to patients what is being documented as they write it.

“I do transparent practice, so [I] verbalise what I’m finding with patients, I verbalise what I think is going on in my records, I will only put ‘my impression is this’. [...] so I’d hope that you’re not going to get things back in your face”. (GP-1, Practice-8)

Intended consequences 2: Improve the efficiency of care or improve practice workload

The primary way that staff found patient online access to their health records improved practice workload was by shifting the responsibility for producing copies of medical records. Instead of practices printing out copies (possibly multiple times), staff and patients highlighted the efficiency of allowing patients to extract information themselves when they pleased.

Unintended consequences: efficiency of care and workload

Patients appreciated the convenience of being able to view their record when they pleased, but beyond this they did not comment on the efficiency of the care they received. Consequently, the unintended consequences below focus on staff experiences of five kinds of addition to practice workload.

First, the preparation of records before giving patients access added to staff workloads. Preparing records included tasks such as redacting sensitive information (that is, information that “would be a risk of harm to [...] the patient or somebody else” (Admin-1, Practice-4)) and references to third-parties (such as individuals other than the patient who can be identified from information in the record).

“We certainly all anecdotally talk about the work that it’s created with many of the admin staff having to go through and take out third-party references and things. Giving patients ownership over their health can be a good thing, but it can also generate work in other ways.” (GP-1, Practice-4)

Although software was sometimes available to help, this “only solve[d] part of the problem.” (Admin-1, Practice-7) and manual checking was often needed.

Second, online access increased workload when clinical staff provided support to patients requesting access. In these cases, supporting and “preparing patients” (GP-1, Practice-9) was necessary to help patients know what to expect, and avoid misunderstanding and surprises. Some GPs provided patients with information leaflets or questionnaires, but there were also instances where GPs had arranged a face-to-face consultation with particular patients, so they could go through important parts of the record together.

“I had a patient who had quite a lot of terrible things [happen] to her in her childhood [...] she wanted online access and so when she requested it [...] I said, ‘You are going to have online access. What I think would be good if we go through your record now’. [... The record was] not that massive and I just went through the problem codes with her so that she could see what they were and that they made sense to her.” (GP-2, Practice-4)

Third, additional workload was also generated when managing access to records of teenage children (around 13 years). For example, situations that generated extra work included: practices being asked to redact comments in the child’s record that parents do not want the child to see (or vice versa); allowing access for parents who have separated; and parents requesting access to a child’s record. As well as creating extra administrative work, some situations also meant navigating tricky conversations with parents and children. For example, at one practice where parental access ended when a child turned 13 years of age:

“There have been a couple of occasions when that’s actually been really quite difficult, where the kids find themselves in a difficult position of parents saying, ‘well why can’t I have access to the notes?’ And you say, ‘well it’s set up for your child to say whether you have this or not’ and the parents will say, ‘well they won’t mind, that will be fine, of course it will’, the child is there and you can see the child squirming [...] If you know the situation, you can actually engineer [a way out of] it, but sometimes that can be quite noisy and quite difficult.” (GP-1, Practice-2)

Fourth, staff recognised risks around online access for patients experiencing domestic violence and abuse and described the difficulty of ensuring that access would not cause harm if perpetrators

viewed their partner's record. An unintended consequence of online access therefore was the additional work undertaken by staff to minimise harm, such as, considering requests on a case-by-case basis and attempting to see the patient alone, face-to-face, to confirm access requests were from them and for them.

"[domestic violence and abuse is] one of the reasons why the process [to get access] is a bit more long-winded now [... a consultation in advance allows] the GP to speak to the patient and that's kind of why we want the face-to-face because they can be alone in the room [...] the GP just needs to make sure that they actually want the access themselves and it's for them." (Admin-1, Practice-4)

Fifth, once online access was available, staff described unintended additional workload from managing and monitoring access, such as queries from patients challenging information or finding errors in their record that required correction. Staff noted that genuine errors were typically easy to amend, whereas patient disagreement with otherwise appropriate codes had the unintended consequence of generating "difficult discussions" around topics such as obesity.

