

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Piloting of the virtual telecare technology 'Addison Care' to promote self-management in persons with chronic diseases in a community setting: protocol for a mixed methods user experience, user engagement and usability pilot study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2022-062159
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	18-Feb-2022
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Krutter, Simon; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Schuessler, Nadine; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Kutschar, Patrick; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Šabić, Edin; New Mexico State University, Department of Psychology; Electronic Caregiver Inc Dellinger, Johanna; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Klausner, Tabea; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Nestler, Nadja; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Beasley, Morgan; Electronic Caregiver Inc Henderson, Bailey; Electronic Caregiver Inc Pitzer, Stefan; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Mitterlehner, Barbara; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Langegger, Doris; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Winkler, Anna; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Kloesch, Michael; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice EBl-Maurer, Roland; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice van der Zee-Neuen, Antje; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Osterbrink, Jürgen; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice; University of North Florida, Brooks College of Health</p>
Keywords:	PRIMARY CARE, PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, GERIATRIC MEDICINE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



1
2
3 I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as
4 defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for
5 contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY
6 licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government
7 officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable,
8 royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is
9 co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in BMJ Open and any other
10 BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our licence.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by
27 BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a
28 postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing
29 charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work
30 available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such
31 Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which
32 Creative Commons licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Piloting of the virtual telecare technology 'Addison Care' to promote self-management in persons**
4 **with chronic diseases in a community setting: protocol for a mixed methods user experience, user**
5 **engagement and usability pilot study**
6
7
8
9

10
11 **Authors:** Simon Krutter¹, Nadine Schuessler¹, Patrick Kutschar¹, Edin Šabić^{2,3}, Johanna Dellinger¹,
12
13 Tabea Klausner¹, Nadja Nestler¹, Morgan Beasley³, Bailey Henderson³, Stefan Pitzer¹, Barbara
14
15 Mitterlehner¹, Doris Langegger¹, Anna Winkler¹, Michael Klösch¹, Roland Eßl-Maurer¹, Antje van der
16
17 Zee-Neuen¹, Juergen Osterbrink^{1,4}
18
19

20
21 **Affiliations**
22

23
24 ¹ Institute of Nursing Science and Practice, Paracelsus Medical University, Salzburg, Austria
25

26 ² Department of Psychology, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico, United States
27

28 ³ Electronic Caregiver Inc., Las Cruces, New Mexico, United States
29

30 ⁴ Brooks College of Health, University of North Florida, Jacksonville, Florida, United States
31

32
33 **Corresponding Author Information**
34

35
36 Simon Krutter
37

38
39 Institute of Nursing Science and Practice, Paracelsus Medical University, Salzburg, Austria
40

41
42 Strubergasse 21, 5020 Salzburg, Austria
43

44
45 Email: simon.krutter@pmu.ac.at
46

47
48 Phone: +43 662 2024 80341
49

50
51 ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5788-9574
52

53
54 **Word Count:** 3.697
55

56
57
58 **ABSTRACT** (278 words)
59
60

1
2
3 **Introduction:** Chronic diseases in older adults are one of the major epidemiological trends of current
4 times and leading cause of disability, poor quality of life, high health care costs, and death. Self-
5 management of chronic diseases is essential to improve health behaviors and health outcomes.
6
7 Technology-assisted interventions have shown to improve self-management of chronic diseases.
8
9 Virtual avatars designed for use by older persons can be a key factor for the acceptance of these
10 technologies. Addison Care is a home-based telecare solution equipped with a virtual avatar named
11 Addison, connecting older persons with their caregivers via an easy-to-use technology. A central
12 advantage is that Addison care provides access to self-management support for an up-to-now highly
13 underrepresented population - older persons with chronic disease(s) - which enables them to profit
14 from e-health in everyday life.
15
16

17 **Methods and analysis:** A pragmatic, non-randomized, one-arm pilot study applying an embedded
18 mixed-methods approach will be conducted to examine user experience, usability, and user
19 engagement of the virtual avatar Addison. The pilot study will take place during the second and third
20 quarter of 2022. Participants will be at least 65 years old and recruited from hospitals during the
21 discharge process to home care. Standardized instruments and survey-based assessments, semi-
22 structured interviews and think-aloud protocols will be used. The study seeks to enroll 20 patients that
23 meet the criteria.
24
25

26 **Ethics and dissemination:** The study protocol has been approved by the ethics committee of the
27 German Society for Nursing Science (21-037). The results of the study are intended to be published as
28 articles in high quality peer-reviewed journals and disseminated through conference papers.
29
30

31 **Trial registration number:** The pilot study is registered in the German Clinical Trials Register (ID:
32 DRKS00025992).
33
34

35 **Keywords:** Telecare, virtual avatar, older people, chronic disease, self-management, pilot study, user
36 experience, e-health;
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ARTICLE SUMMARY

- This pilot study provides an opportunity to explore the acceptability of and experiences with a potentially beneficial e-health technology in the underrepresented population of chronically ill older persons.
- The mixed-methods study design will provide a deep and broad insight on usability, user experience and user engagement of Addison care as a German-speaking, culturally adapted virtual avatar.
- This investigation evaluates the efficacy of a sophisticated virtual avatar, Addison, in assisting with many crucial health management tasks – including medication management and health vitals monitoring.
- A focus on barriers to user-engagement for those who are technologically hesitant will provide rich information concerning how best to design virtual avatars and e-health technologies to match user needs and mental models.
- The primary limitation of this study is the relatively small sample size due to our selective inclusion criteria, which may diminish the ethnic and socio-economic diversity of our sample.

BACKGROUND

Societies across the globe are facing a significant shift in age demographics whereby older adults are becoming an increasingly larger group within their population. This phenomenon is one of the most salient economic, social, and medical issues of current times.[1] Aging is the greatest risk factor associated with a majority of chronic diseases, as well as increasing the risk of multimorbidity. Between 34% and 61% of older adults have multimorbidity.[2] Multimorbidity can have consequences such as disability and functional decline, poor quality of life, social isolation, depression, and high health care costs.[3, 4]

1
2
3 Patients themselves have an integral role in the management of their chronic disease.[5] Factors that
4
5 influence effective self-management of chronic disease include: experience, skill, motivation, culture,
6
7 confidence, habits, physical and mental function, social support, and access to care.[6]
8
9

10
11 Self-management of chronic diseases is defined as the response to signs and symptoms when they
12
13 occur, with the goal of patients playing an active role in optimising health outcomes and minimizing
14
15 the impact of their conditions.[6] Self-management support refers to patient, healthcare professional,
16
17 and healthcare system interventions aimed to improve self-management behaviours.[7] Self-
18
19 monitoring vitals [8] and medication adherence have been recognized as two of the most essential
20
21 self-management activities performed by patients to promote their health.[9]
22
23

24
25 Although interventions designed to promote self-management in chronic diseases have traditionally
26
27 been offered in-person, delivering these interventions remotely utilizing available technology (e.g.
28
29 mobile smart phones, Internet, interactive voice response, telephone, virtual reality) has become more
30
31 prevalent.[10] These technology-assisted interventions have shown to improve self-management and
32
33 health status.[11, 12]
34
35

36
37 Digital information technologies support people with care requirements to maintain their
38
39 independence, improve quality of life, increase health literacy and aid caregivers in their duties.[13,
40
41 14] Telehealth is one of the fastest-growing sectors in health care. The term refers to a broad array of
42
43 provider-to-patient communication and has been defined as using telecommunications, information
44
45 technologies, and devices to share information and to provide clinical, population health, and
46
47 administrative services at a distance.[15] Remote patient monitoring is a widely used telehealth
48
49 intervention that can effectively support self-management in patients with chronic diseases.[7]
50
51

52 53 **Remote Patient Monitoring**

54
55
56 Remote Patient Monitoring (RPM) is a promising solution for facilitating the patient-physician
57
58 relationship while addressing the shortage of healthcare workers today. Through robust advances in
59
60 technology, RPM has matured from simple telephone interviews to real-time tracking of biometrics.

1
2
3 RPM technology now has the capability to further simulate human interaction as well as personalize
4
5 the telehealth experience to make adoption more likely for those who are technologically hesitant.
6
7

8
9 Research concerning the efficacy of RPM has spanned the topics of post-operative rehospitalization,
10
11 chronic disease management, medication adherence, and quality of life and has shown promising
12
13 results [16-18]. Research has also shown that patients may find RPM and telehealth more convenient
14
15 for them compared to more traditional forms of care.[19]
16

17
18 However, RPM technology can only benefit patients if they choose to actively interact with the devices.
19
20 In a study concerning the effect of RPM engagement on type II diabetes, Michaud et al. [20] found that
21
22 those who took vital measurements more often saw a greater reduction in HbA1c levels and BMI and
23
24 also found that those who interacted with their system more frequently saw benefits to their
25
26 knowledge on how to manage their disease. Impediments to RPM adoption may simply stem from the
27
28 'novelty' of the technology and a lack of prior RPM interaction. As compared to younger users, elderly
29
30 users also face unique challenges that are a direct result of aging – such as declines in dexterity,
31
32 hearing, and vision. As a result, researchers have identified that improving ease of navigation for task
33
34 completion, ensuring appropriate size and color of font, and properly configuring the size of the
35
36 hardware itself are paramount in addressing technological hesitancy.[21]
37
38
39

40 41 **Virtual Avatars** 42

43
44 RPM systems have begun to incorporate graphical user interfaces that can improve ease of use as well
45
46 as personify the experience for the user through virtual avatars. Virtual avatars are an emerging
47
48 feature in RPM that has shown propitious results in terms of user engagement, health education, and
49
50 self-care behavior.[22]
51
52

53
54 One important factor in the receptiveness of patients to virtual avatars is the avatar's appearance. Bott
55
56 [23] investigated the impact of a virtual pet avatar to deliver surveys to older clients. They found that
57
58 those who interacted with the avatar experienced lower rates of delirium, fewer falls, and decreased
59
60 loneliness. However, research has generally shown that anthropomorphic characteristics are often

1
2
3 preferable for virtual healthcare avatars [24] – as well as similarities in appearance between the avatar
4 and the user.[25] Previous literature has revealed that when designing virtual agents for older persons,
5
6 key factors related to acceptance of technology include conversational latency, gamification, and
7
8 artificially intelligent lexicon.[26]
9

12 **User experience and technology acceptance among older persons**

13
14
15
16 Understanding how older adults perceive technology and virtual avatars may lead to improvements in
17
18 the accessibility, acceptability, and adoption of virtual avatars among older persons with chronic
19
20 diseases. This can be accomplished through user experience (UX) research, wherein the overall
21
22 experience of the user is assessed through measures related to usability, user engagement, usefulness,
23
24 function, credibility, and satisfaction with the technology.[27] While behavior, cognition, and affect
25
26 are important defining components of user engagement [28], learnability, efficiency, memorability,
27
28 few errors and satisfaction are defining components of usability.[29] UX is based upon User-Centered
29
30 Design (UCD), wherein the needs and characteristics of the end user become the focus of technology
31
32 design and development, with the intention of higher acceptance and fewer user errors.[30]
33
34

35
36
37 Theories that predict and explain health technology acceptance and use can help to tailor the
38
39 technology to specific patient needs. One of the more recent models, the Unified Theory of Acceptance
40
41 and Use of Technology (UTAUT) [31], posits that a person's intent to use (acceptance of technology)
42
43 and usage behavior (actual use) of a technology is predicated by the patient's performance and effort
44
45 expectancy of the technology. The UTAUT also suggests social influence and facilitating conditions as
46
47 determinants of behavioral intention to use the technology.[31, 32] Most older persons are
48
49 significantly less adept at technology use than the general population, with technology anxiety being
50
51 a major influence on older users' intent to use technologies.[33] However, older adults are interested
52
53 in integrating new technologies into their healthcare.[34] Studies confirm the applicability of the
54
55 UTAUT in the context of Telecare services among older persons.[35]
56
57
58
59

60 **Intervention: Addison Care Tablet Personal Computer (PC)**

1
2
3 The present research pilots an intervention provided by Addison Care [36], which is an innovative
4 home-bound connected virtual RPM platform for individuals living with chronic disease. A 3D-
5 animated nurse named 'Addison' is the center of interaction between the system and its users,
6
7 personifying the telehealth experience for the user. The pilot study encompasses two health-related
8
9 functions of Addison Care: 'Addison' supporting the user in self-monitoring relevant vitals (blood
10
11 pressure, weight, pulse and oxygen saturation) as well as medication schedule adherence. This is
12
13 achieved by offering reminder and monitoring functionalities (see Fig. 1).
14
15
16
17

18
19 [Figure 1 about here]
20
21

22
23 The Addison Care hardware consists of a tablet PC with a speaker, a microphone module, and a touch
24
25 screen (see Figure 1). The tablet connects with Bluetooth vitals measuring devices and can be installed
26
27 in the user's home. Avatar technology combined with natural language understanding and automatic
28
29 speech recognition provides users with effective natural interaction with the assisting technology.[22,
30
31 26] Subtitles, vital signs, and medications are graphically illustrated on the Addison Care interface to
32
33 enable clear communication between user and virtual agent.
34
35

36
37 The Addison Tablet PC is connected to a web-based dashboard that allows access to user data,
38
39 including vitals measurements and medication reminders. For the pilot study, medication plans,
40
41 reminder-options, and contact information are managed by members of the study team, who also act
42
43 as a support team for the technical set-up and in case of technical problems. The intervention in this
44
45 study involves voice-driven audio-centered interaction between Addison and users in German, as well
46
47 as the implementation of a German touch screen interface. Introduction of Addison Care to German
48
49 users requires adaption of the original technology to ensure a good cultural fit. Adaptations were made
50
51 to the surroundings of the avatar, as well as to Addison's mannerisms. Additionally, changes were
52
53 made to the system to ensure a good fit between system and real life in terms of interactive elements
54
55 (from basics ensuring appropriate data and time formats to more complex elements like making sure
56
57 the avatar interacts in a culturally appropriate manner with the user). Voice and touch interaction
58
59
60

1
2
3 modes are currently adapted from English into German. All piloted features of Addison Care are shown
4
5 in Fig. 1.
6
7

8 **Objectives**

10
11 While other studies have provided insight into the potential of digital health technology and virtual
12
13 avatars, the vast majority have been tested within laboratory settings, where older adults were unable
14
15 to interact with the technology in a natural setting. Additionally, the digital health systems and virtual
16
17 avatars were not culturally adapted after development.
18
19

20
21 Framed by the UTAUT, the overall study aims to explore the feasibility, acceptability, experience,
22
23 engagement, and usability of the culturally tailored health technology and the virtual avatar Addison
24
25 for self-management for older patients with chronic diseases in their own home.
26
27
28

29 **METHODS AND ANALYSIS**

30
31
32 A pragmatic, non-randomized, one-arm pilot study applying an embedded mixed-methods approach
33
34 will be conducted to examine the primary outcomes 'user experience', 'usability', and 'user
35
36 engagement' of the virtual avatar Addison three times within the use span. 'Embedded' refers to the
37
38 integration of qualitative methods into a quantitative methodology framework, or vice versa, to
39
40 provide enriched insights or understanding into the phenomena of interest.[31, 37] The study design
41
42 is pluralistic, problem-centered, real-world applicable, and focused on the consequences of actions,
43
44 stemming from pragmatism as a research paradigm.[37] The present protocol followed the SPIRIT
45
46 guidelines (see Supplementary 1).[38] Data collection will take place during the second and third
47
48 quarter of 2022.
49
50
51

52 **Recruitment criteria and process**

53
54
55 Eligible patients will be identified by medical specialists in German hospitals through the following
56
57 criteria:
58
59
60

- 1
- 2
- 3 - planned patients transition from hospital to extramural care
- 4
- 5 - three to nine drugs (regular intake of drugs, no status of hypermedication)
- 6
- 7 - no moderate-to-severe cognitive impairment or severe psychiatric disease
- 8
- 9
- 10 - 65 years or older with a chronic health condition
- 11
- 12 - ability to speak and understand German language
- 13
- 14

15 Provided that these criteria are met and general interest in using health technology is expressed,
16 information about the pilot study and the intervention will be shared. If a patient expresses the will to
17 participate, a meeting with the support team will be arranged while the patient is still at the hospital.
18
19 Potential participants will be informed of all aspects of the study through verbal instruction and written
20 materials (Figure 2, Encounter 1). After written informed consent is provided, living situation and socio-
21 demographic data will be assessed by research assistants.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Setting and sample size**

30
31
32 Addison Care will be piloted in participants' homes after their discharge from hospital for two
33 consecutive weeks. In Encounter 2 (see Figure 2) within 1 day after the informed consent is provided,
34 the support team will provide first instructions on Addison Care while the participant is still
35 hospitalized. First adjustments of reminders, medication plan, and vital measurements will be
36 provisioned for the use of Addison Tablet PC at home. This study seeks to enroll 20 patients. The
37 sample size is an adequate number to evaluate study feasibility, test the study procedures and explore
38 the user experience.[39, 40]
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Patient and public involvement**

50
51
52 In advance of the pilot study, older adults assisted in the development of the data collection materials
53 and pre-testing of Addison Care. However, patients and the public were not involved in the
54 development of the research question, outcome measures and the design of the study.
55
56
57
58
59

60 **Outcomes, Instruments, and Variables**

1
2
3 Building upon the theoretical concepts of technology acceptance (UTAUT), we will assess user
4 experience, usability, and user engagement (primary outcomes), as well as participant background
5 information (e.g. sociodemographic, care provision) and health status-associated phenomena
6
7 (functional status, quality of life and wellbeing, loneliness, depression, and medication adherence)
8
9 using standardized, quantitative and semi-standardized qualitative research instruments (see Figure
10
11
12
13
14 2).

17 **Standardized research instruments**

19
20 *User experience.* The German version of the User Experience Questionnaire (UEQ) [41] will be used to
21 assess user experience. The UEQ consists of 26 items along six dimensions: attractiveness,
22
23 transparency, efficiency, controllability, simulation, and originality.[42]
24
25

26
27
28 *Usability.* To assess the usability of Addison Care, the validated German version of the System Usability
29 Scale (SUS) will be applied.[43] The SUS [44] consists of 10 items and is a standardized, generic
30 instrument for assessing the usability of technical applications, mobile applications, or devices.
31
32

33
34
35 *User engagement.* Automatic system and data logging information will be used to measure user
36 engagement in terms of intensity and type of interactions between users and Addison Care. This non-
37 participatory data collection, i.e. documenting data using automatically protocolled technical variables
38 without having asked questions or the presence of an observer, will provide essential information on
39 the actual use, used functions, and user engagement with certain contents of the product of
40 interest.[45-47]
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48
49
50 *Functional status.* The German translation [48] of the Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (iADL) scale
51 [49] will be applied to assess patients' functional status in terms of activities of daily living. The iADL is
52 a standardized instrument that measures functionality related to eight domains of daily living.[50]
53
54

55
56
57 *Quality of life.* Health-related quality of life will be measured by the German version of the Short-Form-
58 8-Questionnaire (SF-8).[51]
59
60

1
2
3 *Loneliness.* To assess participants' perception of social isolation and loneliness, the shortened, 3-item
4 German version [52, 53] of the UCLA (University of California, Los Angeles) Loneliness Scale will be
5
6 applied.
7
8

9
10 *Depression.* The German translation [54] of the Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS) will be used to
11 evaluate the presence of depression.[55, 56] The 8-item version will be applied to make the survey as
12
13 time-efficient as possible.[57]
14
15

16
17 *Medication adherence.* Participants' adherence to their medication regimen will be measured by the
18 Stendal Adherence with Medication Score (SAMS).[58] SAMS consists of 18 items, assessing fully
19
20 adherent to nonadherent medication behaviour.[59]
21
22

23
24 *Self-management.* To assess participant's Self-Efficacy for Managing Chronic Diseases (SESG6), the
25 German version of the 6-item scale will be used.[60]
26
27

28
29 *Technology proficiency, readiness, and expectations.* A standardized face-to-face interview prior to the
30 use of Addison Care ('pre-use interview') will be performed to collect information on participant
31
32 technology proficiency and readiness (7 items) in terms of experience with and use of general
33
34 information and communication technologies (3 items) as well as expectations regarding the upcoming
35
36 use of the Addison Care technology (6 items). These closed-ended questions were derived from
37
38 empirical and theoretical literature [31, 32, 61] and further adapted by the research team.
39
40
41

42
43 *Sociodemographic and care provision variables.* Sociodemographic and care-relevant variables will be
44 collected by means of a short, standardized 9-item questionnaire. Participants' age, gender, living
45
46 situation, place of residence in terms of urbanization, care provision by relatives, and care provision
47
48 by ambulant/mobile care service will be assessed using closed-ended questions. Information on
49
50 documented primary diagnoses and existing additional chronic diseases will be collected using open-
51
52 ended questions and categorized applying the 11th revision of the International Classification of
53
54 Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD-11).[62]
55
56
57
58
59
60

Semi-standardized research instruments

First experiences and encountered technical obstacles. A qualitative, semi-structured brief telephone interview ('mid-use interview') with users after one week of Addison interaction will be conducted. Information about users' experiences to date, as well as previous effort and encountered challenges in using the Addison Care technology will be collected. The user reports are to be recorded in an open-ended documentation sheet.

User experience, fulfilled expectations, perceived enabling conditions for use and technology's social influence, and health behaviour. A comprehensive qualitative, semi-structured, face-to-face interview will explore participants' perspectives with reference to the fulfilled expectations after the use of Addison Care ('post-use interview'), perceived enabling conditions, and social influence in the use of the technology, as well as the participant's experiences and adaptations of health behaviour. The interview guide questions on user experience are based on the respective literature on UX research [63], those on conditions and technology's social influence along the main factors of the UTAUT model [31, 32], and those on health behaviours were developed against the background of the Health Action Process Approach (HAPA) [64]. The interview will be audio-recorded and transcribed. With reference to the embedded mixed-methods approach, the four most striking individual ratings of the previously collected standardized User Experience Questionnaire (UEQ) will be thematised and perceived changes in secondary outcomes (functional status, quality of life, loneliness, depression, medication adherence) will be assessed using open-ended questions. To address their perspectives on the use of Addison Care, an optional topical block of guided questions will be operationalized.

