Supplementary Online Content

McAlearney AS, Walker DM, Sieck CJ, et al. Effect of in-person vs video training and access to all functions vs a limited subset of functions on portal use among inpatients: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2022;5(9):e2231321. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.31321

eMethods. Information About Trial Procedures

eTable 1. MyChart Bedside Inpatient Portal Functions

eTable 2. Demographic and Clinical Characteristics for Patient Enrollment Admission by Survey Type and Study Group Assignment

eTable 3. Inpatient Portal Use Outcomes, Interaction, and Noninteraction Models

eTable 4. Patient Satisfaction Outcomes by Study Group Assignment

eTable 5. Patient Involvement Outcomes by Study Group Assignment

eTable 6. Inpatient Portal Use Outcomes in Full-Tech Subsample

This supplementary material has been provided by the authors to give readers additional information about their work.

eMethods. Information About Trial Procedures

Provisioning of Tablets with Inpatient Portal Application

Provisioning of tablets to patients was performed under a clinical protocol developed by the OSUWMC and was considered usual care during the course of the study. The provisioning workflow for each patient required that the inpatient portal application on the tablet be registered and linked to the patient's medical record.

Trial Design and Hypotheses

The trial was designed to evaluate two hypotheses related to the primary outcomes of portal usage (H1) and satisfaction and involvement with the care experience (H2).

- H1: Patients assigned to the High intervention levels for Tech and Touch will demonstrate higher use of the MyChart Bedside inpatient portal.
- H2: Patients assigned to the High intervention levels for Tech and Touch will demonstrate higher levels of satisfaction with (H2a) and involvement in (H2b) their care experience.

Touch Intervention Protocol

The study training protocol for the Touch intervention groups was developed with input from an Implementation Working Group composed of patients, providers, research team members, and education specialists. As part of this training protocol, a video was developed and produced by the OSUWMC Department of Patient Education with input from the research team to outline the functions of the full-tech and lite-tech versions inpatient portal application. The full-tech training video lasted 11:17 minutes and the lite-tech training video lasted 4:29 minutes. Training in both Touch groups was designed to be delivered in person, one-on-one, by a study-provided research assistant trained to be a Technology Navigator (TN). In both Touch groups, study participants had access to in-application contextual help as well as to health system-provided tip sheets about use of MyChart Bedside. There were no time limits for training of Low- and High-Touch, and in both groups, the TN ended the training when the patient had no further questions. In the High-Touch group, the TN training session lasted an average of 13 minutes (range 2-24 minutes), and depended on the patient's level of confidence to navigate the application with out in-person support. In the Low-Touch group, the TN training session lasted an average of 6.7 minutes (range 2-24 minutes); when patients asked questions in the Low-Touch session, they were respectfully directed to the video and in-application conceptual help and tip sheets.

Trial Survey Deployment

Once a patient provided informed consent, the study Admission survey was activated and could be completed on the OSUWMC-provided tablet; it was also available on paper if the patient preferred that modality. The Admission survey was accessible for the patient to complete throughout their inpatient stay. Patients were reminded up to three times, in-person, by TNs to complete the Admission survey. Following discharge, all patients were contacted and asked to complete two follow-up surveys: a 15-day Post-discharge survey and a 6-month Post-discharge survey. Patients could indicate their preference to be contacted by email or phone and could complete the surveys either electronically, through a web link to their preferred email, or over the phone with a TN. Patients were contacted no less than three times to request completion of the follow-up survey; however, this number was increased if the patient changed their communication preference (e.g., from email to phone), at which point the contact protocol was restarted.

eTable 1. MyChart Bedside Inpatient Portal Functions

MyChart Bedside Function	Description
Dining On Demand*	Order a meal from a predefined menu
Bedside Tutorial*	Access tutorials on the use of MyChart Bedside
To Learn*	Access training materials through a link to an external health information content provider
My Health	Review vitals and laboratory test results
Happening Soon	Review scheduled upcoming interactions with the care team
Notes	Record and review personal notes (audio and written)
Messages	Send and review secure messages
I Would Like	Request one of a number of ancillary services
OSU MyChart	Create an outpatient MyChart account or change the password on an existing MyChart account
Taking Care of Me	Review active members of the care team

^{*} Function available in Lite-Tech version of MyChart Bedside

eTable 2. Demographic and Clinical Characteristics for Patient Enrollment Admission by Survey Type and Study Group Assignment