"people don't like to see things that may be negative about themselves [...] we do tend to find it's the obesity stuff that they [patients] object to" (Practice Manager, Practice-10)

Although Online access generated practice workload in a range of ways, staff sometimes downplayed the impact of online access because access requests were processed on an *ad hoc* basis, and therefore spread out, and patient uptake was relatively low at the majority of practices.

"I didn't really see that it was going to be that great a change and in our experience it hasn't been that great a change. It's still a very low number of patients that want to see their notes and records, or have access to them, in fact we had difficulty convincing patients to sign up." (Practice Manager, Practice-4)

Discussion

Summary

The intended consequences of online access in policy documents are to improve control of one's health, and improve the efficiency of care and practice workload. However, the implementation of online access is more complex than the intended consequences would suggest. Online access generated unintended consequences that negatively impacted patients' control over and understanding of their health, such as when patients discovered surprising information or information was difficult to interpret. Online access impacted GPs' documentation practices, in some cases potentially aiding patients, such as when GPs pre-emptively attempted to minimise potential misunderstandings, in other cases, negatively impacting the quality of the record when GPs avoided documenting their speculations or concerns, which could have negative medicolegal and patient safety consequences. Contrary to assumptions that practice workload would be reduced, online access introduced necessary extra work, such as managing and monitoring access and taking measures to prevent possible harm to patients.

Comparison with existing literature

Studies of online access to medical records have found patients have used them to understand their health and take greater responsibility for their care,¹⁸⁻²³ and found the technology convenient and useful however our findings provide a more nuanced understanding.

Previous research has highlighted potential unintended consequences of online access. There are well-known concerns around confidentiality and risk of patient coercion,^{3, 30} patient confusion and anxiety,^{3, 6, 31} as well as the creation of additional clinician workload²⁴ and widening of health inequalities.^{32, 33} These are often hypothetical concerns, with unclear evidence they are realised in practice.³ This research supports the findings of previous studies examining hypothetical impacts, showing how the potential benefits and concerns about unintended consequences of online access are realised in practice.

Strengths and limitations

A key strength of this research is that it reports the actual experiences of patients and staff using online access, rather than their hypothetical concerns about potential unintended consequences.

Patient experiences of unintended consequences were limited because practices had low numbers of patients using record access. Staff had experienced minor impacts from the increased workload that providing access requires and had minimal experience of patient harm resulting from online access (although we did find some examples from patients of significant, distressing, surprises). Lack of examples of patient harm should be taken as an absence of evidence, not evidence of absence.³

Many practices were not able to easily identify patients who used their online access. Registration for online services is a blunt tool since registration does not entail use. Furthermore, registration is necessary for other linked services (e.g. appointment booking and repeat prescription ordering) that may be the main reason for patients registering.¹⁶ This may explain why there were four participating practices in which no patients who responded to the invitation to take part had, in fact, used online access to medical records, despite being registered for online services. (See Table 1.) Future research must carefully consider, in discussion with practices, how to identify patients using online access.

Patients who agreed to participate were mostly middle-aged and all white British. More generally, the 2020 GP patient survey found that older people were less likely to use online services. Findings should be interpreted considering these limitations. Invitations to participate were in English, sent by post by GP practices, and required individuals to respond to the University researcher, which may have introduced socio-cultural barriers for some communities. Future research could recruit in collaboration with community groups rather than GP practices to improve recruitment diversity, although it would be essential to ensure reciprocal benefits to avoid gatekeeper fatigue.

Implications for research and practice

Table 3 outlines the unintended consequences we identified and offers mitigation guidance for clinicians and practice managers.

Table 3

All the measures identified in Table 3 require extra work on behalf of practices and there is a clear up-front cost to preparing records and supporting patients to access their records. The accumulation of individually minor tasks may pose a more significant challenge as online access is scaled-up, however, some workload may diminish over time. For example, it is a one-time task to redact sensitive content or correct an error highlighted by a patient. Providing access as patients individually request it spreads this workload over a longer period making it potentially easier to absorb.

