

Zrubka Z, Brito Fernandes O, Baji P, Hajdu O, Kovács L, Kringos D; Klazinga N, Gulácsi L, Brodszky V, Rencz F, Péntek M. eHealth Literacy and Patient-Reported Experiences with Outpatient Care in the Hungarian General Adult Population: A Cross-Sectional Survey Study. *J Med Internet Res.* 2020

## Multimedia Appendix 4

### Regression analysis of waiting times

Model	oWP <sup>a</sup>		aWP <sup>b</sup>		Log-oWT <sup>c</sup>		Log-aWT <sup>d</sup>	
	Beta	P value	Beta	P value	Beta	P value	Beta	P value
<b>eHEALS<sup>e</sup></b>								
2nd quartile	0.24	.45	-0.48	.22	0.09	.54	0.03	.89
3rd quartile	0.34	.27	-0.34	.35	0.04	.78	-0.03	.87
4th quartile	0.46	.15	-0.32	.41	0.13	.38	0.02	.91
<b>Age group<sup>f</sup></b>								
25-34 years old	0.03	.95	-0.35	.52	0.14	.49	-0.09	.76
45-64 years old	-0.78	.11	-0.46	.45	-0.06	.78	0.12	.70
65+ years old	-0.72	.17	-0.77	.24	0.08	.74	0.32	.34
<b>Education<sup>g</sup></b>								
Secondary	-0.17	.55	-0.33	.36	-0.07	.58	-0.22	.23
Tertiary	-0.17	.60	-0.20	.61	-0.18	.19	-0.10	.63
<b>Gender</b>								
Male	-0.07	.78	-0.89	.004	0.05	.64	-0.07	.63
<b>Income<sup>h</sup></b>								
2nd quintile	-0.36	.30	0.46	.29	0.04	.78	-0.18	.43
3rd quintile	-0.95	.03	0.55	.26	-0.30	.11	0.12	.68
4th quintile	-0.43	.27	-0.25	.65	0.06	.71	-0.15	.54
5th quintile	-0.26	.45	0.30	.49	-0.16	.30	-0.32	.16
<b>Paid employment</b>								
Yes	-0.18	.54	-0.18	.62	-0.09	.46	0.10	.58
<b>Family status</b>								
Married / domestic partnership	-0.47	.06	-0.12	.68	-0.03	.76	-0.19	.22
<b>Residence<sup>i</sup></b>								
City	0.34	.26	0.43	.27	0.20	.12	-0.15	.43
Village	0.03	.94	0.19	.68	0.03	.85	-0.41	.07
<b>Self-perceived health<sup>j</sup></b>								
Very bad	2.55	.08	-	-	-0.01	.99	-1.18	.24
Bad	1.34	.04	0.21	.78	0.45	.11	0.35	.39
Fair	0.71	.18	0.34	.61	0.23	.29	0.31	.33
Good	0.61	.22	-0.18	.77	0.27	.18	0.13	.65
<b>GALI<sup>k</sup></b>								
Limited but not severely	0.66	.01	0.64	.05	0.33	.005	-0.06	.74
Severely limited	0.49	.30	1.19	.02	0.33	.13	0.08	.82
<b>Chronic morbidity</b>								
Yes	-	.99	0.15	.70	0.03	.80	0.11	.58
<b>Setting<sup>l</sup></b>								
Public specialist	-0.37	.55	0.92	.18	0.52	.04	1.38	<.001
Private specialist	-0.70	.32	1.15	.13	-0.30	.31	1.02	.02
<b>HCP type<sup>m</sup></b>								
Specialist	0.13	.83	0.37	.57	-0.37	.14	0.71	.05
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Usual HCP</b>								
Yes	0.56	.11	0.80	.06	-	.97	-0.21	.31
<b>Constant</b>								
	-1.81	.03	-3.04	.003	3.07	<.001	0.45	.38
n	505		502		502		492	
LR <sup>o</sup> test Chi-square (28)	52.2	.004	63.8	<.001				
LR test F(28;473)					2.49	<.001		
LR test F(28;463)							8.92	<.001
R <sup>2</sup>					0.13		0.31	
GOF <sup>p</sup> test Chi-square (470)	488.1	.27						
GOF <sup>p</sup> test Chi-square (468)			515.0	.07				
Breusch-Pagan test Chi-square (1)					0.9	.33	1.9	.16
Ramsey RESET test F(3;470)					0.8	.49		
Ramsey RESET test F(3;460)							4.3	.005

<sup>a</sup>Office waiting time was a problem

<sup>b</sup>Appointment waiting time was a problem

<sup>c</sup>Log-office waiting time

<sup>d</sup>Log- appointment waiting time

<sup>e</sup>Base: 1st quartile

<sup>f</sup>Base: 18-24 years old

<sup>g</sup>Base: Primary

<sup>h</sup>Base: 1st quintile

<sup>i</sup>Base: Capital

<sup>j</sup>Base: Very good

<sup>k</sup>Base: Not limited

<sup>l</sup>Base: General practitioner

<sup>m</sup>Base: General practitioner

<sup>n</sup>OLS: Ordinary least squares regression

<sup>o</sup>Likelihood ratio; omnibus test for independence, current model versus null model

<sup>p</sup>Goodness of fit; Hosmer-Lemeshow test