	Total				Full-Tech						Lite-Tech						
				Low-To	uch (N=1,5	23)	High-Touch (N=624)				-Touch (N=468))	High-Touch (N=277)				
	Admission survey (n=2,836)	15-day Post- discharg e survey (n=459)	6-month Post- discharg e survey (n=673)	Admission survey (n=1,481)	15-day Post- discharg e survey (n=187)	6 -month Post- discharg e survey (n=346)	Admission survey (n=623)	15-day Post- discharge survey (n=154)	6-month Post- discharg e survey (n=150)	Admission survey (n=456)	15-day Post- discharge survey (n=60)	6-month Post- discharge survey (n=95)	Admission survey (n=276)	15-day Post- discharge survey (n=58)	6-month Post- discharge survey (n=82)		
Female – n (%)	1,606 (56.6)	264 (57.5)	410 (60.9)	846 (57.1)	105 (56.2)	217 (62.7)	357 (57.3)	90 (58.4)	92 (61.3)	252 (55.3)	35 (58.3)	57 (60.0)	151 (54.7)	34 (58.6)	44 (53.7)		
Race – n (%)																	
White	2,184 (77.0)	378 (82.4)	556 (82.6)	1,117 (75.4)	145 (77.5)	277 (80.1)	504 (80.9)	126 (81.8)	132 (88.0)	344 (75.4)	55 (91.7)	79 (83.2)	219 (79.4)	52 (89.7)	68 (82.9)		
Black	534 (18.8)	62 (13.5)	101 (15.0)	303 (20.5)	32 (17.1)	60 (17.3)	96 (15.4)	21 (13.6)	16 (10.7)	89 (19.5)	4 (6.7)	12 (12.6)	46 (16.7)	5 (8.6)	13 (15.9)		
Other	118 (4.2)	19 (4.1)	16 (2.4)	61 (4.1)	10 (5.4)	9 (2.6)	23 (3.7)	7 (4.6)	2 (1.3)	23 (5.0)	1 (1.7)	4 (4.2)	11 (4.0)	1 (1.7)	1 (1.2)		
Age in years – median (95% CI)	47 (46.0, 48.0)	51 (49.0, 53.0)	52 (50.0, 54.0)	46 (45.0, 48.0)	52 (49.0, 54.0)	52 (49.0, 55.0)	47 (45.0, 49.0)	48 (42.3, 51.0)	48 (45.0, 51.0)	48 (45.0, 50.0)	53 (45.0, 59.1)	57 (53.3, 60.0)	49 (46.0, 51.0)	53 (46.1, 58.0)	54 (49.0, 59.4)		
Charlson Comorbidity Index –	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2		
median (95% CI)	(1.0, 2.0)	(1.0, 2.0)	(1.0, 2.0)	(1.0, 2.0)	(1.0, 2.0)	(1.0, 2.0)	(1.0, 1.0)	(1.0, 1.7)	(1.0, 2.0)	(1.0, 2.0)	(0.0, 2.0)	(1.0, 2.0)	(1.0, 2.0)	(1.0, 2.0)	(1.0, 2.0)		
Length of stay in days – median (95% CI)	(6.0, 7.0)	7 (6.0, 7.0)	6 (5.0, 6.0)	6 (6.0, 6.0)	6 (5.0, 7.0)	5 (5.0, 6.0)	7 (7.0, 8.0)	7 (6.0, 8.0)	7 (6.0, 8.0)	(5.0, 6.0)	6 (5.0, 7.0)	6 (5.0, 7.0)	(6.0, 8.0)	7 (6.0, 7.0)	6 (5.0, 7.0)		

Abbreviation: CI, confidence interval.

eTable 3. Inpatient Portal Use Outcomes, Interaction, and Noninteraction Models

	N	Median (95% CI)	Full-Tech IRR (95% CI)	High-Touch IRR (95% CI)	Tech X Touch IRR (95% CI)
Consigns in annullment admission	2 902	19.0 (17.0, 10.0)	1.44 (1.25 to 1.66)	1.29 (1.14 to 1.46)	1.06 (0.98 to 1.15)
Sessions in enrollment admission	2,892	18.0 (17.0, 19.0)	1.47 (1.25 to 1.72)	1.34 (1.25 to 1.44)	
	N	No. positive (%)	Full-Tech OR (95% CI)	High-Touch OR (95% CI)	Tech X Touch OR (95% CI)
Comprehensiveness*	0.000	4 240 (40.5)	0.74 (0.69 to 0.81)	16.82 (13.05 to 21.69)	1.34 (0.94 to 1.90)
(comprehensive functions user)	2,892	1,346 (46.5)	0.79 (0.72 to 0.87)	20.75 (16.49 to 26.10)	

 $\label{eq:local_problem} \mbox{Abbreviations: IRR, incidence rate ratio; OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval.}$

The top row for each outcome reports main effects and interaction effects; the bottom row for each outcome reports main effects only.