Making records accessible to patients raises questions about how they can best serve both clinicians and patients, when traditionally the primary purpose of medical records has been to support clinicians in the care of patients.¹³ Although issues around documentation practices are not new, patient online access, as the default position, throws this into sharper relief. The examples raised around access and others viewing the patient record, for example a child's parents or a coercive partner in issues of domestic violence, both highlight how patients' relationships to others leads to unintended consequences when they do not fit the imagined picture of a patient exclusively accessing their record for their own use.

The unintended consequences described by both staff and patients show that to achieve the intended consequences set out in NHS policy practices face additional work that is necessary to prepare records for sharing and prepare patients about what to expect. It is crucial that practices are adequately supported and resourced to manage the unintended consequences of online access now that it is the "default position".¹²

References

1. Hägglund M, DesRoches C, Petersen C, et al. Patients' access to health records. *BMJ* 2019; 367: l5725.
2. Jacob JA. Patient access to physician notes is gaining momentum. *JAMA* 2016; 315: 2510-2511.
3. Mold F, de Lusignan S, Sheikh A, et al. Patients' online access to their electronic health records and linked online services: a systematic review in primary care. *Br J Gen Pract* 2015; 65: e141-151.
4. Wiljer D, Urowitz S, Apatu E, et al. Patient Accessible Electronic Health Records: Exploring Recommendations for Successful Implementation Strategies. *J Med Internet Res* 2008; 10: e34.
5. Essén A, Scandurra I, Gerrits R, et al. Patient access to electronic health records: Differences across ten countries. *Health Policy Technol* 2018; 7: 44.
6. Fisher B. Patients' access to their electronic record: offer patients access as soon as you can. *Br J Gen Pract* 2013; 63: e423-425
7. Department of Health. The Power of Information, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/giving-people-control-of-the-health-and-care-information-they-need> (2012, accessed 2020-06-30).
8. NHS. Five Year Forward View, <https://www.england.nhs.uk/publication/nhs-five-year-forward-view/> (2014, accessed 2020)
9. NHS England. General Practice Forward View, <https://www.england.nhs.uk/publication/general-practice-forward-view-gp-fv/> (2016, accessed 2020-06-30)
10. NHS England. NHS Long Term Plan, <https://www.england.nhs.uk/2019/01/long-term-plan/> (2019, accessed 2020-06-30)

11. Health Education England. The Topol Review, <https://topol.hee.nhs.uk/> (2019, access 2020-06-30).
12. NHS England. Investment and evolution: A five-year framework for GP contract reform to implement The NHS Long Term Plan, <https://www.england.nhs.uk/publication/gp-contract-five-year-framework/> (2019, accessed 2020-06-30).
13. Department of Health, Royal College of General Practitioners and British Medical Association. The Good Practice Guidelines for GP electronic patient records, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-good-practice-guidelines-for-gp-electronic-patient-records-version-4-2011> (2011, accessed 2021-09-28).
14. NHS Digital. Accelerating patient access to their record, <https://digital.nhs.uk/services/nhs-app/nhs-app-guidance-for-gp-practices/accelerating-patient-access-to-their-record> (2021, accessed 23/12/2021).
15. NHS. Online health and prescription services, <https://www.nhs.uk/using-the-nhs/nhs-services/gps/gp-online-services/> (2019, accessed 5/5/2020).
16. Fisher R and Fraser C. Who gets in? What does the 2020 GP patient survey tell us about access to general practice?, <https://www.health.org.uk/news-and-comment/charts-and-infographics/who-gets-in> (2021, accessed 2021-09-28).
17. NHS England. GP Patient Survey 2021, <https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/2021/07/08/gp-patient-survey-2021/> (2021, accessed 2021-10-04).
18. Neves AL, Freise L, Laranjo L, et al. Impact of providing patients access to electronic health records on quality and safety of care: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2020; 29: 1019.
19. Delbanco T, Walker J, Bell SK, et al. Inviting Patients to Read Their Doctors' Notes: A Quasi-experimental Study and a Look Ahead. *Ann Intern Med* 2012; 157: 461.
20. Fisher B, Bhavnani V and Winfield M. How patients use access to their full health records: a qualitative study of patients in general practice. *J R Soc Med* 2009; 102: 539-544.
21. McMillan B, Davidge G, Brown L, et al. A qualitative exploration of patients' experiences, needs and expectations regarding online access to their primary care record. *BMJ Open* 2021; 11: e044221.
22. Mishra VK, Hoyt RE, Wolver SE, et al. Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis of Patients' Perceptions of the Patient Portal Experience with OpenNotes. *Appl Clin Inform* 2019; 10: 10-18.
23. Walker J, Leveille S, Bell S, et al. OpenNotes After 7 Years: Patient Experiences With Ongoing Access to Their Clinicians' Outpatient Visit Notes. *J Med Internet Res* 2019; 21: e13876.
24. de Lusignan S, Mold F, Sheikh A, et al. Patients' online access to their electronic health records and linked online services: a systematic interpretative review. *BMJ Open* 2014; 4: e006021.
25. Shah SGS, Fitton R, Hannan A, et al. Accessing personal medical records online: A means to what ends? *Int J Med Inform* 2015; 84: 111-118.