Task performance scenario and think-aloud protocol. Finally, to gain insight into users' thoughts, decision-making processes, and how they experience the Addison Care technology, a structured observation with an accompanying think-aloud protocol will be applied.[63, 65] Participants will be asked to perform a set of specific tasks with Addison Care while verbally expressing their immediate

1
2
3 thoughts, and explaining their reactions during system interaction. Task performance and participant
4
5 comments will be documented using a structured observation sheet.
6
7

8 [Figure 2 about here]
9

10 **User safety and data management**

11
12
13
14 During the two weeks study period, medical emergencies, acute deterioration in health or care needs,
15
16 patients' feelings of insecurity, or hospital admissions will constitute reasons to end the participation
17
18 early. Formal health services in the community setting will be informed about the use of Addison Care
19
20 by their clients. Informal caregivers of the participants will be educated about Addison Care and are
21
22 instructed to contact the support team in need of help (see Figure 2).
23
24
25

26
27 Figure 2 provides detailed information on the different data retrieved during participants' enrollment.
28
29 Personal information of participants will be accessed by the support team only, who will monitor the
30
31 dashboard and assist with any user problems. Dashboard access is granted by login data provided by
32
33 Addison Care USA.
34
35

36
37 All data retrieved empirically (see figure 2) will be saved on study-specific computers during data
38
39 collection and stored in password-protected folders on the support team storage after completed data
40
41 collection. User engagement data will be stored on Addison Tablet PC for short periods of time but will
42
43 be regularly exported onto the server from the clinical dashboard and after the end of the pilot study
44
45 transferred to study-specific computers. All personal data will be stored at a server in Berlin in
46
47 Germany and encrypted. According to European Union General Data Protection Regulations,
48
49 participants have the right to view all stored data or choose to delete their data at any given time as
50
51 long as their data has not been anonymized by code yet.
52
53
54

55 **Ethical considerations**

56
57
58 This pilot study was approved by the ethics committee of the German Society for Nursing Science (21-
59
60 037) to ensure that the research is done in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and in line with

1
2
3 the current legislation authority. The pilot study is registered in the German Clinical Trials Register (ID:
4
5 DRKS00025992)
6
7

8 **Analysis**

9

10
11 Various data will be organized and triangulated in data sets Quan 1-4 and Qual 1-3 (see Figure 2) for
12
13 analysis that fit the relevant phenomenon of interest. Final integration of overall results will take place
14
15 upon conclusion of the study [37] and will be summarized with a joint display by using a mixed methods
16
17 matrix.[66]
18

19
20
21 Participants` characteristics will be statistically described using information on socio-demographics,
22
23 living and care provision, quality of life, health literacy, activities of daily living, and medication
24
25 adherence (Quan 1, Figure 2).
26
27

28
29 A thematic content analysis of the qualitative data gained from interviews and observations in
30
31 encounters 3, 4, and 5 (see Figure 2) will be performed, expanding the deductively developed code by
32
33 inductive inputs.[67] Deductive codes prepared from theoretical pre-considerations will include the
34
35 concepts of user experience as well as usability. Coding strategy will separate the two phenomena
36
37 during the coding process. User experience results will be produced by triangulating the results of the
38
39 User Experience Questionnaire (Quan 3) as well as code system elements gathered in qualitative data
40
41 sets (Qual 1, 2, 3). These three data sets will provide usability results after interviews are transcribed
42
43 and coded. The codes will then be merged with the SUS results (Quan 3) to get a clear picture of
44
45 obstacles and acceptance. User Engagement data will track usage events like logins, reminders, and
46
47 overall Addison-user-interaction over the 2-week usage period - resulting in data set Quan 4 (see Figure
48
49 2). All quantitative data will be analyzed using common descriptive statistics.
50
51
52
53

54 **RESULTS**

55

56
57
58 The pilot study will take place during the second and third quarter of 2022. Outcomes will be published
59
60 in peer-reviewed medical journals and presented at international conferences.

DISCUSSION

Overview

This protocol presents research that assesses the feasibility, acceptability, experience, engagement, and usability of Addison Care – a health technology and virtual avatar for older persons with chronic diseases in their own home.

For this purpose, we culturally adopted the Addison Care technology and its functions (tutorial, medication management, testing vital signs) to explore participants' acceptance and experiences of the health technology and the virtual avatar.

For older adults with chronic diseases, the overarching goal of self-management is to enhance their quality of life and maintain independence, all while supporting formal and informal caregivers.

The goal of this pilot study is to further our understanding of the potential issues and challenges that will be used as the foundations for a larger randomized control study.

Limitations

Possible limitations of the pilot study are the lack of results on usability or acceptance of the US American version of Addison Care that we can refer to. Cultural adaption and translation into German therefore might not be the only reason for a suboptimal user experiences. Interviews allow to gain insight into this issue. The effectiveness of the extensive data collection process has to be proven as well as the recruitment process. The highly selective sample of the pilot study will diminish ethnical or socio-economic diversity which will be introduced thoroughly in the study following the pilot. The study's timeline may be influenced by COVID-19 pandemic recruitment-wise as well as by pandemic regulations in Germany which cannot be foreseen in the current situation. Finally, it is not the aim of the pilot study to show effects on the users' health status. But the multiple instruments for testing

1
2
3 health status-associated phenomena should provide adequacy to show such effects in a subsequent
4
5 main study.
6
7

8 9 **Contributors**

10
11 SK, NaS, JD, PK, NN, JO, ES, SP, MB, MK, REM and BM participated in the design of the study protocol.
12
13 SK, NaS, PK, JD, TK, and ES drafted the protocol manuscript. MB, BH, BM, SP, AW, DL, AvZ and JO
14
15 critically revised and commented on its previous versions and the final version. All authors critically
16
17 reviewed the manuscript and agreed on submission.
18
19

20 21 **Acknowledgements**

22
23
24 We acknowledge the Department of General Practice and Health Services Research, University
25
26 Hospital Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany for access to the German version of the SESG6.
27
28
29

30 31 **Funding**

32
33 This work is supported by Electronic Caregiver, Inc., Las Cruces, New Mexico, USA (no grant number)
34
35

36 37 **Declarations**

38
39 The study protocol has been approved by the ethics committee of the German Society for Nursing
40
41 Science (21-037) and is registered in the German Clinical Trials Register (ID: DRKS00025992)
42
43

44 45 **Conflict of interest**

46
47 ES, BH, and MB are employees of Electronic Caregiver, Las Cruces, New Mexico, United States
48
49

50 51 **Figure legend**

52
53 Figure 1 Addison Care functions in German version
54

55
56 Figure 2 Study flow, phenomenon of interest, instruments, data sets, and settings
57
58
59

60 **REFERENCES**

1. Maresova P, Javanmardi E, Barakovic S, Barakovic Husic J, Tomsone S, Krejcar O, et al. Consequences of chronic diseases and other limitations associated with old age – a scoping review. *BMC Public Health*. 2019;19(1):1431.
2. Griffith LE, Gilsing A, Mangin D, Patterson C, van den Heuvel E, Sohel N, et al. Multimorbidity Frameworks Impact Prevalence and Relationships with Patient-Important Outcomes. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2019;67(8):1632-40.
3. Marengoni A, Angleman S, Melis R, Mangialasche F, Karp A, Garmen A, et al. Aging with multimorbidity: a systematic review of the literature. *Ageing research reviews*. 2011;10(4):430-9.
4. Neil-Sztramko SE, Coletta G, Dobbins M, Marr S. Impact of the AGE-ON Tablet Training Program on Social Isolation, Loneliness, and Attitudes Toward Technology in Older Adults: Single-Group Pre-Post Study. *JMIR Aging*. 2020;3(1):e18398-e.
5. Wonggom P, Tongpeth J, Newman P, Du H, Clark R. Effectiveness of using avatar-based technology in patient education for the improvement of chronic disease knowledge and self-care behavior: a systematic review protocol. *JBI Evidence Synthesis*. 2016;14(9):3-14.
6. Riegel B, Jaarsma T, Strömberg A. A Middle-Range Theory of Self-Care of Chronic Illness. *Advances in Nursing Science*. 2012;35(3):194-204.
7. Banbury A, Nancarrow S, Dart J, Gray L, Dodson S, Osborne R, et al. Adding value to remote monitoring: Co-design of a health literacy intervention for older people with chronic disease delivered by telehealth - The telehealth literacy project. *Patient Education & Counseling*. 2020;103(3):597-606.
8. Sheppard JP, Tucker KL, Davison WJ, Stevens R, Aekplakorn W, Bosworth HB, et al. Self-monitoring of Blood Pressure in Patients With Hypertension-Related Multi-morbidity: Systematic Review and Individual Patient Data Meta-analysis. *American Journal of Hypertension*. 2020;33(3):243-51.
9. Bailey SC, Oramasionwu CU, Wolf MS. Rethinking adherence: a health literacy-informed model of medication self-management. *Journal of health communication*. 2013;18 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):20-30.
10. Heapy AA, Higgins DM, Cervone D, Wandner L, Fenton BT, Kerns RD. A Systematic Review of Technology-assisted Self-Management Interventions for Chronic Pain: Looking Across Treatment Modalities. *The Clinical Journal of Pain*. 2015;31(6):470-92.
11. Pfaeffli Dale L, Dobson R, Whittaker R, Maddison R. The effectiveness of mobile-health behaviour change interventions for cardiovascular disease self-management: A systematic review. *European journal of preventive cardiology*. 2016;23(8):801-17.
12. Morton K, Dennison L, May C, Murray E, Little P, McManus RJ, et al. Using digital interventions for self-management of chronic physical health conditions: A meta-ethnography review of published studies. *Patient Education and Counseling*. 2017;100(4):616-35.
13. Krick T, Huter K, Domhoff D, Schmidt A, Rothgang H, Wolf-Ostermann K. Digital technology and nursing care: a scoping review on acceptance, effectiveness and efficiency studies of informal and formal care technologies. *BMC health services research*. 2019;19(1):400-.
14. Maresova P, Tomsone S, Lameski P, Madureira J, Mendes A, Zdravevski E, et al. Technological Solutions for Older People with Alzheimer's Disease: Review. *Curr Alzheimer Res*. 2018;15(10):975-83.
15. Edmunds M, Tuckson R, Lewis J, Atchinson B, Rheuban K, Fanberg H, et al. An Emergent Research and Policy Framework for Telehealth. *EGEMS (Washington, DC)*. 2017;5(2):1303.
16. Hale TM, Jethwani K, Kandola MS, Saldana F, Kvedar JC. A Remote Medication Monitoring System for Chronic Heart Failure Patients to Reduce Readmissions: A Two-Arm Randomized Pilot Study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2016;18(5):e91.
17. Mehta SJ, Hume E, Troxel AB, Reitz C, Norton L, Lacko H, et al. Effect of Remote Monitoring on Discharge to Home, Return to Activity, and Rehospitalization After Hip and Knee Arthroplasty: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(12):e2028328-e.

18. Su D, Michaud TL, Estabrooks P, Schwab RJ, Eiland LA, Hansen G, et al. Diabetes Management Through Remote Patient Monitoring: The Importance of Patient Activation and Engagement with the Technology. *Telemed J E Health*. 2019;25(10):952-9.
19. Hoppe KK, Williams M, Thomas N, Zella JB, Drewry A, Kim K, et al. Telehealth with remote blood pressure monitoring for postpartum hypertension: A prospective single-cohort feasibility study. *Pregnancy hypertension*. 2019;15:171-6.
20. Michaud TL, Siahpush M, Schwab RJ, Eiland LA, DeVany M, Hansen G, et al. Remote Patient Monitoring and Clinical Outcomes for Postdischarge Patients with Type 2 Diabetes. *Population health management*. 2018;21(5):387-94.
21. Foster MV, Sethares KA. Facilitators and barriers to the adoption of telehealth in older adults: an integrative review. *Computers, informatics, nursing : CIN*. 2014;32(11):523-33; quiz 34-5.
22. Wongom P, Kourbelis C, Newman P, Du H, Clark RA. Effectiveness of avatar-based technology in patient education for improving chronic disease knowledge and self-care behavior: a systematic review. *JBI database of systematic reviews and implementation reports*. 2019;17(6):1101-29.
23. Bott N, Wexler S, Drury L, Pollak C, Wang V, Scher K, et al. A Protocol-Driven, Bedside Digital Conversational Agent to Support Nurse Teams and Mitigate Risks of Hospitalization in Older Adults: Case Control Pre-Post Study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2019;21(10):e13440.
24. Cassell J. Embodied Conversational Agents: Representation and Intelligence in User Interfaces. *AI Magazine*. 2001;22(4):67.
25. Gardiner P, Hempstead MB, Ring L, Bickmore T, Yinusa-Nyahkoon L, Tran H, et al. Reaching women through health information technology: the Gabby preconception care system. *American journal of health promotion : AJHP*. 2013;27(3 Suppl):eS11-20.
26. Shaked NA. Avatars and virtual agents - relationship interfaces for the elderly. *Healthcare technology letters*. 2017;4(3):83-7.
27. McLaughlin H. *Service-user research in health and social care*. Los Angeles: SAGE. Los Angeles: SAGE; 2009.
28. Kelders SM, van Zyl LE, Ludden GDS. The Concept and Components of Engagement in Different Domains Applied to eHealth: A Systematic Scoping Review. *Front Psychol*. 2020;11:926-.
29. Sousa VEC, Dunn Lopez K. Towards Usable E-Health. A Systematic Review of Usability Questionnaires. *Appl Clin Inform*. 2017;8(2):470-90.
30. Dabbs A, Myers BA, Mc Curry KR, Dunbar-Jacob J, Hawkins RP, Begey A, et al. User-centered design and interactive health technologies for patients. *Computers, informatics, nursing : CIN*. 2009;27(3):175-83.
31. Venkatesh V, Morris MG, Davis GB, Davis FD. User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *Mis Quart*. 2003;27(3):425-78.
32. Holden RJ, Karsh BT. The technology acceptance model: its past and its future in health care. *Journal of biomedical informatics*. 2010;43(1):159-72.
33. Czaja SJ, Charness N, Fisk AD, Hertzog C, Nair SN, Rogers WA, et al. Factors predicting the use of technology: findings from the Center for Research and Education on Aging and Technology Enhancement (CREATE). *Psychology and aging*. 2006;21(2):333-52.
34. Kim BY, Lee J. Smart Devices for Older Adults Managing Chronic Disease: A Scoping Review. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2017;5(5):e69.
35. Hoque R, Sorwar G. Understanding factors influencing the adoption of mHealth by the elderly: An extension of the UTAUT model. *International journal of medical informatics*. 2017;101:75-84.
36. ECG. *Electronic Caregiver 2020* [Available from: <https://electroniccaregiver.com/>].
37. Creswell JW, Plano Clark VL. *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. 2 ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 2011.
38. Chan AW, Tetzlaff JM, Gøtzsche PC, Altman DG, Mann H, Berlin JA, et al. SPIRIT 2013 explanation and elaboration: guidance for protocols of clinical trials. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)*. 2013;346:e7586.

- 1
2
3 39. Vaughn J, Summers-Goeckerman E, Shaw RJ, Shah N. A Protocol to Assess Feasibility,
4 Acceptability, and Usability of Mobile Technology for Symptom Management in Pediatric Transplant
5 Patients. *Nurs Res.* 2019;68(4):317-23.
6
7 40. Giunti G, Rivera-Romero O, Kool J, Bansi J, Sevillano JL, Granja-Dominguez A, et al. Evaluation
8 of More Stamina, a Mobile App for Fatigue Management in Persons with Multiple Sclerosis: Protocol
9 for a Feasibility, Acceptability, and Usability Study. *JMIR Res Protoc.* 2020;9(8):e18196.
10
11 41. Laugwitz B, Held T, Schrepp M. Construction and Evaluation of a User Experience
12 Questionnaire2008. 63-76 p.
13
14 42. Schrepp M, Hinderks A, Thomaschewski J. Design and Evaluation of a Short Version of the
15 User Experience Questionnaire (UEQ-S). *Int J Interact Multi.* 2017;4(6):103-8.
16
17 43. Ruegenhagen E, Rummel B. System Usability Scale – jetzt auch auf Deutsch. SAP User
18 Experience Community 2015 [Available from: [https://experience.sap.com/skillup/system-usability-
19 scale-jetzt-auch-auf-deutsch/](https://experience.sap.com/skillup/system-usability-scale-jetzt-auch-auf-deutsch/).
20
21 44. Brooke J. SUS: a “quick and dirty” usability. *Usability evaluation in industry.* 1996:189.
22
23 45. Taki S, Lymer S, Russell CG, Campbell K, Laws R, Ong KL, et al. Assessing User Engagement of
24 an mHealth Intervention: Development and Implementation of the Growing Healthy App
25 Engagement Index. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth.* 2017;5(6):e89.
26
27 46. Lalmas M, O'Brien H, Yom-Tov E. Measuring User Engagement. *Synthesis Lectures on
28 Information Concepts, Retrieval, and Services.* 2014;6(4):1-132.
29
30 47. Triberti S, Kelders SM, Gaggioli A. User engagement. In: Gemert-Pijnen Lv, Kelders SM, Kip H,
31 Sanderman R, editors. *eHealth Research, Theory and Development A Multi-Disciplinary Approach.*
32 London: Routledge; 2018. p. 271-89.
33
34 48. MDK -K-CG. https://kcgeriatrie.de/Assessments_in_der_Geriatrie/Documents/iadl.pdf 2020
35 [26.08.2020]. Available from:
36 https://kcgeriatrie.de/Assessments_in_der_Geriatrie/Documents/iadl.pdf.
37
38 49. Lawton MP, Brody EM. Assessment of older people: self-maintaining and instrumental
39 activities of daily living. *The Gerontologist.* 1969;9(3):179-86.
40
41 50. Deppermann KM, Friedrich C, Herth F, Huber RM. [Geriatric assessment and diagnosis in
42 elderly patients]. *Onkologie.* 2008;31 Suppl 3:6-14.
43
44 51. Ware J, Kosinski M, Dewey J, Gandek B, Kisinski M, editors. *How to score and interpret single-
45 item health status measures: a manual for users of the SF-Y” Health Survey2001.*
46
47 52. Hughes ME, Waite LJ, Hawkey LC, Cacioppo JT. A Short Scale for Measuring Loneliness in
48 Large Surveys: Results From Two Population-Based Studies. *Research on aging.* 2004;26(6):655-72.
49
50 53. Kantar P. SOEP-Core – 2017: Personenfragebogen, Stichproben A-L3. *SOEP Survey Papers
51 563: Series A.* Berlin: DIW/SOEP; 2018.
52
53 54. Validität und Reliabilität einer deutschen Version der Geriatrischen Depressionsskala (GDS).
54 [Validity and reliability of a German version of the Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS).] [press release].
55 Germany: Hogrefe Verlag GmbH & Co. KG1999.
56
57 55. Sheikh JI, Yesavage JA. Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS): recent evidence and development of
58 a shorter version. *Clinical Gerontologist: The Journal of Aging and Mental Health.* 1986.
59
60 56. Allgaier AK, Kramer D, Mergl R, Fejtikova S, Hegerl U. [Validity of the geriatric depression scale
in nursing home residents: comparison of GDS-15, GDS-8, and GDS-4]. *Psychiatrische Praxis.*
2011;38(6):280-6.
57
58 57. Jongenelis K, Gerritsen DL, Pot AM, Beekman AT, Eisses AM, Kluiters H, et al. Construction and
validation of a patient- and user-friendly nursing home version of the Geriatric Depression Scale. *Int J
59 Geriatr Psychiatry.* 2007;22(9):837-42.
60
58 58. Prell T, Grosskreutz J, Mendorf S, Franke GH, Witte OW, Kunze A. Clusters of non-adherence
to medication in neurological patients. *Research in social & administrative pharmacy : RSAP.*
2019;15(12):1419-24.
59
60 59. Franke G, Küch D, Jagla-Franke M. Die Erfassung der Medikamenten-Adhärenz bei
Schmerzpatientinnen und -patienten2019.

- 1
2
3 60. Freund T, Gensichen J, Goetz K, Szecsenyi J, Mahler C. Evaluating self-efficacy for managing
4 chronic disease: psychometric properties of the six-item Self-Efficacy Scale in Germany. *Journal of*
5 *evaluation in clinical practice*. 2013;19(1):39-43.
6 61. Seifert A, Schelling H. Digitale Senioren. Nutzung von Informations- und
7 Kommunikationstechnologien (IKT) durch Menschen ab 65 Jahren in der Schweiz im Jahr 20152015.
8 62. World Health Organization. International classification of diseases for mortality and
9 morbidity statistics (11th Revision). 2018 [Available from: <https://icd.who.int/en/>].
10 63. Goodman E, Kuniavsky M, Moed A. *Observing the user experience : a practitioner's guide to*
11 *user research*. Waltham, MA:: Morgan Kaufmann; 2012.
12 64. Schwarzer R, Fleig L. Von der Risikowahrnehmung zur Änderung des Gesundheitsverhaltens.
13 *Zentralblatt für Arbeitsmedizin, Arbeitsschutz und Ergonomie*. 2014;64(5):338-41.
14 65. Jaspers MW, Steen T, van den Bos C, Geenen M. The think aloud method: a guide to user
15 interface design. *International journal of medical informatics*. 2004;73(11-12):781-95.
16 66. O'Cathain A, Murphy E, Nicholl J. Three techniques for integrating data in mixed methods
17 studies. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)*. 2010;341:c4587.
18 67. Mayring P. *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken*. 12. ed. Weinheim/Basel:
19 Beltz Verlag; 2015.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60





Figure 1: Addison Care functions in German version

90x50mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Notes: * in case of the presence of relatives: semi-structured interview with relatives about their impressions and experiences towards AC; AC Addison Care, GDS Geriatric Depression Scale, iADL Instrumental Activities of Daily Living Scale, SAMS Stendal Adherence with Medication Score, SESGG Self-Efficacy for Managing Chronic Disease 6-item Scale, SF-8 Health Related Quality of Life Short-Form-8-Questionnaire, SUS System Usability Scale, UCLA University of California Los Angeles Loneliness Scale, UE User Engagement, UEQ User Experience Questionnaire, US Usability, UX User Experience

Figure 2: Study flow, phenomenon of interest, instruments, data sets, and settings

90x138mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Supplement 1: SPIRIT Checklist



STANDARD PROTOCOL ITEMS: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INTERVENTIONAL TRIALS

SPIRIT 2013 Checklist: Recommended items to address in a clinical trial protocol and related documents*

Section/item	Item No	Description	Protocol adherence: addressed on page number
Administrative information			
Title	1	Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, interventions, and, if applicable, trial acronym	Y:01
Trial registration	2a	Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry	Y:02
	2b	All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set	Y
Protocol version	3	Date and version identifier	NA
Funding	4	Sources and types of financial, material, and other support	Y:16
Roles and responsibilities	5a	Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors	Y:01, 16
	5b	Name and contact information for the trial sponsor	Y:16
	5c	Role of study sponsor and funders, if any, in study design; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report; and the decision to submit the report for publication, including whether they will have ultimate authority over any of these activities	Y:16
	5d	Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre, steering committee, endpoint adjudication committee, data management team, and other individuals or groups overseeing the trial, if applicable (see Item 21a for data monitoring committee)	Y:09, 13

Introduction

1				
2	Background and rationale	6a	Description of research question and justification for undertaking the trial, including summary of relevant studies (published and unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervention	Y:03-06, 08
3				
4				
5				
6				
7		6b	Explanation for choice of comparators	NA
8	Objectives	7	Specific objectives or hypotheses	Y:08
9				
10	Trial design	8	Description of trial design including type of trial (eg, parallel group, crossover, factorial, single group), allocation ratio, and framework (eg, superiority, equivalence, noninferiority, exploratory)	Y:08
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17	Methods: Participants, interventions, and outcomes			
18				
19	Study setting	9	Description of study settings (eg, community clinic, academic hospital) and list of countries where data will be collected. Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained	Y:09, Figure 2
20				
21				
22	Eligibility criteria	10	Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable, eligibility criteria for study centres and individuals who will perform the interventions (eg, surgeons, psychotherapists)	Y:09
23				
24				
25	Interventions	11a	Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication, including how and when they will be administered	Y:07-08, Figure 2
26				
27		11b	Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a given trial participant (eg, drug dose change in response to harms, participant request, or improving/worsening disease)	Y:13
28				
29				
30	Outcomes	11c	Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any procedures for monitoring adherence (eg, drug tablet return, laboratory tests)	Y:09-11, Figure 2
31				
32		11d	Relevant concomitant care and interventions that are permitted or prohibited during the trial	NA
33				
34				
35				
36				
37				
38				
39				
40				
41				
42				
43				
44				
45				
46				
47				
48				
49				
50				
51				
52				
53				
54				
55				
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				