^{*}A comprehensive portal user was one who used all three Lite-Tech functions or used eight or more Full-Tech functions.

 $^{^{\}dagger}\text{A}$ comprehensive portal user was one who used all three Lite-Tech functions.

eTable 4. Patient Satisfaction Outcomes by Study Group Assignment

			Study groups Interve						on effects	
Outcome	N	Lite-Tech + Low- Touch	Lite-Tech + High- Touch	Full-Tech + Low-Touch	Full-Tech + High-Touch		Any High- Touch	Any Low- Touch	Any Full- Tech	Any Lite- Tech
15 day discharge: In yo concerns?	ur mos	t recent hos	oital experienc	e, how satisfie	d were you witl	n h	ow well your he	ealthcare profes	sionals respor	ded to your
Most positive response — n / total (%)	396	36/53 (67.9)	36/53 (67.9)	107/157 (68.2)	94/133 (70.7)		130/186 (69.9)	143/210 (68.1)	201/290 (69.3)	72/106 (67.9)
Odds ratio (95% CI)		—					1.11 (0.5	8 to 2.14)	1.11 (0.6	65 to 1.88)
6 month discharge: In t	he past	6 months, h	ow satisfied w	ere you with h	ow well your he	ealt	thcare professi	onals responde	d to your conc	erns?
Most positive response — n / total (%)	558	36/78 (46.2)	47/73 (64.4)	172/273 (63.0)	84/134 (62.7)		131/207 (63.3)	208/351 (59.3)	256/407 (62.9)	83/151 (55.0)
Odds ratio (95% CI)			_	_	_		2.01 (1.1	6 to 3.50)	2.06 (1.4	12 to 2.99)
Interaction effect (95% CI)								0.50 (0.2	9 to 0.85)	,
15 day discharge: In yo	ur mos	t recent hos	oital experienc	e, how satisfie	d were you witl	n th	ne interactions	you had with yo	our healthcare p	professionals?
Most positive response — n / total (%)	397	35/52 (67.3)	37/53 (69.8)	104/159 (65.4)	105/133 (78.9)		142/186 (76.3)	139/211 (65.9)	209/292 (71.6)	72/105 (68.6)
Odds ratio (95% CI)							1.78 (1.0	9 to 2.90)	1.21 (0.6	88 to 2.18)
6 month discharge: In t	he past	t 6 months, h	ow satisfied w	ere you with th	ne interactions	yoı	u had with your	healthcare pro	fessionals?	
Most positive response — n / total (%)	569	46/79 (58.2)	50/74 (67.6)	185/280 (66.1)	95/136 (69.9)		145/210 (69.0)	231/359 (64.3)	280/416 (67.3)	96/153 (62.7)
Odds ratio (95% CI)		, ,	, ,	, ,	, ,		1.28 (1.0	8 to 1.53)	1.23 (0.6	69 to 2.18)

All models include the comparable survey item from the admission survey as a control variable.

