As the use of digital communication tools expands sharply, there is a growing sense that telehealth can help people better manage their health and improve access to care. Telehealth could be especially valuable in areas where health professionals and facilities are sparse, potentially leading to improved outcomes for many people.

Yet, while there is growing evidence that telehealth can be effective in some circumstances, there are still considerable questions about how well it might work for different populations and under various conditions. Through its funding of studies on telehealth strategies and applications, PCORI is providing evidence to answer these questions.

**Research Addressing Questions That Matter**

PCORI funds comparative clinical effectiveness research (CER) to determine which healthcare options work best for which patients, based on their needs and preferences. CER produces evidence that helps people make better-informed healthcare choices.

**CLINICIAN**

If my patients with high blood pressure tracked their blood pressure at home with a device and had phone check-ins with us, would their outcomes be as good or better as having them routinely come into our clinic for monitoring?

**PATIENT**

Can I get the same quality of care through a virtual house call with my specialist as I would by going to her clinic, which is a long drive from my home?

**Research Spotlight on**

**Telehealth**

**Online Care as Effective as In-Person Visits for Managing Chronic Skin Condition**

Adults with the chronic skin condition psoriasis who used an online program to get care from dermatologists and their primary care providers experienced the same level of improvement as patients who got in-person care in a clinic, this study found. These findings add to evidence about the potential for telehealth to serve as a more widely accessible and convenient option for getting specialty care for chronic skin conditions. Further details are at [www.pcori.org/Armstrong031](http://www.pcori.org/Armstrong031).

**Mobile App Compares Favorably to In-Clinic Care for Serious Mental Illness**

Compared with a widely used in-clinic, intensive intervention involving group wellness sessions, using a mobile app and regular phone check-ins with support staff got more people with serious mental illness engaged in self-management of their symptoms more quickly. The app and calls resulted in just as good clinical improvements and patient satisfaction as the in-person facilitated sessions. Further details are at [www.pcori.org/BenZeev150](http://www.pcori.org/BenZeev150).
As of August 2019, PCORI has awarded $381 MILLION TO FUND 88 comparative clinical effectiveness research studies related to telehealth.

**BY THE NUMBER OF PROJECTS**

**Populations***

PCORI-funded telehealth studies PCORI are enrolling diverse groups of people. Many of these studies include people who face challenges accessing care and who have been understudied.

- Racial/Ethnic Minorities: 67
- Low Socioeconomic Status: 34
- Women: 29
- Children: 20
- Older Adults: 19
- Rural: 19
- Individuals with Multiple Chronic Conditions: 17
- Low Health Literacy: 15

**Primary Condition Categories***

PCORI-funded telehealth studies target a wide array of conditions ranging from common high-burden conditions to rare diseases.

- Mental/Behavioral Health: 20
- Nutritional and Metabolic Disorders: 12
- Cardiovascular Diseases: 11
- Cancer: 8
- Neurological Disorders: 7
- Rare Diseases: 6
- Infectious Diseases: 4
- Kidney Disease: 4

**Purpose of Intervention***

These studies focus on telehealth interventions that seek to improve patients’ knowledge and self-efficacy among other aims.

- Promote Self-management: 55
- Improve Access to Specialty Care: 41
- Education: 49
- Remote Monitoring: 19

* A project may be counted across more than one category.