1				
2	Participant	13	Time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any	Y:09, Figure
3	timeline		run-ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for	2
4			participants. A schematic diagram is highly	
5			recommended (see Figure)	
6				
7	Sample size	14	Estimated number of participants needed to achieve	Y:09
8			study objectives and how it was determined, including	
9			clinical and statistical assumptions supporting any	
10			sample size calculations	
11				
12				
13	Recruitment	15	Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrolment	Y:09
14			to reach target sample size	
15				

Methods: Assignment of interventions (for controlled trials)

Allocation:

20				
21	Sequence	16a	Method of generating the allocation sequence (eg,	NA
22	generation		computer-generated random numbers), and list of any	
23			factors for stratification. To reduce predictability of a	
24			random sequence, details of any planned restriction (eg,	
25			blocking) should be provided in a separate document that	
26			is unavailable to those who enrol participants or assign	
27			interventions	
28				
29				
30	Allocation	16b	Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (eg,	NA
31	concealment		central telephone; sequentially numbered, opaque,	
32	mechanism		sealed envelopes), describing any steps to conceal the	
33			sequence until interventions are assigned	
34				
35				
36	Implementation	16c	Who will generate the allocation sequence, who will enrol	NA
37			participants, and who will assign participants to	
38			interventions	
39				
40	Blinding	17a	Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg,	NA
41	(masking)		trial participants, care providers, outcome assessors,	
42			data analysts), and how	
43				
44				
45		17b	If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is	NA
46			permissible, and procedure for revealing a participant's	
47			allocated intervention during the trial	
48				

Methods: Data collection, management, and analysis

50				
51	Data collection	18a	Plans for assessment and collection of outcome,	Y:10-13
52	methods		baseline, and other trial data, including any related	
53			processes to promote data quality (eg, duplicate	
54			measurements, training of assessors) and a description	
55			of study instruments (eg, questionnaires, laboratory	
56			tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known.	
57			Reference to where data collection forms can be found, if	
58			not in the protocol	
59				
60				

1				
2		18b	Plans to promote participant retention and complete	Y
3			follow-up, including list of any outcome data to be	
4			collected for participants who discontinue or deviate from	
5			intervention protocols	
6				
7	Data	19	Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage,	Y: 12-13
8	management		including any related processes to promote data quality	
9			(eg, double data entry; range checks for data values).	
10			Reference to where details of data management	
11			procedures can be found, if not in the protocol	
12				
13				
14	Statistical	20a	Statistical methods for analysing primary and secondary	Y: 14-15
15	methods		outcomes. Reference to where other details of the	
16			statistical analysis plan can be found, if not in the	
17			protocol	
18				
19				
20		20b	Methods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and	X
21			adjusted analyses)	
22				
23		20c	Definition of analysis population relating to protocol non-	X
24			adherence (eg, as randomised analysis), and any	
25			statistical methods to handle missing data (eg, multiple	
26			imputation)	
27				
28				
29	Methods: Monitoring			
30				
31	Data monitoring	21a	Composition of data monitoring committee (DMC);	X
32			summary of its role and reporting structure; statement of	
33			whether it is independent from the sponsor and	
34			competing interests; and reference to where further	
35			details about its charter can be found, if not in the	
36			protocol. Alternatively, an explanation of why a DMC is	
37			not needed	
38				
39				
40		21b	Description of any interim analyses and stopping	Y: 13
41			guidelines, including who will have access to these	
42			interim results and make the final decision to terminate	
43			the trial	
44				
45				
46	Harms	22	Plans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing	Y: 13
47			solicited and spontaneously reported adverse events and	
48			other unintended effects of trial interventions or trial	
49			conduct	
50				
51				
52	Auditing	23	Frequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if	X
53			any, and whether the process will be independent from	
54			investigators and the sponsor	
55				
56				
57	Ethics and dissemination			
58				
59				
60				

1				
2	Research ethics approval	24	Plans for seeking research ethics committee/institutional review board (REC/IRB) approval	Y: 14
3				
4				
5	Protocol amendments	25	Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC/IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators)	Y: 14
6				
7				
8				
9				
10	Consent or assent	26a	Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32)	Y: 09
11				
12				
13				
14				
15		26b	Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological specimens in ancillary studies, if applicable	NA
16				
17				
18				
19	Confidentiality	27	How personal information about potential and enrolled participants will be collected, shared, and maintained in order to protect confidentiality before, during, and after the trial	Y: 13-15
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25	Declaration of interests	28	Financial and other competing interests for principal investigators for the overall trial and each study site	Y: 16
26				
27				
28	Access to data	29	Statement of who will have access to the final trial dataset, and disclosure of contractual agreements that limit such access for investigators	NA
29				
30				
31				
32				
33	Ancillary and post-trial care	30	Provisions, if any, for ancillary and post-trial care, and for compensation to those who suffer harm from trial participation	NA
34				
35				
36				
37	Dissemination policy	31a	Plans for investigators and sponsor to communicate trial results to participants, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant groups (eg, via publication, reporting in results databases, or other data sharing arrangements), including any publication restrictions	Y: 15
38				
39				
40				
41				
42				
43				
44		31b	Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional writers	NA
45				
46				
47				
48		31c	Plans, if any, for granting public access to the full protocol, participant-level dataset, and statistical code	X
49				
50				
51	Appendices			
52				
53	Informed consent materials	32	Model consent form and other related documentation given to participants and authorised surrogates	X
54				
55				
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				

1
2 Biological 33 Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation, and storage of NA
3 specimens biological specimens for genetic or molecular analysis in
4 the current trial and for future use in ancillary studies, if
5 applicable
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

BMJ Open

Piloting of the virtual telecare technology 'Addison Care' to promote self-management in persons with chronic diseases in a community setting: protocol for a mixed methods user experience, user engagement and usability pilot study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2022-062159.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	06-Jul-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Krutter, Simon; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Schuessler, Nadine; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Kutschar, Patrick; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Šabić, Edin; New Mexico State University, Department of Psychology; Electronic Caregiver Inc Dellinger, Johanna; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Klausner, Tabea; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Nestler, Nadja; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Beasley, Morgan; Electronic Caregiver Inc Henderson, Bailey; Electronic Caregiver Inc Pitzer, Stefan; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Mitterlehner, Barbara; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Langegger, Doris; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Winkler, Anna; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Kloesch, Michael; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice EBl-Maurer, Roland; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice van der Zee-Neuen, Antje; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Osterbrink, Jürgen; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice; University of North Florida, Brooks College of Health
Primary Subject Heading:	Nursing
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Keywords:	PRIMARY CARE, PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, GERIATRIC MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Piloting of the virtual telecare technology 'Addison Care' to promote self-management in persons**
4 **with chronic diseases in a community setting: protocol for a mixed methods user experience, user**
5 **engagement and usability pilot study**
6
7
8
9

10
11 **Authors:** Simon Krutter¹, Nadine Schuessler¹, Patrick Kutschar¹, Edin Šabić^{2,3}, Johanna Dellinger¹,
12
13 Tabea Klausner¹, Nadja Nestler¹, Morgan Beasley³, Bailey Henderson³, Stefan Pitzer¹, Barbara
14
15 Mitterlehner¹, Doris Langegger¹, Anna Winkler¹, Michael Klösch¹, Roland Eßl-Maurer¹, Antje van der
16
17 Zee-Neuen¹, Juergen Osterbrink^{1,4}
18
19

20
21 **Affiliations**
22

23
24 ¹ Institute of Nursing Science and Practice, Paracelsus Medical University, Salzburg, Austria
25

26 ² Department of Psychology, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico, United States
27

28 ³ Electronic Caregiver Inc., Las Cruces, New Mexico, United States
29

30 ⁴ Brooks College of Health, University of North Florida, Jacksonville, Florida, United States
31
32

33 **Corresponding Author Information**
34

35
36 Simon Krutter
37

38
39 Institute of Nursing Science and Practice, Paracelsus Medical University, Salzburg, Austria
40

41
42 Strubergasse 21, 5020 Salzburg, Austria
43

44
45 Email: simon.krutter@pmu.ac.at
46

47
48 Phone: +43 662 2024 80341
49

50
51 ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5788-9574
52
53

54
55 **Word Count:** 4.130
56

57
58 **ABSTRACT** (297 words)
59
60

1
2
3 **Introduction:** Chronic diseases in older adults are one of the major epidemiological challenges of
4 current times and leading cause of disability, poor quality of life, high health care costs, and death.
5
6 Self-management of chronic diseases is essential to improve health behaviors and health outcomes.
7
8 Technology-assisted interventions have shown to improve self-management of chronic diseases.
9
10 Virtual avatars can be a key factor for the acceptance of these technologies. Addison Care is a home-
11 based telecare solution equipped with a virtual avatar named Addison, connecting older persons with
12
13 their caregivers via an easy-to-use technology. A central advantage is that Addison care provides access
14
15 to self-management support for an up-to-now highly underrepresented population - older persons
16
17 with chronic disease(s), which enables them to profit from e-health in everyday life.
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 **Methods and analysis:** A pragmatic, non-randomized, one-arm pilot study applying an embedded
25 mixed-methods approach will be conducted to examine user experience, usability, and user
26
27 engagement of the virtual avatar Addison. The pilot study will take place during the second and third
28
29 quarter of 2022. Participants will be at least 65 years old and recruited from hospitals during the
30
31 discharge process to home care. Standardized instruments, namely the User Experience Questionnaire
32
33 (UEQ), System Usability Scale (SUS), Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (iADL) scale, Short-Form-8-
34
35 Questionnaire (SF-8), UCLA Loneliness Scale, Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS), Stendal Adherence with
36
37 Medication Score (SAMS) and Self-Efficacy for Managing Chronic Diseases Scale (SESG6), as well as
38
39 survey-based assessments, semi-structured interviews and think-aloud protocols will be used. The
40
41 study seeks to enroll 20 patients that meet the criteria.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Ethics and dissemination:** The study protocol has been approved by the ethic committee of the
49
50 German Society for Nursing Science (21-037). The results are intended to be published in peer-
51
52 reviewed journals and disseminated through conference papers.
53
54
55

56 **Trial registration number:** German Clinical Trials Register (ID: DRKS00025992).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Keywords:** Telecare, virtual avatar, older people, chronic disease self-management, pilot study, user
4
5 experience, e-health;
6
7

8 **STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY**

9

- 10
11
12 - This pilot study provides an opportunity to explore the acceptability of and experiences with
13 a potentially beneficial e-health technology in the underrepresented population of
14 chronically ill older persons in a telecare setting.
15
16
17
18 - The mixed-methods study design will provide a deep and broad insight on usability, user
19 experience and user engagement of Addison care as a German-speaking, culturally adapted
20 virtual avatar.
21
22
23 - This investigation evaluates the efficacy of a sophisticated virtual avatar, Addison, in assisting
24 with many crucial health management tasks – including medication management and health
25 vitals monitoring.
26
27
28 - A focus on barriers to user-engagement for those who are technologically hesitant will
29 provide rich information concerning how best to design virtual avatars and e-health
30 technologies to match user needs and mental models.
31
32
33 - The primary limitation of this study is the relatively small sample size due to our selective
34 inclusion criteria, which may diminish the ethnic and socio-economic diversity of our sample.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **BACKGROUND**

48

49
50 Societies across the globe are facing a significant shift in age demographics whereby older adults are
51 becoming an increasingly larger group within their population. This phenomenon is one of the most
52 salient economic, social, and medical issues of current times.[1] Aging increases both the risk for most
53 chronic diseases and for multimorbidity. Between 34% and 61% of older adults are multimorbid [2],
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 which can have consequences such as disability and functional decline, poor quality of life, social
4
5 isolation, depression, and high health care costs.[3, 4]
6
7

8 Patients themselves have an integral role in the management of their chronic disease.[5] Factors that
9
10 influence effective self-management of chronic disease include: experience, skill, motivation, culture,
11
12 confidence, habits, physical and mental function, social support, and access to care.[6]
13
14

15
16 Self-management of chronic diseases is defined as the response to signs and symptoms when they
17
18 occur, with the goal that patients play an active role in optimising health outcomes and minimizing the
19
20 impact of their conditions.[6] Self-management support refers to patient, healthcare professional, and
21
22 healthcare system interventions aimed to improve self-management behaviours.[7] Self-monitoring
23
24 vitals [8] and medication adherence have been recognized as two of the most essential self-
25
26 management activities performed by patients to promote their health.[9]
27
28

29
30 Although interventions designed to promote self-management in chronic diseases have traditionally
31
32 been offered in-person, delivering these interventions remotely utilizing available technology (e.g.,
33
34 mobile smart phones, Internet, interactive voice response, telephone, virtual reality) has become more
35
36 prevalent.[10] These technology-assisted interventions have shown to improve self-management and
37
38 health status.[11, 12]
39
40

41
42 Digital information technologies support people with care requirements to maintain their
43
44 independence, improve quality of life, increase health literacy and aid caregivers in their duties.[13,
45
46 14] Telehealth is one of the fastest-growing sectors in health care. The term refers to a broad array of
47
48 provider-to-patient communication and has been defined as using telecommunications, information
49
50 technologies, and devices to share information and to provide clinical, population health, and
51
52 administrative services at a distance.[15] Remote patient monitoring is a widely used telehealth
53
54 intervention that can effectively support self-management in patients with chronic diseases.[7]
55
56
57

58 **Remote Patient Monitoring**

59
60

1
2
3 Remote Patient Monitoring (RPM) is a promising solution for facilitating the patient-physician
4 relationship while addressing the shortage of healthcare workers today.
5
6

7
8 Studies concerning the efficacy of RPM has spanned the topics of post-operative rehospitalization,
9 chronic disease management, medication adherence, and quality of life and has shown promising
10 results.[16-20] However, RPM technology can only benefit patients who choose to actively interact
11 with the devices. As compared to younger users, elderly users also face unique challenges that are a
12 direct result of aging – such as declines in dexterity, hearing, and vision. As a result, researchers have
13 identified that improving ease of navigation for task completion, ensuring appropriate size and color
14 of font, and properly configuring the size of the hardware itself are paramount in addressing
15 technological hesitancy.[21]
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 27 **Virtual Avatars**

28
29 Graphic user interfaces, which can improve the user experience and personalize the experience for the
30 user through virtual avatars, have begun to be incorporated into RPM systems. Virtual avatars are an
31 emerging feature in RPM that has shown propitious results in terms of user engagement, health
32 education, and self-care behavior.[22]
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 One important factor in the receptiveness of patients to virtual avatars is the avatar's appearance. Bott
41 [23] investigated the impact of a virtual pet avatar to deliver surveys to older clients. They found that
42 those who interacted with the avatar experienced lower rates of delirium, fewer falls, and decreased
43 loneliness. However, research has generally shown that anthropomorphic characteristics are often
44 preferable for virtual healthcare avatars [24] – as well as similarities in appearance between the avatar
45 and the user.[25] Previous literature has revealed that when designing virtual agents for older persons,
46 key factors related to acceptance of technology include conversational latency, gamification, and
47 artificially intelligent lexicon.[26]
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 **User experience and technology acceptance among older persons**

1
2
3 Understanding how older adults perceive technology and virtual avatars may lead to improvements in
4 the accessibility, acceptability, and adoption of virtual avatars among older persons with chronic
5 diseases. This can be accomplished through user experience (UX) research, wherein the overall
6 experience of the user is assessed through measures related to usability, user engagement, usefulness,
7 function, credibility, and satisfaction with the technology.[27] While behavior, cognition, and affect
8 are important defining components of user engagement [28], learnability, efficiency, memorability,
9 few errors and satisfaction are defining components of usability.[29] UX is based upon User-Centered
10 Design (UCD), wherein the needs and characteristics of the end user become the focus of technology
11 design and development, with the intention of higher acceptance and fewer user errors.[30]

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 Theories that predict and explain health technology acceptance and use can help to tailor the
25 technology to specific patient needs. One of the more recent models, the Unified Theory of Acceptance
26 and Use of Technology (UTAUT) [31], posits that a person's intent to use [acceptance of technology]
27 and usage behavior (actual use) of a technology is predicated by the patient's performance and effort
28 expectancy of the technology. The UTAUT also suggests social influence and facilitating conditions as
29 determinants of behavioral intention to use the technology.[31, 32] Most older persons are
30 significantly less adept at technology use than the general population, with technology anxiety being
31 a major influence on older users' intent to use technologies.[33] However, older adults are interested
32 in integrating new technologies into their healthcare.[34] Studies confirm the applicability of the
33 UTAUT in the context of Telecare services among older persons.[35]

46 47 **Intervention: Addison Care Tablet Personal Computer (PC)**

48
49
50 The present research pilots an intervention provided by Addison Care [36], which is an innovative
51 home-bound connected virtual RPM platform for individuals living with chronic disease. A 3D-
52 animated nurse named 'Addison' is the center of interaction between the system and its users,
53 personifying the telehealth experience for the user. The pilot study encompasses two health-related
54 functions of Addison Care: 'Addison' supporting the user in self-monitoring relevant vitals (blood
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 pressure, weight, pulse and oxygen saturation) as well as medication schedule adherence. This is
4
5 achieved by offering reminder and monitoring functionalities (see Fig. 1).
6
7

8 [Figure 1 about here]
9

10
11 The Addison Care hardware consists of a tablet PC with a speaker, a microphone module, and a touch
12
13 screen (see Figure 1). The tablet connects with Bluetooth vitals measuring devices and can be installed
14
15 in a user's home. Avatar technology combined with natural language understanding and automatic
16
17 speech recognition provides users with effective natural interaction with the assisting technology.[22,
18
19 26] Subtitles, vital signs, and medications are graphically illustrated on the Addison Care interface for
20
21 clear communication between the virtual agent and the user.
22
23

24
25 The Addison Tablet PC is connected to a web-based dashboard that allows access to user data,
26
27 including vitals measurements and medication reminders. For the pilot study, medication plans,
28
29 reminder-options, and contact information are managed by members of the study team, who also act
30
31 as a support team for the technical set-up and in case of technical problems. The intervention in this
32
33 study involves voice-driven audio-centered interaction between Addison and users in German, as well
34
35 as the implementation of a German touch screen interface. Introduction of Addison Care to German
36
37 users requires adaption of the original technology to ensure a good cultural fit. Adaptations were made
38
39 to the surroundings of the avatar, as well as to Addison's mannerisms. Additionally, changes were
40
41 made to the system to ensure a good fit between system and real life in terms of interactive elements
42
43 [from basics ensuring appropriate data and time formats to more complex elements like making sure
44
45 the avatar interacts in a culturally appropriate manner with the user). Voice and touch interaction
46
47 modes are currently adapted from English into German. All piloted features of Addison Care are shown
48
49
50
51
52 in Fig. 1.
53

54 **Objectives**

55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 While other studies have provided insight into the potential of digital health technology and virtual
4 avatars, the vast majority have been tested within laboratory settings, where older adults were unable
5 to interact with the technology in a natural environment. Additionally, the digital health systems and
6 virtual avatars were not culturally adapted after development.
7
8
9

10
11
12 The study aims to explore the feasibility, acceptability, experience, engagement, and usability of the
13 culturally tailored health technology and the virtual avatar Addison for self-management for older
14 patients with chronic diseases in their own home.
15
16
17
18
19

20 21 **METHODS AND ANALYSIS**

22
23
24 A pragmatic, non-randomized, one-arm pilot study applying an embedded mixed-methods approach
25 will be conducted to examine the primary outcomes 'user experience', 'usability', and 'user
26 engagement' of the virtual avatar Addison three times within the use span. 'Embedded' refers to the
27 integration of qualitative methods into a quantitative methodology framework, or vice versa, to
28 provide enriched insights or understanding into the phenomena of interest.[31, 37] The study design
29 is pluralistic, problem-centered, real-world applicable, and focused on the consequences of actions,
30 stemming from pragmatism as a research paradigm.[37] The present protocol followed the SPIRIT
31 guidelines (see Supplementary 1).[38] Data collection will take place during the second and third
32 quarter of 2022.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Recruitment criteria and process**

46
47
48 Eligible patients will be identified by medical specialists in in German hospitals. The inclusion criteria
49 are as follows:
50
51

- 52 - Planned patients transition from hospital to extramural care
 - 53 - Three to nine drugs (regular intake of drugs, no status of hypermedication)
 - 54 - 65 years or older with a chronic health condition
 - 55 - Ability to speak and understand German language
- 56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The exclusion criteria are:
4

- 5
6 - Ten or more drugs per day
7
8 - Younger than 65 years old
9
10 - Moderate to severe cognitive impairment or severe psychiatric disorders
11
12

13
14 Provided that these criteria are met and general interest in using health technology is expressed,
15
16 information about the pilot study and the intervention will be shared. If a patient declares the will to
17
18 participate, a meeting with the support team will be arranged while the patient is still at the hospital.
19
20 Potential participants will be informed of all aspects of the study through verbal instruction and written
21
22 materials (Figure 2, Encounter 1). After written informed consent is provided, living situation and socio-
23
24 demographic data will be assessed by research assistants.
25
26

27 28 **Setting and sample size** 29

30
31 Addison Care will be piloted in participants' homes, located in a community setting, after their
32
33 discharge from hospital for two consecutive weeks. In Encounter 2 (see Figure 2) within 1 day after the
34
35 informed consent is provided, the support team will give first instructions on Addison Care while the
36
37 participant is still hospitalized. First adjustments of reminder, medication plan, and vital measurements
38
39 will be provisioned for the use of Addison Tablet PC at home. This study seeks to enroll 20 patients.
40
41 The sample size is an adequate number to evaluate study feasibility, test the study procedures and
42
43 explore the user experience.[39, 40]
44
45
46
47

48 **Patient and public involvement** 49

50
51 In advance of the pilot study, older adults assisted in the development of the data collection materials
52
53 and pre-testing of Addison Care. However, patients and the public were not involved in the
54
55 development of the research question, outcome measures and the design of the study.
56
57

58 **Outcomes, Instruments, and Variables** 59 60

1
2
3 Building upon the theoretical concepts of technology acceptance (UTAUT), we will assess user
4 experience, usability, and user engagement (primary outcomes), as well as participant background
5 information (e.g., sociodemographic, care provision) and health status-associated phenomena
6
7 (functional status, quality of life and wellbeing, loneliness, depression, medication adherence, and self-
8 management) using standardized, quantitative and semi-standardized qualitative research
9 instruments (see Figure 2).
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 17 **Standardized research instruments**

18
19
20 *User experience.* The German version of the User Experience Questionnaire (UEQ) [41] will be used to
21 assess user experience. The UEQ consists of 26 items along six scales: attractiveness (6 items,
22 Cronbach's alpha $\alpha=0.89$), perspicuity (4 items, $\alpha=0.82$), efficiency (4 items, $\alpha=0.73$), dependability (4
23 items, $\alpha=0.65$), stimulation (4 items, $\alpha=0.76$), and novelty (4 items, $\alpha=0.83$).[41, 42] Each item
24 represents a 7-point rating scale (-3 most negative rating, +3 most positive rating) of properties that
25 the product under study may have. An average score is computed for each scale.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34
35 *Usability.* To assess the usability of Addison Care, the validated German version of the System Usability
36 Scale (SUS) will be applied.[43] The SUS [44] consists of 10 items and is a standardized, generic
37 instrument for assessing the usability of technical applications, mobile applications, or devices. Internal
38 consistency has been reported to range between $\alpha=0.70$ to 0.95.[45] The SUS consists of 10 items,
39 each with five-point rating scales (1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree). The standardized scoring of
40 the SUS results in a total score between 0 to 100 points using a given norm-based scoring
41 algorithm.[45]
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 *User engagement.* Automatic system and data logging information will be used to measure user
52 engagement in terms of intensity and type of interactions between users and Addison Care. This non-
53 participatory data collection, e.g., documenting data using automatically protocolled technical
54 variables without having asked questions or the presence of an observer, will provide essential
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 information on the actual use, used functions, and user engagement with certain contents of the
4 product of interest.[46-48]
5
6

7
8 *Functional status.* The German translation [49] of the Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (iADL) scale
9 [50] will be applied to assess patients' functional status in terms of activities of daily living. The iADL is
10 a standardized instrument that measures functionality related to eight domains of daily living. It has
11 reported reliability coefficients ranging from 0.85 to 0.91.[51] Each domain is measured using either
12 three or four ability levels with 0 or 1 point per domain, resulting in a summary score of 8 points at
13 maximum. Due to a strong reference of some items to household aspects, gender-specific scores will
14 be used, e.g., 0 (low function, dependent) to 8 (high function, independent) for women and 0 to 5 for
15 men, respectively.[51]
16
17

18
19 *Quality of life.* Health-related quality of life will be measured by the German version of the Short-Form-
20 8-Questionnaire (SF-8).[52] The SF-8 assesses the 8 dimensions physical functioning, role physical (role
21 limitations because of physical health), bodily pain, general health, vitality, social functioning, role
22 emotional (role limitations because of emotional problems), and mental health, by one item each, and
23 along two scales 'physical component summary score' and 'mental component summary score'. The
24 items comprise of five- or six-point response scales that verbalize the extent to which each dimension
25 is present. In addition to single-item analysis, the two summary scores will be measured using a given
26 norm-based scoring method. Next to an adequate test-retest reliability [52], an overall internal
27 consistency between $\alpha=0.86$ and 0.92 have been reported.[53]
28
29

30
31 *Loneliness.* To assess participants' perception of social isolation and loneliness, the shortened, 3-item
32 German version [54, 55] of the UCLA (University of California, Los Angeles) Loneliness Scale will be
33 applied. Each item exhibits a five-level response scale (very often, often, sometimes, rarely, never) and
34 will be analysed item-by-item. Cronbach's alpha for the 3-item loneliness scale was 0.72.[54]
35
36

37
38 *Depression.* The German translation [56] of the Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS) will be used to
39 evaluate the presence of depression.[57, 58] The 8-item version will be applied to make the survey as
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 time-efficient as possible.[59] Participants are asked about selected symptoms of depressive states
4
5 over the past week using a dichotomous response format (no vs. yes). The total sum score of the GDS-8
6
7 is 0-8 points. Internal consistency with $\alpha > 0.80$ has been shown [59]. A recommended cut-off score of
8
9 GDS ≥ 3 indicating relevant indications of depression will be applied.