eTable 5. Patient Involvement Outcomes by Study Group Assignment

				groups			Intervention effects				
Outcome	N	Lite-Tech +	Lite-Tech + High- Touch	Full-Tech + Low-Touch	Full-Tech + High-Touch		Any High- Touch	Any Low- Touch	Any Full- Tech	Any Lite- Tech	
All of my questions about Most positive response	out mar	naging my hea	ith, including	my medication	112/153	SS	149/211	ne hospital. 155/242	230/337		
— n / total (%)	396	37/58 (63.8)	37/58 (63.8)	(64.1)	(73.2)		(70.6)	(64.0)	(68.2)	74/116 (63.8)	
Odds ratio (95% CI)		_	_	_	_		1.3 (1.10 to			24 o 1.88)	
If you had a question a	bout yo	ur care while	you were in th	e hospital, wh	at steps did yo	ou 1	take to find an a	nswer? (mark a	all that apply)		
I asked my doctor Most positive response — n / total (%)	457	46/60 (76.7)	46/58 (79.3)	142/186 (76.3)	107/153 (69.9)		153/211 (72.5)	188/246 (76.4)	249/339 (73.5)	92/118 (78.0)	
Odds ratio (95% CI)		_	_	_	_		0.8 (0.38 to	81 o 1.72)		77 o 1.02)	
I asked a nurse Most positive response				169/186	142/153		193/211	223/246	311/339	105/118	
— n / total (%)	457	54/60 (90.0)	51/58 (87.9)	(90.9)	(92.8)		(91.5)	(90.7)	(91.7)	(89.0)	
Odds ratio (95% CI)		_	_	_	_		1. (0.78 to	12 o 1.59)		38 o 2.11)	
I asked another hospital staff member								·			
Most positive response	457	47/00 (00 0)	40/50 (00.0)	52/186	36/153		55/044 (00.4)	00/040 (00 0)	00/000 (00 0)	00/440 (00.5)	
— n / total (%) Odds ratio (95% CI)	457	17/60 (28.3)	19/58 (32.8)	(28.0)	(23.5)			23		36/118 (30.5) 98	
Interaction effect (95%		<u> </u>	<u>—</u>	_	<u> </u>		(0.92 to	o 1.65)	(0.67 t	o 1.43)	
CI)									o 0.92)		
I searched online Most positive response				59/186	50/153				109/339		
— n / total (%)	457	14/60 (23.3)	16/58 (27.6)	(31.7)	(32.7)		66/211 (31.3)	73/246 (29.7)	(32.2)	30/118 (25.4)	
Odds ratio (95% CI)		_	_	_	_		1.0 (0.79 to	o 1.51)		40 o 1.97)	
Other Most positive response — n / total (%)	457	4/60 (6.7)	2/58 (3.4)	11/186 (5.9)	12/153 (7.8)		14/211 (6.6)	15/246 (6.1)	23/339 (6.8)	6/118 (5.1)	
Odds ratio (95% CI)			_	_				10 o 1.97)	1.	36 o 4.02)	
I did not have							(0.02 (5 1.97)	(0.40 t	0 4.02)	
questions Most positive response — n / total (%)	457	1/60 (1.7)	1/58 (1.7)	6/186 (3.2)	5/153 (3.3)		6/211 (2.8)	7/246 (2.8)	11/339 (3.2)	2/118 (1.7)	
Odds ratio (95% CI)		_	_	_	_			02 o 2.92)		95 o 5.93)	
What kinds of activities	s did yo	u use the table	et for? (mark a	all that apply)	T		T		T		
Email Most positive response				29/183	18/154						
— n / total (%)	454	7/59 (11.9)	7/58 (12.1)	(15.8)	(11.7)		25/212 (11.8) 0.		47/337 (13.9)		
Odds ratio (95% CI)		_		_			-	1.37)		18 2.01)	
Research health issues											
Most positive response — n / total (%)	454	26/59 (44.1)	23/58 (39.7)	82/183 (44.8)	84/154 (54.5)		107/212 (50.5)	108/242 (44.6)	166/337 (49.3)	49/117 (41.9)	
Odds ratio (95% CI)	101	20/00 (44.1)	20/00 (00:1)				0.8	83	1.	03	
Interaction effect (95%		_	_	_			(0.52,	1.	77	1.38)	
CI) Social media								(1.05,	, 2.98)		
Most positive response				36/183	27/154						
— n / total (%)	454	11/59 (18.6)	7/58 (12.1)	(19.7)	(17.5)		34/212 (16.0) 0.5	47/242 (19.4) 80	63/337 (18.7)	18/117 (15.4) 25	
Odds ratio (95% CI) Watch movies/TV			<u> </u>				(0.43 to	o 1.49)	(0.78 t	o 2.03)	
Most positive response — n / total (%)	454	4/59 (6.8)	5/58 (8.6)	17/183 (9.3)	10/154 (6.5)		15/212 (7.1)	21/242 (8.7)	27/337 (8.0)	9/117 (7.7)	
Odds ratio (95% CI)		_					0.5 (0.55,	80 1.16)		04 2.16)	
Communicate with my family Most positive response	454	5/50 (0.5)	0/50 (5.0)	19/183	40/454 (0.5)		10/010 (0.1)	0.1/0.10 (0.0)	22/227 (2.2)	0(4.17 (0.0)	
— n / total (%) Odds ratio (95% CI)	454	5/59 (8.5)	3/58 (5.2)	(10.4)	10/154 (6.5)		13/212 (6.1)	24/242 (9.9) 60		8/117 (6.8) 26	
Play games			-	-	-		(0.19,	1.83)	(0.63,	2.50)	
Most positive response — n / total (%)	454	20/59 (33.9)	21/58 (36.2)	49/183 (26.8)	47/154 (30.5)		68/212 (32.1)	69/242 (28.5)	96/337 (28.5)	41/117 (35.0)	
Odds ratio (95% CI)		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			17 o 1.85)		74 o 0.80)	
MyChart Bedside				407/400	4.40/45 /			·			
Most positive response — n / total (%)	454	50/59 (84.7)	49/58 (84.5)	167/183 (91.3)	143/154 (92.9)		192/212 (90.6)	217/242 (89.7)	310/337 (92.0)	99/117 (84.6)	
Odds ratio (95% CI)		_	_	_				14 o 1.93)		10 o 4.01)	
None of the above							(3.0.1	/	(/	
Most positive response — n / total (%)	454	5/59 (8.5)	4/58 (6.9)	7/183 (3.8)	6/154 (3.9)		10/212 (4.7)	12/242 (5.0)	13/337 (3.9)	9/117 (7.7)	