26. Greenhalgh T. How to improve success of technology projects in health and social care. *Public Health Res Pract* 2018; 28: 2831815.
27. Ross J, Stevenson F, Lau R, et al. Factors that influence the implementation of e-health: a systematic review of systematic reviews (an update). *Implement Sci* 2016; 11: 146.
28. Zheng K, Abraham J, Novak LL, et al. A Survey of the Literature on Unintended Consequences Associated with Health Information Technology: 2014-2015. *Yearb Med Inform* 2016; 10: 13-29.
29. Ziebland S, Hyde E and Powell J. Power, paradox and pessimism: On the unintended consequences of digital health technologies in primary care. *Soc Sci Med* 2021; 289: 114419.
30. Woodman J, Sohal AH, Gilbert R, et al. Online access to medical records: finding ways to minimise harms. *Br J Gen Pract* 2015; 65: 280.
31. Blease CR, Delbanco T, Torous J, et al. Sharing clinical notes, and placebo and nocebo effects: Can documentation affect patient health? *J Health Psychol* 2020: 1359105320948588.
32. Miller DP, Jr., Latulipe C, Melius KA, et al. Primary Care Providers' Views of Patient Portals: Interview Study of Perceived Benefits and Consequences. *J Med Internet Res* 2016; 18: e8.
33. Mold F, Raleigh M, Alharbi NS, et al. The Impact of Patient Online Access to Computerized Medical Records and Services on Type 2 Diabetes: Systematic Review. *J Med Internet Res* 2018; 20: e235.
34. Turner A, Morris R, Rakhra D, et al. Unintended consequences of online consultations: a qualitative study in UK primary care. *Br J Gen Pract* 2022; 72: e128.
35. Ministry of Housing CLG. English indices of deprivation 2019, <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019> (2019, accessed 01/04/2020)
36. Malterud K, Siersma VD and Guassora AD. Sample Size in Qualitative Interview Studies: Guided by Information Power. *Qual Health Res* 2016; 26(13): 1753-176
37. McDonagh L, Blake S, Stevenson F, et al. The unexpected consequences of researching unexpected consequences: The DECODE Study, <https://blogs.ucl.ac.uk/pcph-blog/2019/03/15/the-unexpected-consequences-of-researching-unexpected-consequences-the-decode-study/> (2019, accessed 2021-09)
38. NIHR ARC West. DECODE: Exploring the unexpected effects of digital health tools, <https://arc-w.nihr.ac.uk/research/projects/exploring-the-unexpected-effects-of-digital-health-tools/> (2019, accessed 2021).
39. Braun V and Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol* 2006; 3: 77-101.