11
12
13 *Medication adherence.* Participants' adherence to their medication regimen will be measured by the
14
15 Stendal Adherence with Medication Score (SAMS).[60] SAMS consists of 18 items on a five-level
16
17 response scale (0-4) assessing fully adherent to nonadherent medication behaviour per item.[61]
18
19 Responses are summarized into a cumulative point scale (0-72), which can be categorized as fully
20
21 adherent (0), moderately adherent (1-10), and not adherent (>10). An overall internal consistency of
22
23 $\alpha = 0.83$ has been reported.[61]

24
25
26
27 *Self-management.* To assess participant's Self-Efficacy for Managing Chronic Diseases (SESG6), the
28
29 German version of the 6-item scale will be used.[62] The six items are rated with a 10-level Likert-type
30
31 scale (1 'not at all confident' to 10 'totally confident'). A mean score over at least four of the six items
32
33 will be calculated, thus allowing a maximum of two missing item responses. SESG6 has been attested
34
35 a high internal consistency measure of $\alpha = 0.93$. [62]

36
37
38
39 *Technology proficiency, readiness, and expectations.* A standardized face-to-face interview prior to the
40
41 use of Addison Care ('pre-use interview') will be performed to collect information on participant
42
43 technology proficiency and readiness (7 items) in terms of experience with and use of general
44
45 information and communication technologies (3 items) as well as expectations regarding the upcoming
46
47 use of the Addison Care technology (6 items). These closed-ended questions were derived from
48
49 empirical and theoretical literature [31, 32, 63] and further adapted by the research team.

50
51
52
53 *Sociodemographic and care provision variables.* Sociodemographic and care-relevant variables will be
54
55 collected by means of a short, standardized 9-item questionnaire. Age of participants, gender, living
56
57 situation, place of residence in terms of urbanization, care provision by relatives, and care provision
58
59 by ambulant/mobile care service will be assessed using closed-ended questions. Information on
60

1
2
3 documented primary diagnoses and existing additional chronic diseases will be collected using open-
4 ended questions and categorized applying the 11th revision of the International Classification of
5 Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD-11).[64]
6
7
8
9

10 **Semi-standardized research instruments**

11
12
13 *First experiences and encountered technical obstacles.* A qualitative, semi-structured brief telephone
14 interview ('mid-use interview') with users after one week of Addison interaction will be conducted.
15 Information about users' experiences to date, as well as previous effort and encountered challenges
16 in using the Addison Care technology will be collected. The user reports are to be recorded in an open-
17 ended documentation sheet.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 *User experience, fulfilled expectations, perceived enabling conditions for use and technology's social*
27 *influence, and health behaviour.* A comprehensive qualitative, semi-structured, face-to-face interview
28 will explore participants' perspectives with reference to the fulfilled expectations after the use of
29 Addison Care ('post-use interview'), perceived enabling conditions, and social influence in the use of
30 the technology, as well as the participant's experiences and adaptations of health behaviour. The
31 interview guide questions on user experience are based on the respective literature on UX research
32 [65], those on conditions and technology's social influence along the main factors of the UTAUT model
33 [31, 32], and those on health behaviours were developed against the background of the Health Action
34 Process Approach (HAPA).[66] The interview will be audio-recorded and transcribed. With reference
35 to the embedded mixed-methods approach, the four most striking individual ratings of the previously
36 collected standardized User Experience Questionnaire (UEQ) will be thematised and perceived changes
37 in secondary outcomes (functional status, quality of life, loneliness, depression, medication
38 adherence) will be assessed using open-ended questions. To address their perspectives on the use of
39 Addison Care, an optional topical block of guided questions will be operationalized.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 *Task performance scenario and think-aloud protocol.* Finally, to gain insight into user thoughts,
59 decision-making processes, and how they experience the Addison Care technology, a structured
60

1
2
3 observation with an accompanying think-aloud protocol will be applied.[67] Participants will be asked
4
5 to perform a set of specific tasks with Addison Care while verbally expressing their immediate
6
7 thoughts, and explaining their reactions during system interaction. Task performance and participant
8
9 comments will be documented using a structured observation sheet.
10
11

12
13 [Figure 2 about here]
14
15

16 **User safety and data management**

17
18 During the two weeks study period, medical emergencies, acute deterioration in health or care needs,
19
20 patients' feelings of insecurity, or hospital admissions will constitute reasons to end the participation
21
22 early. Formal health services in the community setting will be informed about the use of Addison Care
23
24 by their clients. Informal caregivers of the participants will be educated about Addison Care and are
25
26 instructed to contact the support team in need of help (see Figure 2).
27
28
29

30
31 Figure 2 provides detailed information on the different data retrieved during participants'
32
33 enrolment. Personal information of participants will be accessed by the support team only, who will
34
35 monitor the dashboard and assist with any user problems. Dashboard access is granted by login data
36
37 provided by Addison Care USA.
38
39

40
41 All data retrieved empirically (see figure 2) will be saved on study-specific computers during data
42
43 collection and stored in password-protected folders on the support team storage after completed data
44
45 collection. User engagement data will be stored on Addison Tablet PC for short periods of time being
46
47 but regularly exported onto the server from the clinical dashboard and after the end of the pilot study
48
49 transferred to study-specific computers. All personal data will be stored at a server in Berlin in
50
51 Germany and encrypted. According to European Union General Data Protection Regulations,
52
53 participants have the right to view all stored data or choose to delete their data at any given time as
54
55 long as their data has not been anonymized by code yet.
56
57
58

59 **Ethical considerations**

60

1
2
3 This pilot study was approved by the ethics committee of the German Society for Nursing Science (21-
4 037) to ensure that the research is done in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and in line with
5 the current legislation authority (see Supplementary 2). The pilot study is registered in the German
6
7
8
9
10 Clinical Trials Register (ID: DRKS00025992).

11 12 13 **Analysis**

14
15
16 Various data will be organized and triangulated in data sets Quan 1-4 and Qual 1-3 (see Figure 2) for
17
18 analysis that fit the relevant phenomenon of interest. Final integration of overall results will take place
19
20 upon conclusion of the study [37] and will be summarized with a joint display by using a mixed methods
21
22 matrix.[68]

23
24
25 Participants` characteristics will be statistically described using information on socio-demographics,
26
27 living and care provision, quality of life, health literacy, activities of daily living, and medication
28
29 adherence (Quan 1, Figure 2).

30
31
32
33 A thematic content analysis of the qualitative data gained from interviews and observations in
34
35 encounters 4 and 5 (see Figure 2) will be performed, expanding the deductively developed code by
36
37 inductive inputs.[69] Deductive codes prepared from theoretical pre-considerations will include the
38
39 concepts of user experience as well as usability. Coding strategy will separate the two phenomena
40
41 during the coding process. User experience results will be produced by triangulating the results of the
42
43 User Experience Questionnaire (Quan 3) as well as code system elements gathered in qualitative data
44
45 sets (Qual 1, 2, 3). These three data sets will provide usability results after interviews are transcribed
46
47 and coded. The codes will then be merged with the SUS results (Quan 3) to get a clear picture of
48
49 obstacles and acceptance. User Engagement data will track usage events like logins, reminders, and
50
51 overall Addison-user-interaction over the 2-week usage period - resulting in data set Quan 4 (see Figure
52
53 2). To facilitate the subsequent main study, deductive codes for the area of a feasibility study are also
54
55 included in the coding strategy.[70] All quantitative data will be analyzed using common descriptive
56
57
58
59
60 statistics.

DISCUSSION

Overview

This protocol presents research that assesses the feasibility, acceptability, experience, engagement, and usability of Addison Care – a health technology and virtual avatar for older persons with chronic diseases in their own home.

For this purpose, we culturally adopted the Addison Care technology and its functions (tutorial, medication management, testing vital signs) to explore participants' acceptance and experiences of the health technology and the virtual avatar.

For older adults with chronic diseases, the overarching goal of self-management is to enhance their quality of life and maintain independence, all while supporting formal and informal caregivers.

The goal of this pilot study is to further our understanding of the potential issues and challenges that will be used as the foundations for a larger randomized control study.

One of the strengths of this study is the use of the health technology for a longer period of time and with real patients in a natural setting. Another strength lies in the cultural adaption of the health technology and its integration in a telecare framework. The integrated voice and touch interaction with the avatar 'Addison' should also contribute to improve the human-computer interaction.

Limitations

Possible limitations of the pilot study are the lack of results on usability or acceptance of the US American version of Addison Care that we can refer to. Cultural adaption and translation into German therefore might not be the only reason for a suboptimal user experience. Interviews allow to gain insight into this issue. The effectiveness of the extensive data collection process has to be proven as well as the recruitment process. The highly selective sample of the pilot study will diminish ethnical or

1
2
3 socio-economic diversity which will be introduced thoroughly in the study following the pilot. Within
4
5 the qualitative branch of the mixed-methods study we seek sufficient richness of data but do not
6
7 expect to achieve a data saturation. The study's time line may be influenced by COVID-19 pandemic
8
9 recruitment-wise as well as by pandemic regulations in Germany which cannot be foreseen at the
10
11 current situation. Because we do not have an influence on the stability of the Internet connection, this
12
13 could be another source of uncertainty. Finally, it is not the aim of the pilot study to show effects on
14
15 the health status of the users. But the multiple instruments for testing health status-associated
16
17 phenomena should provide adequacy to show such effects in a subsequent main study.
18
19

20 21 22 **Contributors**

23
24
25 SK, NaS, JD, PK, NN, JO, ES, SP, MB, MK, REM and BM participated in the design of the study protocol.
26
27 SK, NaS, PK, JD, TK, and ES drafted the protocol manuscript. MB, BH, BM, SP, AW, DL, AvZ and JO
28
29 critically revised and commented on its previous versions and the final version. All authors critically
30
31 reviewed the manuscript and agreed on submission.
32
33

34 35 **Acknowledgements**

36
37
38 We acknowledge the Department of General Practice and Health Services Research, University
39
40 Hospital Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany for access to the German version of the SESG6.
41
42

43 44 **Funding**

45
46 This work is supported by Electronic Caregiver, Inc., Las Cruces, New Mexico, USA (no grant number)
47
48

49 50 **Declarations**

51
52 The study protocol has been approved by the ethic committee of the German Society for Nursing
53
54 Science (21-037) and is registered in the German Clinical Trials Register (ID: DRKS0002599).
55
56

57 58 **Conflict of interest**

59
60 ES, BH, and MB are employees of Electronic Caregiver, Las Cruces, New Mexico, United States

Figure legend

Figure 1 Addison Care functions in German version (Reproduced with permission from <https://electroniccaregiver.com>)

Figure 2 Study flow, phenomenon of interest, instruments, data sets, and settings


REFERENCES

1. Maresova P, Javanmardi E, Barakovic S, Barakovic Husic J, Tomsone S, Krejcar O, et al. Consequences of chronic diseases and other limitations associated with old age – a scoping review. *BMC Public Health*. 2019;19(1):1431.
2. Griffith LE, Gilsing A, Mangin D, Patterson C, van den Heuvel E, Sohel N, et al. Multimorbidity Frameworks Impact Prevalence and Relationships with Patient-Important Outcomes. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2019;67(8):1632-40.
3. Marengoni A, Angleman S, Melis R, Mangialasche F, Karp A, Garmen A, et al. Aging with multimorbidity: a systematic review of the literature. *Ageing research reviews*. 2011;10(4):430-9.
4. Neil-Sztramko SE, Coletta G, Dobbins M, Marr S. Impact of the AGE-ON Tablet Training Program on Social Isolation, Loneliness, and Attitudes Toward Technology in Older Adults: Single-Group Pre-Post Study. *JMIR Aging*. 2020;3(1):e18398-e.
5. Wonggom P, Tongpeth J, Newman P, Du H, Clark R. Effectiveness of using avatar-based technology in patient education for the improvement of chronic disease knowledge and self-care behavior: a systematic review protocol. *JBI Evidence Synthesis*. 2016;14(9):3-14.
6. Riegel B, Jaarsma T, Strömberg A. A Middle-Range Theory of Self-Care of Chronic Illness. *Advances in Nursing Science*. 2012;35(3):194-204.
7. Banbury A, Nancarrow S, Dart J, Gray L, Dodson S, Osborne R, et al. Adding value to remote monitoring: Co-design of a health literacy intervention for older people with chronic disease delivered by telehealth - The telehealth literacy project. *Patient Education & Counseling*. 2020;103(3):597-606.
8. Sheppard JP, Tucker KL, Davison WJ, Stevens R, Aekplakorn W, Bosworth HB, et al. Self-monitoring of Blood Pressure in Patients With Hypertension-Related Multi-morbidity: Systematic Review and Individual Patient Data Meta-analysis. *American Journal of Hypertension*. 2020;33(3):243-51.
9. Bailey SC, Oramasionwu CU, Wolf MS. Rethinking adherence: a health literacy-informed model of medication self-management. *Journal of health communication*. 2013;18 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):20-30.
10. Heapy AA, Higgins DM, Cervone D, Wandner L, Fenton BT, Kerns RD. A Systematic Review of Technology-assisted Self-Management Interventions for Chronic Pain: Looking Across Treatment Modalities. *The Clinical Journal of Pain*. 2015;31(6):470-92.
11. Pfaeffli Dale L, Dobson R, Whittaker R, Maddison R. The effectiveness of mobile-health behaviour change interventions for cardiovascular disease self-management: A systematic review. *European journal of preventive cardiology*. 2016;23(8):801-17.
12. Morton K, Dennison L, May C, Murray E, Little P, McManus RJ, et al. Using digital interventions for self-management of chronic physical health conditions: A meta-ethnography review of published studies. *Patient Education and Counseling*. 2017;100(4):616-35.
13. Krick T, Huter K, Domhoff D, Schmidt A, Rothgang H, Wolf-Ostermann K. Digital technology and nursing care: a scoping review on acceptance, effectiveness and efficiency studies of informal and formal care technologies. *BMC health services research*. 2019;19(1):400.

14. Maresova P, Tomsone S, Lameski P, Madureira J, Mendes A, Zdravevski E, et al. Technological Solutions for Older People with Alzheimer's Disease: Review. *Curr Alzheimer Res.* 2018;15(10):975-83.
15. Edmunds M, Tuckson R, Lewis J, Atchinson B, Rheuban K, Fanberg H, et al. An Emergent Research and Policy Framework for Telehealth. *EGEMS (Washington, DC).* 2017;5(2):1303.
16. Hale TM, Jethwani K, Kandola MS, Saldana F, Kvedar JC. A Remote Medication Monitoring System for Chronic Heart Failure Patients to Reduce Readmissions: A Two-Arm Randomized Pilot Study. *J Med Internet Res.* 2016;18(5):e91.
17. Mehta SJ, Hume E, Troxel AB, Reitz C, Norton L, Lacko H, et al. Effect of Remote Monitoring on Discharge to Home, Return to Activity, and Rehospitalization After Hip and Knee Arthroplasty: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2020;3(12):e2028328-e.
18. Su D, Michaud TL, Estabrooks P, Schwab RJ, Eiland LA, Hansen G, et al. Diabetes Management Through Remote Patient Monitoring: The Importance of Patient Activation and Engagement with the Technology. *Telemed J E Health.* 2019;25(10):952-9.
19. Hoppe KK, Williams M, Thomas N, Zella JB, Drewry A, Kim K, et al. Telehealth with remote blood pressure monitoring for postpartum hypertension: A prospective single-cohort feasibility study. *Pregnancy hypertension.* 2019;15:171-6.
20. Michaud TL, Siahpush M, Schwab RJ, Eiland LA, DeVany M, Hansen G, et al. Remote Patient Monitoring and Clinical Outcomes for Postdischarge Patients with Type 2 Diabetes. *Population health management.* 2018;21(5):387-94.
21. Foster MV, Sethares KA. Facilitators and barriers to the adoption of telehealth in older adults: an integrative review. *Computers, informatics, nursing : CIN.* 2014;32(11):523-33; quiz 34-5.
22. Wongom P, Kourbelis C, Newman P, Du H, Clark RA. Effectiveness of avatar-based technology in patient education for improving chronic disease knowledge and self-care behavior: a systematic review. *JBI database of systematic reviews and implementation reports.* 2019;17(6):1101-29.
23. Bott N, Wexler S, Drury L, Pollak C, Wang V, Scher K, et al. A Protocol-Driven, Bedside Digital Conversational Agent to Support Nurse Teams and Mitigate Risks of Hospitalization in Older Adults: Case Control Pre-Post Study. *J Med Internet Res.* 2019;21(10):e13440.
24. Cassell J. Embodied Conversational Agents: Representation and Intelligence in User Interfaces. *AI Magazine.* 2001;22(4):67.
25. Gardiner P, Hempstead MB, Ring L, Bickmore T, Yinusa-Nyahkoon L, Tran H, et al. Reaching women through health information technology: the Gabby preconception care system. *American journal of health promotion : AJHP.* 2013;27(3 Suppl):eS11-20.
26. Shaked NA. Avatars and virtual agents - relationship interfaces for the elderly. *Healthcare technology letters.* 2017;4(3):83-7.
27. McLaughlin H. *Service-user research in health and social care.* Los Angeles: SAGE. Los Angeles: SAGE; 2009.
28. Kelders SM, van Zyl LE, Ludden GDS. The Concept and Components of Engagement in Different Domains Applied to eHealth: A Systematic Scoping Review. *Front Psychol.* 2020;11:926-.
29. Sousa VEC, Dunn Lopez K. Towards Usable E-Health. A Systematic Review of Usability Questionnaires. *Appl Clin Inform.* 2017;8(2):470-90.
30. Dabbs A, Myers BA, Mc Curry KR, Dunbar-Jacob J, Hawkins RP, Begey A, et al. User-centered design and interactive health technologies for patients. *Computers, informatics, nursing : CIN.* 2009;27(3):175-83.
31. Venkatesh V, Morris MG, Davis GB, Davis FD. User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *Mis Quarterly.* 2003;27(3):425-78.
32. Holden RJ, Karsh BT. The technology acceptance model: its past and its future in health care. *Journal of biomedical informatics.* 2010;43(1):159-72.
33. Czaja SJ, Charness N, Fisk AD, Hertzog C, Nair SN, Rogers WA, et al. Factors predicting the use of technology: findings from the Center for Research and Education on Aging and Technology Enhancement (CREATE). *Psychology and aging.* 2006;21(2):333-52.