Oddo rotio (OE9/ CI)				0.93	0.48
Odds ratio (95% CI)	_	 _	_	(0.49 to 1.75)	(0.14 to 1.63)

Patient involvement items were only asked in the 15-day Post-discharge survey.

Responses from multiple response questions were coded as 1 if selected by the respondent, and 0 if the respondent selected any other response options from the question but not the given response.

eTable 6. Inpatient Portal Use Outcomes in Full-Tech Subsample

Outcome	N	Low-Touch	High-Touch		
Inpatient portal frequency of use					
Sessions in enrollment admission — patient no. (mean sessions)	2147	1523 (26.5)	624 (36.1)		
Incidence rate ratio (95% CI)		1.36 (1.29	9 to 1.44)		
Inpatient portal comprehensiveness of use					
Comprehensive portal user* — n / total (%)	2147	396/1523 (26.0)	554/624 (88.8)		
Odds ratio (95% CI)		22.52 (16.8	8 to 30.06)		
Inpatient portal functions					
Dining on Demand, mean proportion (sd)	2146	0.22 (0.19)	0.18 (0.14)		
Odds ratio (95% CI)		0.75 (0.68	3 to 0.82)		
Tutorial, mean proportion (sd)	2146	0.19 (0.22)	0.12 (0.10)		
Odds ratio (95% CI)		0.56 (0.53 to 0.59)			
To Learn, mean proportion (sd)	2146	0.01 (0.04)	0.03 (0.03)		
Odds ratio (95% CI)		1.84 (1.73	3 to 1.96)		
My Health, mean proportion (sd)	2146	0.09 (0.17)	0.13 (0.15)		
Odds ratio (95% CI)		1.45 (1.27 to 1.66)			
Happening Soon, mean proportion (sd)	2146	0.37 (0.25)	0.42 (0.19)		
Odds ratio (95% CI)		1.24 (1.20	0 to 1.28)		
Notes, mean proportion (sd)	2146	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)		
Odds ratio (95% CI)		1.32 (0.56	6 to 3.11)		
Messages, mean proportion (sd)	2146	0.03 (0.05)	0.04 (0.03		
Odds ratio (95% CI)		1.13 (0.99	9 to 1.30)		
I Would Like, mean proportion (sd)	2146	0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)		
Odds ratio (95% CI)		2.55 (2.26 to 2.88)			
OSU MyChart, mean proportion (sd)	2146	0.03 (0.04)	0.03 (0.03)		
Odds ratio (95% CI)		1.25 (0.97	7 to 1.60)		
Taking Care of Me, mean proportion (sd)	2146	0.04 (0.05)	0.05 (0.03)		
Odds ratio (95% CI)		1.16 (1.04	4 to 1.29)		

 $^{^{\}star}$ A comprehensive portal user was one who used eight or more Full-Tech functions.

 $^{^{\}dagger}\mbox{Adjusted}$ for frequency of use prior to study enrollment.