Funding

The DECODE study is funded by National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) School for Primary Care Research and supported by NIHR Applied Research Collaboration West (NIHR ARC West). This

work was also supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Greater Manchester Patient Safety Translational Research Centre (award number: PSTRC-2016-003). The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Ethical approval

The study received approval from North West - Haydock NHS Research Ethics Committee (Ref: 18/NW/0625).

Competing interests

None to declare.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all the participants in this study, Bob Golding for his PPI input over the course of the study, the NIHR Clinical Research Network for adopting the study on the NIHR portfolio, and the NIHR SPCR for funding the research. Sue Ziebland and John Powell are NIHR Senior Investigators. Jeremy Horwood and Gemma Lasseter are members of the NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Behavioural Science and Evaluation at University of Bristol.

Accepted Manuscript – BJGP-2021.0720

Unintended consequences of patient online access to health records: a qualitative study in UK primary care

TABLE 1 Practice characteristics

Site	Patient list size*	IMD quintile**	Location	Level of patient online access to health records***	No. staff interviewed	No. patients interviewed
1	Medium	5	Urban	DCR	1	1
2	Small	5	Urban	DCR	2	5
3	Medium	5	Rural	DCR	2	0
4	Large	2	Urban	Full record	4	2
5	Medium	5	Urban	DCR	0	2
6	Small	5	Rural	Full record	0	1
7	Small	5	Urban	DCR	1	0
8	Large	2	Urban	DCR	2	0
9	Medium	2	Urban	Full record	1	0
10	Small	4	Urban	DCR	3	2

* small < 10,000; medium 10-15,000; large 15,000+

** IMD =Practice location Index of Multiple Deprivation. 1=more deprived, 5=less deprived.

(<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019>)

***DCR= Detailed Coded Record

Unintended consequences of patient online access to health records: a qualitative study in UK primary care

Table 2: Participant characteristics

Characteristics of patients		n = 13
Sex		
Female		9
Male		4
Age		
30-54		2
55-64		9
65+		2
Ethnicity		
White British		13
Characteristics of GP practice staff		n = 16
Sex		
Female		8
Male		8
Staff role		
GP		10
Administrative/Managerial		6
Average no. years GP qualified		21

Unintended consequences of patient online access to health records: a qualitative study in UK primary care

TABLE 3: Patient online access to health records guidance for clinicians and practice managers

Potential unintended consequences	Mitigation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distress for patients at discovering unknown information in their record. Additional workload for staff supporting patients in order to prepare them for what to expect from online access. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offer consultation to patients who you are concerned may be surprised or distressed by parts of their record. It may also be prudent to verbally summarise what is being documented during consultations to reduce the risk of future surprises or distress.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-patient friendly information in records. For example, jargon, abbreviations, spelling mistakes, lack of context, leading to offence, misinterpretation or misunderstanding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where possible, clinicians should aim to reduce the use of jargon that may offend or confuse. However, it is imperative that the content of patient notes are kept as accurate as possible. Improving understandability for the patient must not compromise a high-quality of care. Use texting or email to communicate reliable websites for information about conditions and treatments.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clinician hesitation to document speculative concerns or diagnoses or third-party information in records that are shared with patients. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clinicians should continue their objective and factual documentation practices.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional workload to redact sensitive or third-party content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Software to automate these tasks is available, but manual checking may still be required. It may be practical to have a staged rollout of online access, as patients individually request it, to spread the workload over a longer period of time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional workload from managing more complex situations, for example: parent/teenager access, or individuals experiencing domestic violence and abuse. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended that complex situations are dealt with on a case-by-case basis before online access is provided. Where possible, this should involve a multidisciplinary team. In the case of parent/teenager access, depending on the competence and capacity of the young person, consent must be gained before releasing notes to parents.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional workload from patients querying/challenging notes and correcting errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corrections or qualifications should be welcomed. Practices should expect that a minority of patients will present with questions regarding the content of the notes.

Accepted Manuscript – BJGP – BJGP.2021.0720