- 1
- 2
- 3 34. Kim BY, Lee J. Smart Devices for Older Adults Managing Chronic Disease: A Scoping Review. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2017;5(5):e69.
- 4
- 5 35. Hoque R, Sorwar G. Understanding factors influencing the adoption of mHealth by the
- 6 elderly: An extension of the UTAUT model. *International journal of medical informatics*. 2017;101:75-
- 7 84.
- 8 36. ECG. *Electronic Caregiver 2020* (Available from: <https://electroniccaregiver.com/>).
- 9 37. Creswell JW, Plano Clark VL. *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. 2 ed.
- 10 Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 2011.
- 11 38. Chan AW, Tetzlaff JM, Gøtzsche PC, Altman DG, Mann H, Berlin JA, et al. SPIRIT 2013
- 12 explanation and elaboration: guidance for protocols of clinical trials. *Bmj*. 2013;346:e7586.
- 13 39. Vaughn J, Summers-Goeckerman E, Shaw RJ, Shah N. A Protocol to Assess Feasibility,
- 14 Acceptability, and Usability of Mobile Technology for Symptom Management in Pediatric Transplant
- 15 Patients. *Nursing research*. 2019;68(4):317-23.
- 16 40. Giunti G, Rivera-Romero O, Kool J, Bansi J, Sevilano JL, Granja-Dominguez A, et al. Evaluation
- 17 of More Stamina, a Mobile App for Fatigue Management in Persons with Multiple Sclerosis: Protocol
- 18 for a Feasibility, Acceptability, and Usability Study. *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2020;9(8):e18196.
- 19 41. Laugwitz B, Held T, Schrepp M. Construction and Evaluation of a User Experience
- 20 Questionnaire2008. 63-76 p.
- 21 42. Schrepp M, Hinderks A, Thomaschewski J. Design and Evaluation of a Short Version of the
- 22 User Experience Questionnaire (UEQ-S). *International Journal of Interactive Multimedia and Artificial*
- 23 *Intelligence*. 2017;4(6):103-8.
- 24 43. Ruegenhagen E, Rummel B. System Usability Scale – jetzt auch auf Deutsch. *SAP User*
- 25 *Experience Community 2015* (Available from: [https://experience.sap.com/skillup/system-usability-](https://experience.sap.com/skillup/system-usability-scale-jetzt-auch-auf-deutsch/)
- 26 [scale-jetzt-auch-auf-deutsch/](https://experience.sap.com/skillup/system-usability-scale-jetzt-auch-auf-deutsch/)).
- 27 44. Brooke J. SUS: a “quick and dirty” usability. *Usability evaluation in industry*. 1996:189.
- 28 45. Lewis JR. The System Usability Scale: Past, Present, and Future. *International Journal of*
- 29 *Human-Computer Interaction*. 2018;34(7):577-90.
- 30 46. Taki S, Lymer S, Russell CG, Campbell K, Laws R, Ong KL, et al. Assessing User Engagement of
- 31 an mHealth Intervention: Development and Implementation of the Growing Healthy App
- 32 Engagement Index. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2017;5(6):e89.
- 33 47. Lalmas M, O'Brien H, Yom-Tov E. Measuring User Engagement. *Synthesis Lectures on*
- 34 *Information Concepts, Retrieval, and Services*. 2014;6(4):1-132.
- 35 48. Triberti S, Kelders SM, Gaggioli A. User engagement. In: Gemert-Pijnen Lv, Kelders SM, Kip H,
- 36 Sanderman R, editors. *eHealth Research, Theory and Development A Multi-Disciplinary Approach*.
- 37 London: Routledge; 2018. p. 271-89.
- 38 49. MDK -K-CG. https://kcgeriatrie.de/Assessments_in_der_Geriatrie/Documents/iadl.pdf 2020
- 39 (26.08.2020). Available from:
- 40 https://kcgeriatrie.de/Assessments_in_der_Geriatrie/Documents/iadl.pdf.
- 41 50. Lawton MP, Brody EM. Assessment of older people: self-maintaining and instrumental
- 42 activities of daily living. *The Gerontologist*. 1969;9(3):179-86.
- 43 51. Deppermann KM, Friedrich C, Herth F, Huber RM. (Geriatric assessment and diagnosis in
- 44 elderly patients). *Onkologie*. 2008;31 Suppl 3:6-14.
- 45 52. Ware J, Kosinski M, Dewey J, Gandek B, Kisinski M, editors. *How to score and interpret single-*
- 46 *item health status measures: a manual for users of the SF-Y" Health Survey*2001.
- 47 53. Yiengprugsawan V, Kelly M, Tawatsupa B. SF-8TM Health Survey. In: Michalos AC, editor.
- 48 *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands; 2014. p.
- 49 5940-2.
- 50 54. Hughes ME, Waite LJ, Hawkley LC, Cacioppo JT. A Short Scale for Measuring Loneliness in
- 51 Large Surveys: Results From Two Population-Based Studies. *Research on aging*. 2004;26(6):655-72.
- 52 55. Kantar P. *SOEP-Core – 2017: Personenfragebogen, Stichproben A-L3. SOEP Survey Papers*
- 53 *563: Series A*. Berlin: DIW/SOEP; 2018.
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 56. Validität und Reliabilität einer deutschen Version der Geriatrischen Depressionsskala (GDS). (Validity and reliability of a German version of the Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS).) (press release).
5 Germany: Hogrefe Verlag GmbH & Co. KG1999.
- 6
- 7 57. Sheikh JI, Yesavage JA. Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS): recent evidence and development of
8 a shorter version. *Clinical Gerontologist: The Journal of Aging and Mental Health*. 1986.
- 9 58. Allgaier AK, Kramer D, Mergl R, Fejtkova S, Hegerl U. (Validity of the geriatric depression scale
10 in nursing home residents: comparison of GDS-15, GDS-8, and GDS-4). *Psychiatrische Praxis*.
11 2011;38(6):280-6.
- 12 59. Jongenelis K, Gerritsen DL, Pot AM, Beekman AT, Eisses AM, Kluiters H, et al. Construction and
13 validation of a patient- and user-friendly nursing home version of the Geriatric Depression Scale. *Int J*
14 *Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2007;22(9):837-42.
- 15 60. Prell T, Grosskreutz J, Mendorf S, Franke GH, Witte OW, Kunze A. Clusters of non-adherence
16 to medication in neurological patients. *Research in social & administrative pharmacy : RSAP*.
17 2019;15(12):1419-24.
- 18 61. Franke G, Küch D, Jagla-Franke M. Die Erfassung der Medikamenten-Adhärenz bei
19 Schmerzpatientinnen und -patienten2019.
- 20 62. Freund T, Gensichen J, Goetz K, Szecsenyi J, Mahler C. Evaluating self-efficacy for managing
21 chronic disease: psychometric properties of the six-item Self-Efficacy Scale in Germany. *Journal of*
22 *evaluation in clinical practice*. 2013;19(1):39-43.
- 23 63. Seifert A, Schelling H. Digitale Senioren. Nutzung von Informations- und
24 Kommunikationstechnologien (IKT) durch Menschen ab 65 Jahren in der Schweiz im Jahr 20152015.
- 25 64. World Health Organization. International classification of diseases for mortality and
26 morbidity statistics (11th Revision). 2018 (Available from: <https://icd.who.int/en/>).
- 27 65. Goodman E, Kuniavsky M, Moed A. Observing the user experience : a practitioner's guide to
28 user research. Waltham, MA:: Morgan Kaufmann; 2012.
- 29 66. Schwarzer R, Fleig L. Von der Risikowahrnehmung zur Änderung des Gesundheitsverhaltens.
30 *Zentralblatt für Arbeitsmedizin, Arbeitsschutz und Ergonomie*. 2014;64(5):338-41.
- 31 67. Jaspers MW, Steen T, van den Bos C, Geenen M. The think aloud method: a guide to user
32 interface design. *Int J Med Inform*. 2004;73(11-12):781-95.
- 33 68. O'Cathain A, Murphy E, Nicholl J. Three techniques for integrating data in mixed methods
34 studies. *Bmj*. 2010;341:c4587.
- 35 69. Mayring P. Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken. 12. ed. Weinheim/Basel:
36 Beltz Verlag; 2015.
- 37 70. Bowen DJ, Kreuter M, Spring B, Cofta-Woerpel L, Linnan L, Weiner D, et al. How we design
38 feasibility studies. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2009;36(5):452-7.
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60



25 Figure 1: Addison Care functions in German version (Figure 1 reproduced with permission from
26 <https://electroniccaregiver.com>)

27 90x50mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Notes: * in case of the presence of relatives: semi-structured interview with relatives about their impressions and experiences towards AC; AC Addison Care, GDS Geriatric Depression Scale, iADL Instrumental Activities of Daily Living Scale, SAMS Stendal Adherence with Medication Score, SESGG Self-Efficacy for Managing Chronic Disease 6-item Scale, SF-8 Health Related Quality of Life Short-Form-8-Questionnaire, SUS System Usability Scale, UCLA University of California Los Angeles Loneliness Scale, UE User Engagement, UEQ User Experience Questionnaire, US Usability, UX User Experience

Figure 2: Study flow, phenomenon of interest, instruments, data sets, and settings

90x138mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Supplement 1: SPIRIT Checklist



STANDARD PROTOCOL ITEMS: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INTERVENTIONAL TRIALS

SPIRIT 2013 Checklist: Recommended items to address in a clinical trial protocol and related documents*

Section/item	Item No	Description	Protocol adherence: addressed on page number
Administrative information			
Title	1	Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, interventions, and, if applicable, trial acronym	Y:01
Trial registration	2a	Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry	Y:02
	2b	All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set	Y
Protocol version	3	Date and version identifier	NA
Funding	4	Sources and types of financial, material, and other support	Y:16
Roles and responsibilities	5a	Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors	Y:01, 16
	5b	Name and contact information for the trial sponsor	Y:16
	5c	Role of study sponsor and funders, if any, in study design; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report; and the decision to submit the report for publication, including whether they will have ultimate authority over any of these activities	Y:16
	5d	Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre, steering committee, endpoint adjudication committee, data management team, and other individuals or groups overseeing the trial, if applicable (see Item 21a for data monitoring committee)	Y:09, 13

Introduction

1				
2	Background and rationale	6a	Description of research question and justification for undertaking the trial, including summary of relevant studies (published and unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervention	Y:03-06, 08
3				
4				
5				
6				
7		6b	Explanation for choice of comparators	NA
8	Objectives	7	Specific objectives or hypotheses	Y:08
9				
10	Trial design	8	Description of trial design including type of trial (eg, parallel group, crossover, factorial, single group), allocation ratio, and framework (eg, superiority, equivalence, noninferiority, exploratory)	Y:08
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17	Methods: Participants, interventions, and outcomes			
18				
19	Study setting	9	Description of study settings (eg, community clinic, academic hospital) and list of countries where data will be collected. Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained	Y:09, Figure 2
20				
21				
22	Eligibility criteria	10	Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable, eligibility criteria for study centres and individuals who will perform the interventions (eg, surgeons, psychotherapists)	Y:09
23				
24				
25	Interventions	11a	Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication, including how and when they will be administered	Y:07-08, Figure 2
26				
27		11b	Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a given trial participant (eg, drug dose change in response to harms, participant request, or improving/worsening disease)	Y:13
28				
29				
30	Outcomes	11c	Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any procedures for monitoring adherence (eg, drug tablet return, laboratory tests)	Y:09-11, Figure 2
31				
32		11d	Relevant concomitant care and interventions that are permitted or prohibited during the trial	NA
33				
34				
35				
36				
37				
38				
39				
40				
41				
42				
43				
44				
45				
46				
47				
48				
49				
50				
51				
52				
53				
54				
55				
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				

1				
2	Participant	13	Time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any	Y:09, Figure
3	timeline		run-ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for	2
4			participants. A schematic diagram is highly	
5			recommended (see Figure)	
6				
7	Sample size	14	Estimated number of participants needed to achieve	Y:09
8			study objectives and how it was determined, including	
9			clinical and statistical assumptions supporting any	
10			sample size calculations	
11				
12				
13	Recruitment	15	Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrolment	Y:09
14			to reach target sample size	
15				

Methods: Assignment of interventions (for controlled trials)

Allocation:

16				
17				
18				
19				
20	Sequence	16a	Method of generating the allocation sequence (eg,	NA
21	generation		computer-generated random numbers), and list of any	
22			factors for stratification. To reduce predictability of a	
23			random sequence, details of any planned restriction (eg,	
24			blocking) should be provided in a separate document that	
25			is unavailable to those who enrol participants or assign	
26			interventions	
27				
28				
29				
30	Allocation	16b	Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (eg,	NA
31	concealment		central telephone; sequentially numbered, opaque,	
32	mechanism		sealed envelopes), describing any steps to conceal the	
33			sequence until interventions are assigned	
34				
35				
36	Implementation	16c	Who will generate the allocation sequence, who will enrol	NA
37			participants, and who will assign participants to	
38			interventions	
39				
40	Blinding	17a	Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg,	NA
41	(masking)		trial participants, care providers, outcome assessors,	
42			data analysts), and how	
43				
44				
45		17b	If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is	NA
46			permissible, and procedure for revealing a participant's	
47			allocated intervention during the trial	
48				

Methods: Data collection, management, and analysis

49				
50				
51	Data collection	18a	Plans for assessment and collection of outcome,	Y:10-13
52	methods		baseline, and other trial data, including any related	
53			processes to promote data quality (eg, duplicate	
54			measurements, training of assessors) and a description	
55			of study instruments (eg, questionnaires, laboratory	
56			tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known.	
57			Reference to where data collection forms can be found, if	
58			not in the protocol	
59				
60				

1				
2		18b	Plans to promote participant retention and complete	Y
3			follow-up, including list of any outcome data to be	
4			collected for participants who discontinue or deviate from	
5			intervention protocols	
6				
7	Data	19	Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage,	Y: 12-13
8	management		including any related processes to promote data quality	
9			(eg, double data entry; range checks for data values).	
10			Reference to where details of data management	
11			procedures can be found, if not in the protocol	
12				
13				
14	Statistical	20a	Statistical methods for analysing primary and secondary	Y: 14-15
15	methods		outcomes. Reference to where other details of the	
16			statistical analysis plan can be found, if not in the	
17			protocol	
18				
19				
20		20b	Methods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and	X
21			adjusted analyses)	
22				
23		20c	Definition of analysis population relating to protocol non-	X
24			adherence (eg, as randomised analysis), and any	
25			statistical methods to handle missing data (eg, multiple	
26			imputation)	
27				
28				
29	Methods: Monitoring			
30				
31	Data monitoring	21a	Composition of data monitoring committee (DMC);	X
32			summary of its role and reporting structure; statement of	
33			whether it is independent from the sponsor and	
34			competing interests; and reference to where further	
35			details about its charter can be found, if not in the	
36			protocol. Alternatively, an explanation of why a DMC is	
37			not needed	
38				
39				
40		21b	Description of any interim analyses and stopping	Y: 13
41			guidelines, including who will have access to these	
42			interim results and make the final decision to terminate	
43			the trial	
44				
45				
46	Harms	22	Plans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing	Y: 13
47			solicited and spontaneously reported adverse events and	
48			other unintended effects of trial interventions or trial	
49			conduct	
50				
51				
52	Auditing	23	Frequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if	X
53			any, and whether the process will be independent from	
54			investigators and the sponsor	
55				
56				
57	Ethics and dissemination			
58				
59				
60				

1				
2	Research ethics approval	24	Plans for seeking research ethics committee/institutional review board (REC/IRB) approval	Y: 14
3				
4				
5	Protocol amendments	25	Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC/IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators)	Y: 14
6				
7				
8				
9				
10	Consent or assent	26a	Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32)	Y: 09
11				
12				
13				
14				
15		26b	Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological specimens in ancillary studies, if applicable	NA
16				
17				
18				
19	Confidentiality	27	How personal information about potential and enrolled participants will be collected, shared, and maintained in order to protect confidentiality before, during, and after the trial	Y: 13-15
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25	Declaration of interests	28	Financial and other competing interests for principal investigators for the overall trial and each study site	Y: 16
26				
27				
28	Access to data	29	Statement of who will have access to the final trial dataset, and disclosure of contractual agreements that limit such access for investigators	NA
29				
30				
31				
32				
33	Ancillary and post-trial care	30	Provisions, if any, for ancillary and post-trial care, and for compensation to those who suffer harm from trial participation	NA
34				
35				
36				
37	Dissemination policy	31a	Plans for investigators and sponsor to communicate trial results to participants, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant groups (eg, via publication, reporting in results databases, or other data sharing arrangements), including any publication restrictions	Y: 15
38				
39				
40				
41				
42				
43				
44		31b	Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional writers	NA
45				
46				
47				
48		31c	Plans, if any, for granting public access to the full protocol, participant-level dataset, and statistical code	X
49				
50				
51	Appendices			
52				
53	Informed consent materials	32	Model consent form and other related documentation given to participants and authorised surrogates	X
54				
55				
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				

1
2 Biological 33 Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation, and storage of NA
3 specimens biological specimens for genetic or molecular analysis in
4 the current trial and for future use in ancillary studies, if
5 applicable
6
7

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Ethikkommission der DGP • Stockumer Straße 12 • 58453 Witten

Paracelsus Medizinische Privatuniversität
Herrn Univ.-Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Jürgen Osterbrink
Vorstand des Instituts für Pflegewissenschaft und -praxis
Strubergasse 21
A - 5020 Salzburg



Deutsche Gesellschaft für Pflegewissenschaft
(DGP) e. V.
Geschäftsstelle
Bürgerstr. 47
47057 Duisburg

Telefon: 0203 – 356793
info@dg-pflegewissenschaft.de

Ethikkommission der Deutschen Gesellschaft
für Pflegewissenschaft
(DGP) e.V.
Vorsitz Prof. Dr. Sabine Bartholomeyczik
Stockumer Str. 12
58453 Witten

Ethikkommission@dg-pflegewissenschaft.de

Your proposal no. 21-037 to the ethical review committee of the German Society of Nursing Science (EK-DGP)

Dear Mr. Osterbrink,

the EK-DGP discussed and evaluated your proposal

A pilot study of Addison Care, the Virtual Telecare Technology, - PiloTT-A (application no. 21-037)
submitted 2021-11-16.

The committee decided to give you an ethical approval.

Good luck for the project!

2021-12-27

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Sabine Bartholomeyczik', is written over the letter.

Prof. Dr. Sabine Bartholomeyczik
Chairperson EK-DGP

BMJ Open

Piloting of the virtual telecare technology 'Addison Care' to promote self-management in persons with chronic diseases in a community setting: protocol for a mixed methods user experience, user engagement and usability pilot study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2022-062159.R2
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	19-Aug-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Krutter, Simon; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Schuessler, Nadine; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Kutschar, Patrick; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Šabić, Edin; New Mexico State University, Department of Psychology; Electronic Caregiver Inc Dellinger, Johanna; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Klausner, Tabea; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Nestler, Nadja; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Beasley, Morgan; Electronic Caregiver Inc Henderson, Bailey; Electronic Caregiver Inc Pitzer, Stefan; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Mitterlehner, Barbara; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Langegger, Doris; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Winkler, Anna; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Kloesch, Michael; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice EBl-Maurer, Roland; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice van der Zee-Neuen, Antje; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Osterbrink, Jürgen; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice; University of North Florida, Brooks College of Health
Primary Subject Heading:	Nursing
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Keywords:	PRIMARY CARE, PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, GERIATRIC MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Piloting of the virtual telecare technology ‘Addison Care’ to promote self-management in persons**
4 **with chronic diseases in a community setting: protocol for a mixed methods user experience, user**
5 **engagement and usability pilot study**
6
7
8
9

10
11 **Authors:** Simon Krutter¹, Nadine Schuessler¹, Patrick Kutschar¹, Edin Šabić^{2,3}, Johanna Dellinger¹,
12
13 Tabea Klausner¹, Nadja Nestler¹, Morgan Beasley³, Bailey Henderson³, Stefan Pitzer¹, Barbara
14
15 Mitterlehner¹, Doris Langegger¹, Anna Winkler¹, Michael Kloesch¹, Roland Eßl-Maurer¹, Antje van der
16
17 Zee-Neuen¹, Jürgen Osterbrink^{1,4}
18
19

20
21 **Affiliations**
22

23
24 ¹ Institute of Nursing Science and Practice, Paracelsus Medical University, Salzburg, Austria
25

26 ² Department of Psychology, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico, United States
27

28 ³ Electronic Caregiver Inc., Las Cruces, New Mexico, United States
29

30 ⁴ Brooks College of Health, University of North Florida, Jacksonville, Florida, United States
31
32

33 **Corresponding Author Information**
34

35
36 Simon Krutter
37

38
39 Institute of Nursing Science and Practice, Paracelsus Medical University, Salzburg, Austria
40

41
42 Strubergasse 21, 5020 Salzburg, Austria
43

44
45 Email: simon.krutter@pmu.ac.at
46

47
48 Phone: +43 662 2024 80341
49

50
51 ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5788-9574
52
53

54
55 **Word Count:** 4.130
56

57
58 **ABSTRACT** (293 words)
59
60

1
2
3 **Introduction:** Chronic diseases in older adults are one of the major epidemiological challenges of
4 current times and leading cause of disability, poor quality of life, high health care costs, and death.
5
6 Self-management of chronic diseases is essential to improve health behaviors and health outcomes.
7
8 Technology-assisted interventions have shown to improve self-management of chronic diseases.
9
10 Virtual avatars can be a key factor for the acceptance of these technologies. Addison Care is a home-
11 based telecare solution equipped with a virtual avatar named Addison, connecting older persons with
12 their caregivers via an easy-to-use technology. A central advantage is that Addison care provides access
13 to self-management support for an up-to-now highly underrepresented population - older persons
14 with chronic disease(s), which enables them to profit from e-health in everyday life.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 **Methods and analysis:** A pragmatic, non-randomized, one-arm pilot study applying an embedded
25 mixed-methods approach will be conducted to examine user experience, usability, and user
26 engagement of the virtual avatar Addison. Participants will be at least 65 years old and will be recruited
27 between September 2022 and November 2022 from hospitals during the discharge process to home
28 care. Standardized instruments, namely the User Experience Questionnaire (UEQ), System Usability
29 Scale (SUS), Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (iADL) scale, Short-Form-8-Questionnaire (SF-8),
30 UCLA Loneliness Scale, Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS), Stendal Adherence with Medication Score
31 (SAMS) and Self-Efficacy for Managing Chronic Diseases Scale (SESG6), as well as survey-based
32 assessments, semi-structured interviews and think-aloud protocols will be used. The study seeks to
33 enroll 20 patients that meet the criteria.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Ethics and dissemination:** The study protocol has been approved by the ethic committee of the
49 German Society for Nursing Science (21-037). The results are intended to be published in peer-
50 reviewed journals and disseminated through conference papers.
51
52
53
54
55

56 **Trial registration number:** German Clinical Trials Register (ID: DRKS00025992).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Keywords:** Telecare, virtual avatar, older people, chronic disease self-management, pilot study, user
4
5 experience, e-health;
6
7

8 **STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY**

9

- 10
11
12 - This pilot study provides an opportunity to explore the acceptability of and experiences with
13 a potentially beneficial e-health technology in the underrepresented population of
14 chronically ill older persons in a telecare setting.
15
16
17
18 - The mixed-methods study design will provide a deep and broad insight on usability, user
19 experience and user engagement of Addison care as a German-speaking, culturally adapted
20 virtual avatar.
21
22
23 - This investigation evaluates the efficacy of a sophisticated virtual avatar, Addison, in assisting
24 with many crucial health management tasks – including medication management and health
25 vitals monitoring.
26
27
28 - A focus on barriers to user-engagement for those who are technologically hesitant will
29 provide rich information concerning how best to design virtual avatars and e-health
30 technologies to match user needs and mental models.
31
32
33 - The primary limitation of this study is the relatively small sample size due to our selective
34 inclusion criteria, which may diminish the ethnic and socio-economic diversity of our sample.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **BACKGROUND**

48

49
50 Societies across the globe are facing a significant shift in age demographics whereby older adults are
51 becoming an increasingly larger group within their population. This phenomenon is one of the most
52 salient economic, social, and medical issues of current times.[1] Aging increases both the risk for most
53 chronic diseases and for multimorbidity. Between 34% and 61% of older adults are multimorbid [2],
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 which can have consequences such as disability and functional decline, poor quality of life, social
4
5 isolation, depression, and high health care costs.[3, 4]
6
7

8 Patients themselves have an integral role in the management of their chronic disease.[5] Factors that
9
10 influence effective self-management of chronic disease include: experience, skill, motivation, culture,
11
12 confidence, habits, physical and mental function, social support, and access to care.[6]
13
14

15
16 Self-management of chronic diseases is defined as the response to signs and symptoms when they
17
18 occur, with the goal that patients play an active role in optimising health outcomes and minimizing the
19
20 impact of their conditions.[6] Self-management support refers to patient, healthcare professional, and
21
22 healthcare system interventions aimed to improve self-management behaviours.[7] Self-monitoring
23
24 vitals [8] and medication adherence have been recognized as two of the most essential self-
25
26 management activities performed by patients to promote their health.[9]
27
28

29
30 Although interventions designed to promote self-management in chronic diseases have traditionally
31
32 been offered in-person, delivering these interventions remotely utilizing available technology (e.g.,
33
34 mobile smart phones, Internet, interactive voice response, telephone, virtual reality) has become more
35
36 prevalent.[10] These technology-assisted interventions have shown to improve self-management and
37
38 health status.[11, 12]
39
40

41
42 Digital information technologies support people with care requirements to maintain their
43
44 independence, improve quality of life, increase health literacy and aid caregivers in their duties.[13,
45
46 14] Telehealth is one of the fastest-growing sectors in health care. The term refers to a broad array of
47
48 provider-to-patient communication and has been defined as using telecommunications, information
49
50 technologies, and devices to share information and to provide clinical, population health, and
51
52 administrative services at a distance.[15] Remote patient monitoring is a widely used telehealth
53
54 intervention that can effectively support self-management in patients with chronic diseases.[7]
55
56
57

58 **Remote Patient Monitoring**

59
60

1
2
3 Remote Patient Monitoring (RPM) is a promising solution for facilitating the patient-physician
4 relationship while addressing the shortage of healthcare workers today.
5
6

7
8 Studies concerning the efficacy of RPM has spanned the topics of post-operative rehospitalization,
9 chronic disease management, medication adherence, and quality of life and has shown promising
10 results.[16-20] However, RPM technology can only benefit patients who choose to actively interact
11 with the devices. As compared to younger users, elderly users also face unique challenges that are a
12 direct result of aging – such as declines in dexterity, hearing, and vision. As a result, researchers have
13 identified that improving ease of navigation for task completion, ensuring appropriate size and color
14 of font, and properly configuring the size of the hardware itself are paramount in addressing
15 technological hesitancy.[21]
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 27 **Virtual Avatars**

28
29 Graphic user interfaces, which can improve the user experience and personalize the experience for the
30 user through virtual avatars, have begun to be incorporated into RPM systems. Virtual avatars are an
31 emerging feature in RPM that has shown propitious results in terms of user engagement, health
32 education, and self-care behavior.[22]
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 One important factor in the receptiveness of patients to virtual avatars is the avatar's appearance. Bott
41 [23] investigated the impact of a virtual pet avatar to deliver surveys to older clients. They found that
42 those who interacted with the avatar experienced lower rates of delirium, fewer falls, and decreased
43 loneliness. However, research has generally shown that anthropomorphic characteristics are often
44 preferable for virtual healthcare avatars [24] – as well as similarities in appearance between the avatar
45 and the user.[25] Previous literature has revealed that when designing virtual agents for older persons,
46 key factors related to acceptance of technology include conversational latency, gamification, and
47 artificially intelligent lexicon.[26]
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 **User experience and technology acceptance among older persons**

59
60

1
2
3 Understanding how older adults perceive technology and virtual avatars may lead to improvements in
4 the accessibility, acceptability, and adoption of virtual avatars among older persons with chronic
5 diseases. This can be accomplished through user experience (UX) research, wherein the overall
6 experience of the user is assessed through measures related to usability, user engagement, usefulness,
7 function, credibility, and satisfaction with the technology.[27] While behavior, cognition, and affect
8 are important defining components of user engagement [28], learnability, efficiency, memorability,
9 few errors and satisfaction are defining components of usability.[29] UX is based upon User-Centered
10 Design (UCD), wherein the needs and characteristics of the end user become the focus of technology
11 design and development, with the intention of higher acceptance and fewer user errors.[30]

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 Theories that predict and explain health technology acceptance and use can help to tailor the
25 technology to specific patient needs. One of the more recent models, the Unified Theory of Acceptance
26 and Use of Technology (UTAUT) [31], posits that a person's intent to use [acceptance of technology]
27 and usage behavior (actual use) of a technology is predicated by the patient's performance and effort
28 expectancy of the technology. The UTAUT also suggests social influence and facilitating conditions as
29 determinants of behavioral intention to use the technology.[31, 32] Most older persons are
30 significantly less adept at technology use than the general population, with technology anxiety being
31 a major influence on older users' intent to use technologies.[33] However, older adults are interested
32 in integrating new technologies into their healthcare.[34] Studies confirm the applicability of the
33 UTAUT in the context of Telecare services among older persons.[35]

46 47 **Intervention: Addison Care Tablet Personal Computer (PC)**

48
49
50 The present research pilots an intervention provided by Addison Care [36], which is an innovative
51 home-bound connected virtual RPM platform for individuals living with chronic disease. A 3D-
52 animated nurse named 'Addison' is the center of interaction between the system and its users,
53 personifying the telehealth experience for the user. The pilot study encompasses two health-related
54 functions of Addison Care: 'Addison' supporting the user in self-monitoring relevant vitals (blood
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 pressure, weight, pulse and oxygen saturation) as well as medication schedule adherence. This is
4
5 achieved by offering reminder and monitoring functionalities (see Fig. 1).
6
7

8 [Figure 1 about here]
9

10
11 The Addison Care hardware consists of a tablet PC with a speaker, a microphone module, and a touch
12
13 screen (see Figure 1). The tablet connects with Bluetooth vitals measuring devices and can be installed
14
15 in a user's home. Avatar technology combined with natural language understanding and automatic
16
17 speech recognition provides users with effective natural interaction with the assisting technology.[22,
18
19 26] Subtitles, vital signs, and medications are graphically illustrated on the Addison Care interface for
20
21 clear communication between the virtual agent and the user.
22
23

24
25 The Addison Tablet PC is connected to a web-based dashboard that allows access to user data,
26
27 including vitals measurements and medication reminders. For the pilot study, medication plans,
28
29 reminder-options, and contact information are managed by members of the study team, who also act
30
31 as a support team for the technical set-up and in case of technical problems. The intervention in this
32
33 study involves voice-driven audio-centered interaction between Addison and users in German, as well
34
35 as the implementation of a German touch screen interface. Introduction of Addison Care to German
36
37 users requires adaption of the original technology to ensure a good cultural fit. Adaptations were made
38
39 to the surroundings of the avatar, as well as to Addison's mannerisms. Additionally, changes were
40
41 made to the system to ensure a good fit between system and real life in terms of interactive elements
42
43 [from basics ensuring appropriate data and time formats to more complex elements like making sure
44
45 the avatar interacts in a culturally appropriate manner with the user). Voice and touch interaction
46
47 modes are currently adapted from English into German. All piloted features of Addison Care are shown
48
49
50
51
52 in Fig. 1.
53

54 **Objectives**

55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 While other studies have provided insight into the potential of digital health technology and virtual
4 avatars, the vast majority have been tested within laboratory settings, where older adults were unable
5 to interact with the technology in a natural environment. Additionally, the digital health systems and
6 virtual avatars were not culturally adapted after development.
7
8
9

10
11
12 The study aims to explore the feasibility, acceptability, experience, engagement, and usability of the
13 culturally tailored health technology and the virtual avatar Addison for self-management for older
14 patients with chronic diseases in their own home.
15
16
17
18
19

20 21 **METHODS AND ANALYSIS**

22
23
24 A pragmatic, non-randomized, one-arm pilot study applying an embedded mixed-methods approach
25 will be conducted to examine the primary outcomes 'user experience', 'usability', and 'user
26 engagement' of the virtual avatar Addison three times within the use span. 'Embedded' refers to the
27 integration of qualitative methods into a quantitative methodology framework, or vice versa, to
28 provide enriched insights or understanding into the phenomena of interest.[31, 37] The study design
29 is pluralistic, problem-centered, real-world applicable, and focused on the consequences of actions,
30 stemming from pragmatism as a research paradigm.[37] The present protocol followed the SPIRIT
31 guidelines (see Supplementary 1).[38] Data collection will take place between September 2022 and
32 November 2022.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Recruitment criteria and process**

46
47
48 Eligible patients will be identified by medical specialists in in German hospitals. The inclusion criteria
49 are as follows:
50
51

- 52 - Planned patients transition from hospital to extramural care
 - 53 - Three to nine drugs (regular intake of drugs, no status of hypermedication)
 - 54 - 65 years or older with a chronic health condition
 - 55 - Ability to speak and understand German language
- 56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The exclusion criteria are:
4

- 5
6 - Ten or more drugs per day
7
8 - Younger than 65 years old
9
10 - Moderate to severe cognitive impairment or severe psychiatric disorders
11
12

13
14 Provided that these criteria are met and general interest in using health technology is expressed,
15
16 information about the pilot study and the intervention will be shared. If a patient declares the will to
17
18 participate, a meeting with the support team will be arranged while the patient is still at the hospital.
19
20 Potential participants will be informed of all aspects of the study through verbal instruction and written
21
22 materials (Figure 2, Encounter 1). After written informed consent (see Supplementary 2) is provided,
23
24 living situation and socio-demographic data will be assessed by research assistants.
25
26
27

28 **Setting and sample size**

29
30
31 Addison Care will be piloted in participants' homes, located in a community setting, after their
32
33 discharge from hospital for two consecutive weeks. In Encounter 2 (see Figure 2) within 1 day after the
34
35 informed consent is provided, the support team will give first instructions on Addison Care while the
36
37 participant is still hospitalized. First adjustments of reminder, medication plan, and vital measurements
38
39 will be provisioned for the use of Addison Tablet PC at home. This study seeks to enroll 20 patients.
40
41 The sample size is an adequate number to evaluate study feasibility, test the study procedures and
42
43 explore the user experience.[39, 40]
44
45
46
47

48 **Patient and public involvement**

49
50
51 In advance of the pilot study, older adults assisted in the development of the data collection materials
52
53 and pre-testing of Addison Care. However, patients and the public were not involved in the
54
55 development of the research question, outcome measures and the design of the study.
56
57
58

59 **Outcomes, Instruments, and Variables**

1
2
3 Building upon the theoretical concepts of technology acceptance (UTAUT), we will assess user
4 experience, usability, and user engagement (primary outcomes), as well as participant background
5 information (e.g., sociodemographic, care provision) and health status-associated phenomena
6 (functional status, quality of life and wellbeing, loneliness, depression, medication adherence, and self-
7 management) using standardized, quantitative and semi-standardized qualitative research
8 instruments (see Figure 2).
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 17 **Standardized research instruments**

18
19
20 *User experience.* The German version of the User Experience Questionnaire (UEQ) [41] will be used to
21 assess user experience. The UEQ consists of 26 items along six scales: attractiveness (6 items,
22 Cronbach's alpha $\alpha=0.89$), perspicuity (4 items, $\alpha=0.82$), efficiency (4 items, $\alpha=0.73$), dependability (4
23 items, $\alpha=0.65$), stimulation (4 items, $\alpha=0.76$), and novelty (4 items, $\alpha=0.83$).[41, 42] Each item
24 represents a 7-point rating scale (-3 most negative rating, +3 most positive rating) of properties that
25 the product under study may have. An average score is computed for each scale.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34
35 *Usability.* To assess the usability of Addison Care, the validated German version of the System Usability
36 Scale (SUS) will be applied.[43] The SUS [44] consists of 10 items and is a standardized, generic
37 instrument for assessing the usability of technical applications, mobile applications, or devices. Internal
38 consistency has been reported to range between $\alpha=0.70$ to 0.95.[45] The SUS consists of 10 items,
39 each with five-point rating scales (1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree). The standardized scoring of
40 the SUS results in a total score between 0 to 100 points using a given norm-based scoring
41 algorithm.[45]
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 *User engagement.* Automatic system and data logging information will be used to measure user
52 engagement in terms of intensity and type of interactions between users and Addison Care. This non-
53 participatory data collection, e.g., documenting data using automatically protocolled technical
54 variables without having asked questions or the presence of an observer, will provide essential
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 information on the actual use, used functions, and user engagement with certain contents of the
4 product of interest.[46-48]
5
6

7
8 *Functional status.* The German translation [49] of the Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (iADL) scale
9 [50] will be applied to assess patients' functional status in terms of activities of daily living. The iADL is
10 a standardized instrument that measures functionality related to eight domains of daily living. It has
11 reported reliability coefficients ranging from 0.85 to 0.91.[51] Each domain is measured using either
12 three or four ability levels with 0 or 1 point per domain, resulting in a summary score of 8 points at
13 maximum. Due to a strong reference of some items to household aspects, gender-specific scores will
14 be used, e.g., 0 (low function, dependent) to 8 (high function, independent) for women and 0 to 5 for
15 men, respectively.[51]
16
17

18
19 *Quality of life.* Health-related quality of life will be measured by the German version of the Short-Form-
20 8-Questionnaire (SF-8).[52] The SF-8 assesses the 8 dimensions physical functioning, role physical (role
21 limitations because of physical health), bodily pain, general health, vitality, social functioning, role
22 emotional (role limitations because of emotional problems), and mental health, by one item each, and
23 along two scales 'physical component summary score' and 'mental component summary score'. The
24 items comprise of five- or six-point response scales that verbalize the extent to which each dimension
25 is present. In addition to single-item analysis, the two summary scores will be measured using a given
26 norm-based scoring method. Next to an adequate test-retest reliability [52], an overall internal
27 consistency between $\alpha=0.86$ and 0.92 have been reported.[53]
28
29

30
31 *Loneliness.* To assess participants' perception of social isolation and loneliness, the shortened, 3-item
32 German version [54, 55] of the UCLA (University of California, Los Angeles) Loneliness Scale will be
33 applied. Each item exhibits a five-level response scale (very often, often, sometimes, rarely, never) and
34 will be analysed item-by-item. Cronbach's alpha for the 3-item loneliness scale was 0.72.[54]
35
36

37
38 *Depression.* The German translation [56] of the Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS) will be used to
39 evaluate the presence of depression.[57, 58] The 8-item version will be applied to make the survey as
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 time-efficient as possible.[59] Participants are asked about selected symptoms of depressive states
4
5 over the past week using a dichotomous response format (no vs. yes). The total sum score of the GDS-8
6
7 is 0-8 points. Internal consistency with $\alpha > 0.80$ has been shown [59]. A recommended cut-off score of
8
9 GDS ≥ 3 indicating relevant indications of depression will be applied.

11
12
13 *Medication adherence.* Participants' adherence to their medication regimen will be measured by the
14
15 Stendal Adherence with Medication Score (SAMS).[60] SAMS consists of 18 items on a five-level
16
17 response scale (0-4) assessing fully adherent to nonadherent medication behaviour per item.[61]
18
19 Responses are summarized into a cumulative point scale (0-72), which can be categorized as fully
20
21 adherent (0), moderately adherent (1-10), and not adherent (>10). An overall internal consistency of
22
23 $\alpha = 0.83$ has been reported.[61]

24
25
26
27 *Self-management.* To assess participant's Self-Efficacy for Managing Chronic Diseases (SESG6), the
28
29 German version of the 6-item scale will be used.[62] The six items are rated with a 10-level Likert-type
30
31 scale (1 'not at all confident' to 10 'totally confident'). A mean score over at least four of the six items
32
33 will be calculated, thus allowing a maximum of two missing item responses. SESG6 has been attested
34
35 a high internal consistency measure of $\alpha = 0.93$. [62]

36
37
38
39 *Technology proficiency, readiness, and expectations.* A standardized face-to-face interview prior to the
40
41 use of Addison Care ('pre-use interview') will be performed to collect information on participant
42
43 technology proficiency and readiness (7 items) in terms of experience with and use of general
44
45 information and communication technologies (3 items) as well as expectations regarding the upcoming
46
47 use of the Addison Care technology (6 items). These closed-ended questions were derived from
48
49 empirical and theoretical literature [31, 32, 63] and further adapted by the research team.

50
51
52
53 *Sociodemographic and care provision variables.* Sociodemographic and care-relevant variables will be
54
55 collected by means of a short, standardized 9-item questionnaire. Age of participants, gender, living
56
57 situation, place of residence in terms of urbanization, care provision by relatives, and care provision
58
59 by ambulant/mobile care service will be assessed using closed-ended questions. Information on
60

1
2
3 documented primary diagnoses and existing additional chronic diseases will be collected using open-
4 ended questions and categorized applying the 11th revision of the International Classification of
5 Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD-11).[64]
6
7
8
9

10 **Semi-standardized research instruments**

11
12
13 *First experiences and encountered technical obstacles.* A qualitative, semi-structured brief telephone
14 interview ('mid-use interview') with users after one week of Addison interaction will be conducted.
15 Information about users' experiences to date, as well as previous effort and encountered challenges
16 in using the Addison Care technology will be collected. The user reports are to be recorded in an open-
17 ended documentation sheet.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 *User experience, fulfilled expectations, perceived enabling conditions for use and technology's social*
27 *influence, and health behaviour.* A comprehensive qualitative, semi-structured, face-to-face interview
28 will explore participants' perspectives with reference to the fulfilled expectations after the use of
29 Addison Care ('post-use interview'), perceived enabling conditions, and social influence in the use of
30 the technology, as well as the participant's experiences and adaptations of health behaviour. The
31 interview guide questions on user experience are based on the respective literature on UX research
32 [65], those on conditions and technology's social influence along the main factors of the UTAUT model
33 [31, 32], and those on health behaviours were developed against the background of the Health Action
34 Process Approach (HAPA).[66] The interview will be audio-recorded and transcribed. With reference
35 to the embedded mixed-methods approach, the four most striking individual ratings of the previously
36 collected standardized User Experience Questionnaire (UEQ) will be thematised and perceived changes
37 in secondary outcomes (functional status, quality of life, loneliness, depression, medication
38 adherence) will be assessed using open-ended questions. To address their perspectives on the use of
39 Addison Care, an optional topical block of guided questions will be operationalized.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 *Task performance scenario and think-aloud protocol.* Finally, to gain insight into user thoughts,
59 decision-making processes, and how they experience the Addison Care technology, a structured
60

1
2
3 observation with an accompanying think-aloud protocol will be applied.[67] Participants will be asked
4
5 to perform a set of specific tasks with Addison Care while verbally expressing their immediate
6
7 thoughts, and explaining their reactions during system interaction. Task performance and participant
8
9 comments will be documented using a structured observation sheet.
10
11

12
13 [Figure 2 about here]
14
15

16 **User safety and data management**

17
18 During the two weeks study period, medical emergencies, acute deterioration in health or care needs,
19
20 patients' feelings of insecurity, or hospital admissions will constitute reasons to end the participation
21
22 early. Formal health services in the community setting will be informed about the use of Addison Care
23
24 by their clients. Informal caregivers of the participants will be educated about Addison Care and are
25
26 instructed to contact the support team in need of help (see Figure 2).
27
28
29

30
31 Figure 2 provides detailed information on the different data retrieved during participants'
32
33 enrolment. Personal information of participants will be accessed by the support team only, who will
34
35 monitor the dashboard and assist with any user problems. Dashboard access is granted by login data
36
37 provided by Addison Care USA.
38
39

40
41 All data retrieved empirically (see figure 2) will be saved on study-specific computers during data
42
43 collection and stored in password-protected folders on the support team storage after completed data
44
45 collection. User engagement data will be stored on Addison Tablet PC for short periods of time being
46
47 but regularly exported onto the server from the clinical dashboard and after the end of the pilot study
48
49 transferred to study-specific computers. All personal data will be stored at a server in Berlin in
50
51 Germany and encrypted. According to European Union General Data Protection Regulations,
52
53 participants have the right to view all stored data or choose to delete their data at any given time as
54
55 long as their data has not been anonymized by code yet.
56
57
58

59 **Analysis**

60

1
2
3 Various data will be organized and triangulated in data sets Quan 1-4 and Qual 1-3 (see Figure 2) for
4 analysis that fit the relevant phenomenon of interest. Final integration of overall results will take place
5 upon conclusion of the study [37] and will be summarized with a joint display by using a mixed methods
6 matrix.[68]
7
8
9

10
11
12 Participants` characteristics will be statistically described using information on socio-demographics,
13 living and care provision, quality of life, health literacy, activities of daily living, and medication
14 adherence (Quan 1, Figure 2).
15
16
17
18

19
20
21 A thematic content analysis of the qualitative data gained from interviews and observations in
22 encounters 4 and 5 (see Figure 2) will be performed, expanding the deductively developed code by
23 inductive inputs.[69] Deductive codes prepared from theoretical pre-considerations will include the
24 concepts of user experience as well as usability. Coding strategy will separate the two phenomena
25 during the coding process. User experience results will be produced by triangulating the results of the
26 User Experience Questionnaire (Quan 3) as well as code system elements gathered in qualitative data
27 sets (Qual 1, 2, 3). These three data sets will provide usability results after interviews are transcribed
28 and coded. The codes will then be merged with the SUS results (Quan 3) to get a clear picture of
29 obstacles and acceptance. User Engagement data will track usage events like logins, reminders, and
30 overall Addison-user-interaction over the 2-week usage period - resulting in data set Quan 4 (see Figure
31 2). To facilitate the subsequent main study, deductive codes for the area of a feasibility study are also
32 included in the coding strategy.[70] All quantitative data will be analyzed using common descriptive
33 statistics.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 51 **Ethics and dissemination**

52 53 54 **Ethical considerations**

55
56
57 This pilot study was approved by the ethics committee of the German Society for Nursing Science (21-
58 037) to ensure that the research is done in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and in line with
59
60

1
2
3 the current legislation authority (see Supplementary 3). The pilot study is registered in the German
4
5 Clinical Trials Register (ID: DRKS00025992).
6
7

8 **Overview**

9

10
11 This protocol presents research that assesses the feasibility, acceptability, experience, engagement,
12
13 and usability of Addison Care – a health technology and virtual avatar for older persons with chronic
14
15 diseases in their own home.
16
17

18
19 For this purpose, we culturally adopted the Addison Care technology and its functions (tutorial,
20
21 medication management, testing vital signs) to explore participants' acceptance and experiences of
22
23 the health technology and the virtual avatar.
24
25

26
27 For older adults with chronic diseases, the overarching goal of self-management is to enhance their
28
29 quality of life and maintain independence, all while supporting formal and informal caregivers.
30
31

32
33 The goal of this pilot study is to further our understanding of the potential issues and challenges that
34
35 will be used as the foundations for a larger randomized control study.
36
37

38
39 One of the strengths of this study is the use of the health technology for a longer period of time and
40
41 with real patients in a natural setting. Another strength lies in the cultural adaption of the health
42
43 technology and its integration in a telecare framework. The integrated voice and touch interaction with
44
45 the avatar 'Addison' should also contribute to improve the human-computer interaction.
46
47

48 **Limitations**

49

50
51
52 Possible limitations of the pilot study are the lack of results on usability or acceptance of the US
53
54 American version of Addison Care that we can refer to. Cultural adaption and translation into German
55
56 therefore might not be the only reason for a suboptimal user experience. Interviews allow to gain
57
58 insight into this issue. The effectiveness of the extensive data collection process has to be proven as
59
60

1
2
3 well as the recruitment process. The highly selective sample of the pilot study will diminish ethnical or
4 socio-economic diversity which will be introduced thoroughly in the study following the pilot. Within
5 the qualitative branch of the mixed-methods study we seek sufficient richness of data but do not
6 expect to achieve a data saturation. The study's time line may be influenced by COVID-19 pandemic
7 recruitment-wise as well as by pandemic regulations in Germany which cannot be foreseen at the
8 current situation. Because we do not have an influence on the stability of the Internet connection, this
9 could be another source of uncertainty. Finally, it is not the aim of the pilot study to show effects on
10 the health status of the users. But the multiple instruments for testing health status-associated
11 phenomena should provide adequacy to show such effects in a subsequent main study.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Contributors**

25
26 SK, NaS, JD, PK, NN, JO, ES, SP, MB, MK, REM and BM participated in the design of the study protocol.
27
28 SK, NaS, PK, JD, TK, and ES drafted the protocol manuscript. MB, BH, BM, SP, AW, DL, AvZ and JO
29 critically revised and commented on its previous versions and the final version. All authors critically
30 reviewed the manuscript and agreed on submission.
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Acknowledgements**

38
39 We acknowledge the Department of General Practice and Health Services Research, University
40 Hospital Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany for access to the German version of the SESG6.
41
42
43
44

45 **Funding**

46
47 This work is supported by Electronic Caregiver, Inc., Las Cruces, New Mexico, USA (no grant number)
48
49
50

51 **Declarations**

52
53 The study protocol has been approved by the ethic committee of the German Society for Nursing
54 Science (21-037) and is registered in the German Clinical Trials Register (ID: DRKS0002599).
55
56
57
58
59

60 **Conflict of interest**

ES, BH, and MB are employees of Electronic Caregiver, Las Cruces, New Mexico, United States

Figure legend

Figure 1 Addison Care functions in German version (Reproduced with permission from <https://electroniccaregiver.com>)

Figure 2 Study flow, phenomenon of interest, instruments, data sets, and settings

REFERENCES

1. Maresova P, Javanmardi E, Barakovic S, Barakovic Husic J, Tomsone S, Krejcar O, et al. Consequences of chronic diseases and other limitations associated with old age – a scoping review. *BMC Public Health*. 2019;19(1):1431.
2. Griffith LE, Gilsing A, Mangin D, Patterson C, van den Heuvel E, Sohel N, et al. Multimorbidity Frameworks Impact Prevalence and Relationships with Patient-Important Outcomes. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2019;67(8):1632-40.
3. Marengoni A, Angleman S, Melis R, Mangialasche F, Karp A, Garmen A, et al. Aging with multimorbidity: a systematic review of the literature. *Ageing research reviews*. 2011;10(4):430-9.
4. Neil-Sztramko SE, Coletta G, Dobbins M, Marr S. Impact of the AGE-ON Tablet Training Program on Social Isolation, Loneliness, and Attitudes Toward Technology in Older Adults: Single-Group Pre-Post Study. *JMIR Aging*. 2020;3(1):e18398-e.
5. Wonggom P, Tongpeth J, Newman P, Du H, Clark R. Effectiveness of using avatar-based technology in patient education for the improvement of chronic disease knowledge and self-care behavior: a systematic review protocol. *JBIC Evidence Synthesis*. 2016;14(9):3-14.
6. Riegel B, Jaarsma T, Strömberg A. A Middle-Range Theory of Self-Care of Chronic Illness. *Advances in Nursing Science*. 2012;35(3):194-204.
7. Banbury A, Nancarrow S, Dart J, Gray L, Dodson S, Osborne R, et al. Adding value to remote monitoring: Co-design of a health literacy intervention for older people with chronic disease delivered by telehealth - The telehealth literacy project. *Patient Education & Counseling*. 2020;103(3):597-606.
8. Sheppard JP, Tucker KL, Davison WJ, Stevens R, Aekplakorn W, Bosworth HB, et al. Self-monitoring of Blood Pressure in Patients With Hypertension-Related Multi-morbidity: Systematic Review and Individual Patient Data Meta-analysis. *American Journal of Hypertension*. 2020;33(3):243-51.
9. Bailey SC, Oramasionwu CU, Wolf MS. Rethinking adherence: a health literacy-informed model of medication self-management. *Journal of health communication*. 2013;18 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):20-30.
10. Heapy AA, Higgins DM, Cervone D, Wandner L, Fenton BT, Kerns RD. A Systematic Review of Technology-assisted Self-Management Interventions for Chronic Pain: Looking Across Treatment Modalities. *The Clinical Journal of Pain*. 2015;31(6):470-92.
11. Pfaeffli Dale L, Dobson R, Whittaker R, Maddison R. The effectiveness of mobile-health behaviour change interventions for cardiovascular disease self-management: A systematic review. *European journal of preventive cardiology*. 2016;23(8):801-17.
12. Morton K, Dennison L, May C, Murray E, Little P, McManus RJ, et al. Using digital interventions for self-management of chronic physical health conditions: A meta-ethnography review of published studies. *Patient Education and Counseling*. 2017;100(4):616-35.

13. Krick T, Huter K, Domhoff D, Schmidt A, Rothgang H, Wolf-Ostermann K. Digital technology and nursing care: a scoping review on acceptance, effectiveness and efficiency studies of informal and formal care technologies. *BMC health services research*. 2019;19(1):400.
14. Maresova P, Tomson S, Lameski P, Madureira J, Mendes A, Zdravevski E, et al. Technological Solutions for Older People with Alzheimer's Disease: Review. *Curr Alzheimer Res*. 2018;15(10):975-83.
15. Edmunds M, Tuckson R, Lewis J, Atchinson B, Rheuban K, Fanberg H, et al. An Emergent Research and Policy Framework for Telehealth. *EGEMS (Washington, DC)*. 2017;5(2):1303.
16. Hale TM, Jethwani K, Kandola MS, Saldana F, Kvedar JC. A Remote Medication Monitoring System for Chronic Heart Failure Patients to Reduce Readmissions: A Two-Arm Randomized Pilot Study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2016;18(5):e91.
17. Mehta SJ, Hume E, Troxel AB, Reitz C, Norton L, Lacko H, et al. Effect of Remote Monitoring on Discharge to Home, Return to Activity, and Rehospitalization After Hip and Knee Arthroplasty: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(12):e2028328-e.
18. Su D, Michaud TL, Estabrooks P, Schwab RJ, Eiland LA, Hansen G, et al. Diabetes Management Through Remote Patient Monitoring: The Importance of Patient Activation and Engagement with the Technology. *Telemed J E Health*. 2019;25(10):952-9.
19. Hoppe KK, Williams M, Thomas N, Zella JB, Drewry A, Kim K, et al. Telehealth with remote blood pressure monitoring for postpartum hypertension: A prospective single-cohort feasibility study. *Pregnancy hypertension*. 2019;15:171-6.
20. Michaud TL, Siahpush M, Schwab RJ, Eiland LA, DeVany M, Hansen G, et al. Remote Patient Monitoring and Clinical Outcomes for Postdischarge Patients with Type 2 Diabetes. *Population health management*. 2018;21(5):387-94.
21. Foster MV, Sethares KA. Facilitators and barriers to the adoption of telehealth in older adults: an integrative review. *Computers, informatics, nursing : CIN*. 2014;32(11):523-33; quiz 34-5.
22. Wongom P, Kourbelis C, Newman P, Du H, Clark RA. Effectiveness of avatar-based technology in patient education for improving chronic disease knowledge and self-care behavior: a systematic review. *JBI database of systematic reviews and implementation reports*. 2019;17(6):1101-29.
23. Bott N, Wexler S, Drury L, Pollak C, Wang V, Scher K, et al. A Protocol-Driven, Bedside Digital Conversational Agent to Support Nurse Teams and Mitigate Risks of Hospitalization in Older Adults: Case Control Pre-Post Study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2019;21(10):e13440.
24. Cassell J. Embodied Conversational Agents: Representation and Intelligence in User Interfaces. *AI Magazine*. 2001;22(4):67.
25. Gardiner P, Hempstead MB, Ring L, Bickmore T, Yinusa-Nyahkoon L, Tran H, et al. Reaching women through health information technology: the Gabby preconception care system. *American journal of health promotion : AJHP*. 2013;27(3 Suppl):eS11-20.
26. Shaked NA. Avatars and virtual agents - relationship interfaces for the elderly. *Healthcare technology letters*. 2017;4(3):83-7.
27. McLaughlin H. Service-user research in health and social care. Los Angeles: SAGE. Los Angeles: SAGE; 2009.
28. Kelders SM, van Zyl LE, Ludden GDS. The Concept and Components of Engagement in Different Domains Applied to eHealth: A Systematic Scoping Review. *Front Psychol*. 2020;11:926-.
29. Sousa VEC, Dunn Lopez K. Towards Usable E-Health. A Systematic Review of Usability Questionnaires. *Appl Clin Inform*. 2017;8(2):470-90.
30. Dabbs A, Myers BA, Mc Curry KR, Dunbar-Jacob J, Hawkins RP, Begey A, et al. User-centered design and interactive health technologies for patients. *Computers, informatics, nursing : CIN*. 2009;27(3):175-83.
31. Venkatesh V, Morris MG, Davis GB, Davis FD. User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *Mis Quarterly*. 2003;27(3):425-78.
32. Holden RJ, Karsh BT. The technology acceptance model: its past and its future in health care. *Journal of biomedical informatics*. 2010;43(1):159-72.

- 1
- 2
- 3 33. Czaja SJ, Charness N, Fisk AD, Hertzog C, Nair SN, Rogers WA, et al. Factors predicting the use
- 4 of technology: findings from the Center for Research and Education on Aging and Technology
- 5 Enhancement (CREATE). *Psychology and aging*. 2006;21(2):333-52.
- 6 34. Kim BY, Lee J. Smart Devices for Older Adults Managing Chronic Disease: A Scoping Review.
- 7 *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2017;5(5):e69.
- 8 35. Hoque R, Sorwar G. Understanding factors influencing the adoption of mHealth by the
- 9 elderly: An extension of the UTAUT model. *International journal of medical informatics*. 2017;101:75-
- 10 84.
- 11 36. ECG. Electronic Caregiver 2020 (Available from: <https://electroniccaregiver.com/>).
- 12 37. Creswell JW, Plano Clark VL. *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. 2 ed.
- 13 Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 2011.
- 14 38. Chan AW, Tetzlaff JM, Gøtzsche PC, Altman DG, Mann H, Berlin JA, et al. SPIRIT 2013
- 15 explanation and elaboration: guidance for protocols of clinical trials. *Bmj*. 2013;346:e7586.
- 16 39. Vaughn J, Summers-Goeckerman E, Shaw RJ, Shah N. A Protocol to Assess Feasibility,
- 17 Acceptability, and Usability of Mobile Technology for Symptom Management in Pediatric Transplant
- 18 Patients. *Nursing research*. 2019;68(4):317-23.
- 19 40. Giunti G, Rivera-Romero O, Kool J, Bansi J, Sevillano JL, Granja-Dominguez A, et al. Evaluation
- 20 of More Stamina, a Mobile App for Fatigue Management in Persons with Multiple Sclerosis: Protocol
- 21 for a Feasibility, Acceptability, and Usability Study. *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2020;9(8):e18196.
- 22 41. Laugwitz B, Held T, Schrepp M. Construction and Evaluation of a User Experience
- 23 Questionnaire2008. 63-76 p.
- 24 42. Schrepp M, Hinderks A, Thomaschewski J. Design and Evaluation of a Short Version of the
- 25 User Experience Questionnaire (UEQ-S). *International Journal of Interactive Multimedia and Artificial*
- 26 *Intelligence*. 2017;4(6):103-8.
- 27 43. Ruegenhagen E, Rummel B. System Usability Scale – jetzt auch auf Deutsch. *SAP User*
- 28 *Experience Community 2015* (Available from: [https://experience.sap.com/skillup/system-usability-](https://experience.sap.com/skillup/system-usability-scale-jetzt-auch-auf-deutsch/)
- 29 [scale-jetzt-auch-auf-deutsch/](https://experience.sap.com/skillup/system-usability-scale-jetzt-auch-auf-deutsch/)).
- 30 44. Brooke J. SUS: a “quick and dirty” usability. *Usability evaluation in industry*. 1996:189.
- 31 45. Lewis JR. The System Usability Scale: Past, Present, and Future. *International Journal of*
- 32 *Human-Computer Interaction*. 2018;34(7):577-90.
- 33 46. Taki S, Lymer S, Russell CG, Campbell K, Laws R, Ong KL, et al. Assessing User Engagement of
- 34 an mHealth Intervention: Development and Implementation of the Growing Healthy App
- 35 Engagement Index. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2017;5(6):e89.
- 36 47. Lalmas M, O'Brien H, Yom-Tov E. Measuring User Engagement. *Synthesis Lectures on*
- 37 *Information Concepts, Retrieval, and Services*. 2014;6(4):1-132.
- 38 48. Triberti S, Kelders SM, Gaggioli A. User engagement. In: Gemert-Pijnen Lv, Kelders SM, Kip H,
- 39 Sanderman R, editors. *eHealth Research, Theory and Development A Multi-Disciplinary Approach*.
- 40 London: Routledge; 2018. p. 271-89.
- 41 49. MDK -K-CG. https://kcgeriatrie.de/Assessments_in_der_Geriatrie/Documents/iadl.pdf 2020
- 42 (26.08.2020). Available from:
- 43 https://kcgeriatrie.de/Assessments_in_der_Geriatrie/Documents/iadl.pdf.
- 44 50. Lawton MP, Brody EM. Assessment of older people: self-maintaining and instrumental
- 45 activities of daily living. *The Gerontologist*. 1969;9(3):179-86.
- 46 51. Deppermann KM, Friedrich C, Herth F, Huber RM. (Geriatric assessment and diagnosis in
- 47 elderly patients). *Onkologie*. 2008;31 Suppl 3:6-14.
- 48 52. Ware J, Kosinski M, Dewey J, Gandek B, Kisinski M, editors. *How to score and interpret single-*
- 49 *item health status measures: a manual for users of the SF-Y" Health Survey*2001.
- 50 53. Yiengprugsawan V, Kelly M, Tawatsupa B. SF-8TM Health Survey. In: Michalos AC, editor.
- 51 *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands; 2014. p.
- 52 5940-2.
- 53 54. Hughes ME, Waite LJ, Hawkey LC, Cacioppo JT. A Short Scale for Measuring Loneliness in
- 54 Large Surveys: Results From Two Population-Based Studies. *Research on aging*. 2004;26(6):655-72.
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

- 1
- 2
- 3 55. Kantar P. SOEP-Core – 2017: Personenfragebogen, Stichproben A-L3. SOEP Survey Papers
- 4 563: Series A. Berlin: DIW/SOEP; 2018.
- 5 56. Validität und Reliabilität einer deutschen Version der Geriatrischen Depressionsskala (GDS).
- 6 (Validity and reliability of a German version of the Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS).) (press release).
- 7 Germany: Hogrefe Verlag GmbH & Co. KG1999.
- 8 57. Sheikh JI, Yesavage JA. Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS): recent evidence and development of
- 9 a shorter version. *Clinical Gerontologist: The Journal of Aging and Mental Health*. 1986.
- 10 58. Allgaier AK, Kramer D, Mergl R, Fejtkova S, Hegerl U. (Validity of the geriatric depression scale
- 11 in nursing home residents: comparison of GDS-15, GDS-8, and GDS-4). *Psychiatrische Praxis*.
- 12 2011;38(6):280-6.
- 13 59. Jongenelis K, Gerritsen DL, Pot AM, Beekman AT, Eisses AM, Kluiters H, et al. Construction and
- 14 validation of a patient- and user-friendly nursing home version of the Geriatric Depression Scale. *Int J*
- 15 *Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2007;22(9):837-42.
- 16 60. Prell T, Grosskreutz J, Mendorf S, Franke GH, Witte OW, Kunze A. Clusters of non-adherence
- 17 to medication in neurological patients. *Research in social & administrative pharmacy : RSAP*.
- 18 2019;15(12):1419-24.
- 19 61. Franke G, Küch D, Jagla-Franke M. Die Erfassung der Medikamenten-Adhärenz bei
- 20 Schmerzpatientinnen und -patienten2019.
- 21 62. Freund T, Gensichen J, Goetz K, Szecsenyi J, Mahler C. Evaluating self-efficacy for managing
- 22 chronic disease: psychometric properties of the six-item Self-Efficacy Scale in Germany. *Journal of*
- 23 *evaluation in clinical practice*. 2013;19(1):39-43.
- 24 63. Seifert A, Schelling H. Digitale Senioren. Nutzung von Informations- und
- 25 Kommunikationstechnologien (IKT) durch Menschen ab 65 Jahren in der Schweiz im Jahr 20152015.
- 26 64. World Health Organization. International classification of diseases for mortality and
- 27 morbidity statistics (11th Revision). 2018 (Available from: <https://icd.who.int/en/>).
- 28 65. Goodman E, Kuniavsky M, Moed A. Observing the user experience : a practitioner's guide to
- 29 user research. Waltham, MA:: Morgan Kaufmann; 2012.
- 30 66. Schwarzer R, Fleig L. Von der Risikowahrnehmung zur Änderung des Gesundheitsverhaltens.
- 31 *Zentralblatt für Arbeitsmedizin, Arbeitsschutz und Ergonomie*. 2014;64(5):338-41.
- 32 67. Jaspers MW, Steen T, van den Bos C, Geenen M. The think aloud method: a guide to user
- 33 interface design. *Int J Med Inform*. 2004;73(11-12):781-95.
- 34 68. O'Cathain A, Murphy E, Nicholl J. Three techniques for integrating data in mixed methods
- 35 studies. *Bmj*. 2010;341:c4587.
- 36 69. Mayring P. Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken. 12. ed. Weinheim/Basel:
- 37 Beltz Verlag; 2015.
- 38 70. Bowen DJ, Kreuter M, Spring B, Cofta-Woerpel L, Linnan L, Weiner D, et al. How we design
- 39 feasibility studies. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2009;36(5):452-7.
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60





Figure 1: Addison Care functions in German version (Figure 1 reproduced with permission from <https://electroniccaregiver.com>)

90x50mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Notes: * in case of the presence of relatives: semi-structured interview with relatives about their impressions and experiences towards AC; AC Addison Care, GDS Geriatric Depression Scale, iADL Instrumental Activities of Daily Living Scale, SAMS Stendal Adherence with Medication Score, SESGG Self-Efficacy for Managing Chronic Disease 6-item Scale, SF-8 Health Related Quality of Life Short-Form-8-Questionnaire, SUS System Usability Scale, UCLA University of California Los Angeles Loneliness Scale, UE User Engagement, UEQ User Experience Questionnaire, US Usability, UX User Experience

Figure 2: Study flow, phenomenon of interest, instruments, data sets, and settings

90x138mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Supplement 1: SPIRIT Checklist



STANDARD PROTOCOL ITEMS: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INTERVENTIONAL TRIALS

SPIRIT 2013 Checklist: Recommended items to address in a clinical trial protocol and related documents*

Section/item	Item No	Description	Protocol adherence: addressed on page number
Administrative information			
Title	1	Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, interventions, and, if applicable, trial acronym	Y:01
Trial registration	2a	Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry	Y:02
	2b	All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set	Y
Protocol version	3	Date and version identifier	NA
Funding	4	Sources and types of financial, material, and other support	Y:16
Roles and responsibilities	5a	Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors	Y:01, 16
	5b	Name and contact information for the trial sponsor	Y:16
	5c	Role of study sponsor and funders, if any, in study design; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report; and the decision to submit the report for publication, including whether they will have ultimate authority over any of these activities	Y:16
	5d	Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre, steering committee, endpoint adjudication committee, data management team, and other individuals or groups overseeing the trial, if applicable (see Item 21a for data monitoring committee)	Y:09, 13

Introduction

1				
2	Background and rationale	6a	Description of research question and justification for undertaking the trial, including summary of relevant studies (published and unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervention	Y:03-06, 08
3				
4				
5				
6				
7		6b	Explanation for choice of comparators	NA
8	Objectives	7	Specific objectives or hypotheses	Y:08
9				
10	Trial design	8	Description of trial design including type of trial (eg, parallel group, crossover, factorial, single group), allocation ratio, and framework (eg, superiority, equivalence, noninferiority, exploratory)	Y:08
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17	Methods: Participants, interventions, and outcomes			
18				
19	Study setting	9	Description of study settings (eg, community clinic, academic hospital) and list of countries where data will be collected. Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained	Y:09, Figure 2
20				
21				
22	Eligibility criteria	10	Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable, eligibility criteria for study centres and individuals who will perform the interventions (eg, surgeons, psychotherapists)	Y:09
23				
24				
25	Interventions	11a	Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication, including how and when they will be administered	Y:07-08, Figure 2
26				
27		11b	Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a given trial participant (eg, drug dose change in response to harms, participant request, or improving/worsening disease)	Y:13
28				
29				
30	Outcomes	11c	Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any procedures for monitoring adherence (eg, drug tablet return, laboratory tests)	Y:09-11, Figure 2
31				
32		11d	Relevant concomitant care and interventions that are permitted or prohibited during the trial	NA
33				
34				
35				
36				
37				
38				
39				
40				
41				
42				
43				
44				
45				
46				
47				
48				
49				
50				
51				
52				
53				
54				
55				
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				

1				
2	Participant	13	Time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any	Y:09, Figure
3	timeline		run-ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for	2
4			participants. A schematic diagram is highly	
5			recommended (see Figure)	
6				
7	Sample size	14	Estimated number of participants needed to achieve	Y:09
8			study objectives and how it was determined, including	
9			clinical and statistical assumptions supporting any	
10			sample size calculations	
11				
12				
13	Recruitment	15	Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrolment	Y:09
14			to reach target sample size	
15				

Methods: Assignment of interventions (for controlled trials)

Allocation:

16				
17				
18				
19				
20	Sequence	16a	Method of generating the allocation sequence (eg,	NA
21	generation		computer-generated random numbers), and list of any	
22			factors for stratification. To reduce predictability of a	
23			random sequence, details of any planned restriction (eg,	
24			blocking) should be provided in a separate document that	
25			is unavailable to those who enrol participants or assign	
26			interventions	
27				
28				
29				
30	Allocation	16b	Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (eg,	NA
31	concealment		central telephone; sequentially numbered, opaque,	
32	mechanism		sealed envelopes), describing any steps to conceal the	
33			sequence until interventions are assigned	
34				
35				
36	Implementation	16c	Who will generate the allocation sequence, who will enrol	NA
37			participants, and who will assign participants to	
38			interventions	
39				
40	Blinding	17a	Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg,	NA
41	(masking)		trial participants, care providers, outcome assessors,	
42			data analysts), and how	
43				
44				
45		17b	If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is	NA
46			permissible, and procedure for revealing a participant's	
47			allocated intervention during the trial	
48				

Methods: Data collection, management, and analysis

49				
50				
51	Data collection	18a	Plans for assessment and collection of outcome,	Y:10-13
52	methods		baseline, and other trial data, including any related	
53			processes to promote data quality (eg, duplicate	
54			measurements, training of assessors) and a description	
55			of study instruments (eg, questionnaires, laboratory	
56			tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known.	
57			Reference to where data collection forms can be found, if	
58			not in the protocol	
59				
60				

1				
2		18b	Plans to promote participant retention and complete	Y
3			follow-up, including list of any outcome data to be	
4			collected for participants who discontinue or deviate from	
5			intervention protocols	
6				
7	Data	19	Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage,	Y: 12-13
8	management		including any related processes to promote data quality	
9			(eg, double data entry; range checks for data values).	
10			Reference to where details of data management	
11			procedures can be found, if not in the protocol	
12				
13				
14	Statistical	20a	Statistical methods for analysing primary and secondary	Y: 14-15
15	methods		outcomes. Reference to where other details of the	
16			statistical analysis plan can be found, if not in the	
17			protocol	
18				
19				
20		20b	Methods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and	X
21			adjusted analyses)	
22				
23		20c	Definition of analysis population relating to protocol non-	X
24			adherence (eg, as randomised analysis), and any	
25			statistical methods to handle missing data (eg, multiple	
26			imputation)	
27				
28				
29	Methods: Monitoring			
30				
31	Data monitoring	21a	Composition of data monitoring committee (DMC);	X
32			summary of its role and reporting structure; statement of	
33			whether it is independent from the sponsor and	
34			competing interests; and reference to where further	
35			details about its charter can be found, if not in the	
36			protocol. Alternatively, an explanation of why a DMC is	
37			not needed	
38				
39				
40		21b	Description of any interim analyses and stopping	Y: 13
41			guidelines, including who will have access to these	
42			interim results and make the final decision to terminate	
43			the trial	
44				
45				
46	Harms	22	Plans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing	Y: 13
47			solicited and spontaneously reported adverse events and	
48			other unintended effects of trial interventions or trial	
49			conduct	
50				
51				
52	Auditing	23	Frequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if	X
53			any, and whether the process will be independent from	
54			investigators and the sponsor	
55				
56				
57	Ethics and dissemination			
58				
59				
60				

1				
2	Research ethics approval	24	Plans for seeking research ethics committee/institutional review board (REC/IRB) approval	Y: 14
3				
4				
5	Protocol amendments	25	Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC/IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators)	Y: 14
6				
7				
8				
9				
10	Consent or assent	26a	Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32)	Y: 09
11				
12				
13				
14				
15		26b	Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological specimens in ancillary studies, if applicable	NA
16				
17				
18				
19	Confidentiality	27	How personal information about potential and enrolled participants will be collected, shared, and maintained in order to protect confidentiality before, during, and after the trial	Y: 13-15
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25	Declaration of interests	28	Financial and other competing interests for principal investigators for the overall trial and each study site	Y: 16
26				
27				
28	Access to data	29	Statement of who will have access to the final trial dataset, and disclosure of contractual agreements that limit such access for investigators	NA
29				
30				
31				
32				
33	Ancillary and post-trial care	30	Provisions, if any, for ancillary and post-trial care, and for compensation to those who suffer harm from trial participation	NA
34				
35				
36				
37	Dissemination policy	31a	Plans for investigators and sponsor to communicate trial results to participants, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant groups (eg, via publication, reporting in results databases, or other data sharing arrangements), including any publication restrictions	Y: 15
38				
39				
40				
41				
42				
43				
44		31b	Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional writers	NA
45				
46				
47				
48		31c	Plans, if any, for granting public access to the full protocol, participant-level dataset, and statistical code	X
49				
50				
51	Appendices			
52				
53	Informed consent materials	32	Model consent form and other related documentation given to participants and authorised surrogates	X
54				
55				
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				

1
2 Biological 33 Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation, and storage of NA
3 specimens biological specimens for genetic or molecular analysis in
4 the current trial and for future use in ancillary studies, if
5 applicable
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

1. Informed Consent

Patient Consent Form

Name of patient in block letters:

Date of birth:

I agree to participate in the patient survey and use of the digital support platform "Addison Care" in the project PiloTT-A: Piloting of the virtual telecare technology "Addison".

I have been informed that I can decline to participate without any adverse consequences, especially regarding my medical care.

The Paracelsus Medical Private University Salzburg (Austria) is responsible for conducting the survey in the context of using "Addison Care" as a digital support service for medical care needs.

I have been informed by Mr./Mrs. in a detailed conversation about the nature, type, scope and significance of the survey, as well as the aims of using the Addison Care platform, and have received a copy of this consent form.

It has been explained to me for what purpose, to what extent, on what legal basis and for how long my data from the survey will be stored and what rights I have towards the responsible party with regard to my personal data. I have received a corresponding data protection declaration as well as an information letter.

Furthermore, I agree that the clinic's physicians will hand over my current list of medications to a member of the project team.

In addition, I have been informed that by using the Addison Care platform, my usage behavior of this technology will be transmitted to the Paracelsus Medical Private University, based on data known to me.

Furthermore, I have read the text of this patient information and consent form, which comprises a total of 9 pages. I have had sufficient time to decide. I have no further questions at this time.

I am aware that my participation in the project is voluntary and that I can revoke it at any time without giving reasons and without personal disadvantage for further medical and nursing treatment. In this case, the collected data will be completely deleted and I will be informed about it.

I declare that I am willing to participate in the research project and consent to the associated processing of my personal data and the usage data of the Addison Care platform, which are known to me.

I consent to the processing of my data collected as part of this clinical trial and as described in the "Data Protection" section of this document.

1
2
3 Insofar as special personal data within the meaning of Art. 9 DSGVO, such as health data, are
4 collected, my consent also relates to this information.
5

6 **I hereby declare my voluntary participation in the survey.**
7

8 I consent that any personal information I provide for the survey may be stored and scientifically
9 processed by the Paracelsus Medical Private University Salzburg.
10

11 My personal information will only be used for this research project. Once the survey has been
12 completed, it will no longer be possible to make any further link to me as a person.
13
14
15

16 _____
17

18 Date

16 _____
17

18 Patient's signature

23
24 _____
25

26 Date

23
24 _____
25

26 Surname, first name of the informing staff member
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Ethikkommission der DGP • Stockumer Straße 12 • 58453 Witten

Paracelsus Medizinische Privatuniversität
Herrn Univ.-Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Jürgen Osterbrink
Vorstand des Instituts für Pflegewissenschaft und -praxis
Strubergasse 21
A - 5020 Salzburg



Deutsche Gesellschaft für Pflegewissenschaft
(DGP) e. V.
Geschäftsstelle
Bürgerstr. 47
47057 Duisburg

Telefon: 0203 – 356793
info@dg-pflegewissenschaft.de

Ethikkommission der Deutschen Gesellschaft
für Pflegewissenschaft
(DGP) e.V.
Vorsitz Prof. Dr. Sabine Bartholomeyczik
Stockumer Str. 12
58453 Witten

Ethikkommission@dg-pflegewissenschaft.de

Your proposal no. 21-037 to the ethical review committee of the German Society of Nursing Science (EK-DGP)

Dear Mr. Osterbrink,

the EK-DGP discussed and evaluated your proposal

A pilot study of Addison Care, the Virtual Telecare Technology, - PiloTT-A (application no. 21-037)
submitted 2021-11-16.

The committee decided to give you an ethical approval.

Good luck for the project!

2021-12-27

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Sabine Bartholomeyczik', is written over the letter.

Prof. Dr. Sabine Bartholomeyczik
Chairperson EK-DGP

BMJ Open

Piloting of the virtual telecare technology 'Addison Care' to promote self-management in persons with chronic diseases in a community setting: protocol for a mixed methods user experience, user engagement and usability pilot study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2022-062159.R3
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	22-Aug-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Krutter, Simon; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Schuessler, Nadine; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Kutschar, Patrick; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Šabić, Edin; New Mexico State University, Department of Psychology; Electronic Caregiver Inc Dellinger, Johanna; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Klausner, Tabea; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Nestler, Nadja; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Beasley, Morgan; Electronic Caregiver Inc Henderson, Bailey; Electronic Caregiver Inc Pitzer, Stefan; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Mitterlehner, Barbara; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Langegger, Doris; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Winkler, Anna; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Kloesch, Michael; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice EBl-Maurer, Roland; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice van der Zee-Neuen, Antje; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice Osterbrink, Jürgen; Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Institute of Nursing Science and Practice; University of North Florida, Brooks College of Health
Primary Subject Heading:	Nursing
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Keywords:	PRIMARY CARE, PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, GERIATRIC MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Piloting of the virtual telecare technology ‘Addison Care’ to promote self-management in persons**
4 **with chronic diseases in a community setting: protocol for a mixed methods user experience, user**
5 **engagement and usability pilot study**
6
7
8
9

10
11 **Authors:** Simon Krutter¹, Nadine Schuessler¹, Patrick Kutschar¹, Edin Šabić^{2,3}, Johanna Dellinger¹,
12
13 Tabea Klausner¹, Nadja Nestler¹, Morgan Beasley³, Bailey Henderson³, Stefan Pitzer¹, Barbara
14
15 Mitterlehner¹, Doris Langegger¹, Anna Winkler¹, Michael Kloesch¹, Roland Eßl-Maurer¹, Antje van der
16
17 Zee-Neuen¹, Jürgen Osterbrink^{1,4}
18
19

20
21 **Affiliations**
22

23
24 ¹ Institute of Nursing Science and Practice, Paracelsus Medical University, Salzburg, Austria
25

26 ² Department of Psychology, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico, United States
27

28 ³ Electronic Caregiver Inc., Las Cruces, New Mexico, United States
29

30 ⁴ Brooks College of Health, University of North Florida, Jacksonville, Florida, United States
31
32

33 **Corresponding Author Information**
34

35
36 Simon Krutter
37

38
39 Institute of Nursing Science and Practice, Paracelsus Medical University, Salzburg, Austria
40

41
42 Strubergasse 21, 5020 Salzburg, Austria
43

44
45 Email: simon.krutter@pmu.ac.at
46

47
48 Phone: +43 662 2024 80341
49

50
51 ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5788-9574
52
53

54
55 **Word Count:** 4.148
56

57
58 **ABSTRACT** (293 words)
59
60

1
2
3 **Introduction:** Chronic diseases in older adults are one of the major epidemiological challenges of
4 current times and leading cause of disability, poor quality of life, high health care costs, and death.
5
6 Self-management of chronic diseases is essential to improve health behaviors and health outcomes.
7
8 Technology-assisted interventions have shown to improve self-management of chronic diseases.
9
10 Virtual avatars can be a key factor for the acceptance of these technologies. Addison Care is a home-
11 based telecare solution equipped with a virtual avatar named Addison, connecting older persons with
12
13 their caregivers via an easy-to-use technology. A central advantage is that Addison care provides access
14
15 to self-management support for an up-to-now highly underrepresented population - older persons
16
17 with chronic disease(s), which enables them to profit from e-health in everyday life.
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 **Methods and analysis:** A pragmatic, non-randomized, one-arm pilot study applying an embedded
25 mixed-methods approach will be conducted to examine user experience, usability, and user
26
27 engagement of the virtual avatar Addison. Participants will be at least 65 years old and will be recruited
28
29 between September 2022 and November 2022 from hospitals during the discharge process to home
30
31 care. Standardized instruments, namely the User Experience Questionnaire (UEQ), System Usability
32
33 Scale (SUS), Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (iADL) scale, Short-Form-8-Questionnaire (SF-8),
34
35 UCLA Loneliness Scale, Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS), Stendal Adherence with Medication Score
36
37 (SAMS) and Self-Efficacy for Managing Chronic Diseases Scale (SESG6), as well as survey-based
38
39 assessments, semi-structured interviews and think-aloud protocols will be used. The study seeks to
40
41 enroll 20 patients that meet the criteria.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Ethics and dissemination:** The study protocol has been approved by the ethic committee of the
49
50 German Society for Nursing Science (21-037). The results are intended to be published in peer-
51
52 reviewed journals and disseminated through conference papers.
53
54
55

56 **Trial registration number:** German Clinical Trials Register (ID: DRKS00025992).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Keywords:** Telecare, virtual avatar, older people, chronic disease self-management, pilot study, user
4
5 experience, e-health;
6
7

8 **STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY**

9

- 10
11
12 - This pilot study provides an opportunity to explore the acceptability of and experiences with
13 a potentially beneficial e-health technology in the underrepresented population of
14 chronically ill older persons in a telecare setting.
15
16
17 - The mixed-methods study design will provide a deep and broad insight on usability, user
18 experience and user engagement of Addison care as a German-speaking, culturally adapted
19 virtual avatar.
20
21
22 - This investigation evaluates the efficacy of a sophisticated virtual avatar, Addison, in assisting
23 with many crucial health management tasks – including medication management and health
24 vitals monitoring.
25
26
27 - A focus on barriers to user-engagement for those who are technologically hesitant will
28 provide rich information concerning how best to design virtual avatars and e-health
29 technologies to match user needs and mental models.
30
31
32 - The primary limitation of this study is the relatively small sample size due to our selective
33 inclusion criteria, which may diminish the ethnic and socio-economic diversity of our sample.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **BACKGROUND**

48

49
50 Societies across the globe are facing a significant shift in age demographics whereby older adults are
51 becoming an increasingly larger group within their population. This phenomenon is one of the most
52 salient economic, social, and medical issues of current times.[1] Aging increases both the risk for most
53 chronic diseases and for multimorbidity. Between 34% and 61% of older adults are multimorbid [2],
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 which can have consequences such as disability and functional decline, poor quality of life, social
4
5 isolation, depression, and high health care costs.[3, 4]
6
7

8 Patients themselves have an integral role in the management of their chronic disease.[5] Factors that
9
10 influence effective self-management of chronic disease include: experience, skill, motivation, culture,
11
12 confidence, habits, physical and mental function, social support, and access to care.[6]
13
14

15
16 Self-management of chronic diseases is defined as the response to signs and symptoms when they
17
18 occur, with the goal that patients play an active role in optimising health outcomes and minimizing the
19
20 impact of their conditions.[6] Self-management support refers to patient, healthcare professional, and
21
22 healthcare system interventions aimed to improve self-management behaviours.[7] Self-monitoring
23
24 vitals [8] and medication adherence have been recognized as two of the most essential self-
25
26 management activities performed by patients to promote their health.[9]
27
28

29
30 Although interventions designed to promote self-management in chronic diseases have traditionally
31
32 been offered in-person, delivering these interventions remotely utilizing available technology (e.g.,
33
34 mobile smart phones, Internet, interactive voice response, telephone, virtual reality) has become more
35
36 prevalent.[10] These technology-assisted interventions have shown to improve self-management and
37
38 health status.[11, 12]
39
40

41
42 Digital information technologies support people with care requirements to maintain their
43
44 independence, improve quality of life, increase health literacy and aid caregivers in their duties.[13,
45
46 14] Telehealth is one of the fastest-growing sectors in health care. The term refers to a broad array of
47
48 provider-to-patient communication and has been defined as using telecommunications, information
49
50 technologies, and devices to share information and to provide clinical, population health, and
51
52 administrative services at a distance.[15] Remote patient monitoring is a widely used telehealth
53
54 intervention that can effectively support self-management in patients with chronic diseases.[7]
55
56
57

58 **Remote Patient Monitoring**

59
60

1
2
3 Remote Patient Monitoring (RPM) is a promising solution for facilitating the patient-physician
4 relationship while addressing the shortage of healthcare workers today.
5
6

7
8 Studies concerning the efficacy of RPM has spanned the topics of post-operative rehospitalization,
9 chronic disease management, medication adherence, and quality of life and has shown promising
10 results.[16-20] However, RPM technology can only benefit patients who choose to actively interact
11 with the devices. As compared to younger users, elderly users also face unique challenges that are a
12 direct result of aging – such as declines in dexterity, hearing, and vision. As a result, researchers have
13 identified that improving ease of navigation for task completion, ensuring appropriate size and color
14 of font, and properly configuring the size of the hardware itself are paramount in addressing
15 technological hesitancy.[21]
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 27 **Virtual Avatars**

28
29 Graphic user interfaces, which can improve the user experience and personalize the experience for the
30 user through virtual avatars, have begun to be incorporated into RPM systems. Virtual avatars are an
31 emerging feature in RPM that has shown propitious results in terms of user engagement, health
32 education, and self-care behavior.[22]
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 One important factor in the receptiveness of patients to virtual avatars is the avatar's appearance. Bott
41 [23] investigated the impact of a virtual pet avatar to deliver surveys to older clients. They found that
42 those who interacted with the avatar experienced lower rates of delirium, fewer falls, and decreased
43 loneliness. However, research has generally shown that anthropomorphic characteristics are often
44 preferable for virtual healthcare avatars [24] – as well as similarities in appearance between the avatar
45 and the user.[25] Previous literature has revealed that when designing virtual agents for older persons,
46 key factors related to acceptance of technology include conversational latency, gamification, and
47 artificially intelligent lexicon.[26]
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 **User experience and technology acceptance among older persons**

1
2
3 Understanding how older adults perceive technology and virtual avatars may lead to improvements in
4 the accessibility, acceptability, and adoption of virtual avatars among older persons with chronic
5 diseases. This can be accomplished through user experience (UX) research, wherein the overall
6 experience of the user is assessed through measures related to usability, user engagement, usefulness,
7 function, credibility, and satisfaction with the technology.[27] While behavior, cognition, and affect
8 are important defining components of user engagement [28], learnability, efficiency, memorability,
9 few errors and satisfaction are defining components of usability.[29] UX is based upon User-Centered
10 Design (UCD), wherein the needs and characteristics of the end user become the focus of technology
11 design and development, with the intention of higher acceptance and fewer user errors.[30]

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 Theories that predict and explain health technology acceptance and use can help to tailor the
25 technology to specific patient needs. One of the more recent models, the Unified Theory of Acceptance
26 and Use of Technology (UTAUT) [31], posits that a person's intent to use [acceptance of technology]
27 and usage behavior (actual use) of a technology is predicated by the patient's performance and effort
28 expectancy of the technology. The UTAUT also suggests social influence and facilitating conditions as
29 determinants of behavioral intention to use the technology.[31, 32] Most older persons are
30 significantly less adept at technology use than the general population, with technology anxiety being
31 a major influence on older users' intent to use technologies.[33] However, older adults are interested
32 in integrating new technologies into their healthcare.[34] Studies confirm the applicability of the
33 UTAUT in the context of Telecare services among older persons.[35]

46 47 **Intervention: Addison Care Tablet Personal Computer (PC)**

48
49
50 The present research pilots an intervention provided by Addison Care [36], which is an innovative
51 home-bound connected virtual RPM platform for individuals living with chronic disease. A 3D-
52 animated nurse named 'Addison' is the center of interaction between the system and its users,
53 personifying the telehealth experience for the user. The pilot study encompasses two health-related
54 functions of Addison Care: 'Addison' supporting the user in self-monitoring relevant vitals (blood
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 pressure, weight, pulse and oxygen saturation) as well as medication schedule adherence. This is
4
5 achieved by offering reminder and monitoring functionalities (see Fig. 1).
6
7

8 [Figure 1 about here]
9

10
11 The Addison Care hardware consists of a tablet PC with a speaker, a microphone module, and a touch
12
13 screen (see Figure 1). The tablet connects with Bluetooth vitals measuring devices and can be installed
14
15 in a user's home. Avatar technology combined with natural language understanding and automatic
16
17 speech recognition provides users with effective natural interaction with the assisting technology.[22,
18
19 26] Subtitles, vital signs, and medications are graphically illustrated on the Addison Care interface for
20
21 clear communication between the virtual agent and the user.
22
23

24
25 The Addison Tablet PC is connected to a web-based dashboard that allows access to user data,
26
27 including vitals measurements and medication reminders. For the pilot study, medication plans,
28
29 reminder-options, and contact information are managed by members of the study team, who also act
30
31 as a support team for the technical set-up and in case of technical problems. The intervention in this
32
33 study involves voice-driven audio-centered interaction between Addison and users in German, as well
34
35 as the implementation of a German touch screen interface. Introduction of Addison Care to German
36
37 users requires adaption of the original technology to ensure a good cultural fit. Adaptations were made
38
39 to the surroundings of the avatar, as well as to Addison's mannerisms. Additionally, changes were
40
41 made to the system to ensure a good fit between system and real life in terms of interactive elements
42
43 [from basics ensuring appropriate data and time formats to more complex elements like making sure
44
45 the avatar interacts in a culturally appropriate manner with the user). Voice and touch interaction
46
47 modes are currently adapted from English into German. All piloted features of Addison Care are shown
48
49
50
51
52 in Fig. 1.
53

54 **Objectives**

55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 While other studies have provided insight into the potential of digital health technology and virtual
4 avatars, the vast majority have been tested within laboratory settings, where older adults were unable
5 to interact with the technology in a natural environment. Additionally, the digital health systems and
6 virtual avatars were not culturally adapted after development.
7
8
9

10
11
12 The study aims to explore the feasibility, acceptability, experience, engagement, and usability of the
13 culturally tailored health technology and the virtual avatar Addison for self-management for older
14 patients with chronic diseases in their own home.
15
16
17
18
19

20 21 **METHODS AND ANALYSIS**

22
23
24 A pragmatic, non-randomized, one-arm pilot study applying an embedded mixed-methods approach
25 will be conducted to examine the primary outcomes 'user experience', 'usability', and 'user
26 engagement' of the virtual avatar Addison three times within the use span. 'Embedded' refers to the
27 integration of qualitative methods into a quantitative methodology framework, or vice versa, to
28 provide enriched insights or understanding into the phenomena of interest.[31, 37] The study design
29 is pluralistic, problem-centered, real-world applicable, and focused on the consequences of actions,
30 stemming from pragmatism as a research paradigm.[37] The present protocol followed the SPIRIT
31 guidelines (see Supplementary 1).[38] Data collection will take place between September 2022 and
32 November 2022.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Recruitment criteria and process**

46
47
48 Eligible patients will be identified by medical specialists in in German hospitals. The inclusion criteria
49 are as follows:
50
51

- 52 - Planned patients transition from hospital to extramural care
 - 53 - Three to nine drugs (regular intake of drugs, no status of hypermedication)
 - 54 - 65 years or older with a chronic health condition
 - 55 - Ability to speak and understand German language
- 56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The exclusion criteria are:
4

- 5
6 - Ten or more drugs per day
7
8 - Younger than 65 years old
9
10 - Moderate to severe cognitive impairment or severe psychiatric disorders
11
12

13
14 Provided that these criteria are met and general interest in using health technology is expressed,
15
16 information about the pilot study and the intervention will be shared. If a patient declares the will to
17
18 participate, a meeting with the support team will be arranged while the patient is still at the hospital.
19
20 Potential participants will be informed of all aspects of the study through verbal instruction and written
21
22 materials (Figure 2, Encounter 1). After written informed consent (see Supplementary 2) is provided,
23
24 living situation and socio-demographic data will be assessed by research assistants.
25
26

27 28 **Setting and sample size** 29

30
31 Addison Care will be piloted in participants' homes, located in a community setting, after their
32
33 discharge from hospital for two consecutive weeks. In Encounter 2 (see Figure 2) within 1 day after the
34
35 informed consent is provided, the support team will give first instructions on Addison Care while the
36
37 participant is still hospitalized. First adjustments of reminder, medication plan, and vital measurements
38
39 will be provisioned for the use of Addison Tablet PC at home. This study seeks to enroll 20 patients.
40
41 The sample size is an adequate number to evaluate study feasibility, test the study procedures and
42
43 explore the user experience.[39, 40]
44
45
46
47

48 **Patient and public involvement** 49

50
51 In advance of the pilot study, older adults assisted in the development of the data collection materials
52
53 and pre-testing of Addison Care. However, patients and the public were not involved in the
54
55 development of the research question, outcome measures and the design of the study.
56
57

58 **Outcomes, Instruments, and Variables** 59 60

1
2
3 Building upon the theoretical concepts of technology acceptance (UTAUT), we will assess user
4 experience, usability, and user engagement (primary outcomes), as well as participant background
5 information (e.g., sociodemographic, care provision) and health status-associated phenomena
6
7 (functional status, quality of life and wellbeing, loneliness, depression, medication adherence, and self-
8 management) using standardized, quantitative and semi-standardized qualitative research
9 instruments (see Figure 2).
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 17 **Standardized research instruments**

18
19
20 *User experience.* The German version of the User Experience Questionnaire (UEQ) [41] will be used to
21 assess user experience. The UEQ consists of 26 items along six scales: attractiveness (6 items,
22 Cronbach's alpha $\alpha=0.89$), perspicuity (4 items, $\alpha=0.82$), efficiency (4 items, $\alpha=0.73$), dependability (4
23 items, $\alpha=0.65$), stimulation (4 items, $\alpha=0.76$), and novelty (4 items, $\alpha=0.83$).[41, 42] Each item
24 represents a 7-point rating scale (-3 most negative rating, +3 most positive rating) of properties that
25 the product under study may have. An average score is computed for each scale.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34
35 *Usability.* To assess the usability of Addison Care, the validated German version of the System Usability
36 Scale (SUS) will be applied.[43] The SUS [44] consists of 10 items and is a standardized, generic
37 instrument for assessing the usability of technical applications, mobile applications, or devices. Internal
38 consistency has been reported to range between $\alpha=0.70$ to 0.95.[45] The SUS consists of 10 items,
39 each with five-point rating scales (1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree). The standardized scoring of
40 the SUS results in a total score between 0 to 100 points using a given norm-based scoring
41 algorithm.[45]
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 *User engagement.* Automatic system and data logging information will be used to measure user
52 engagement in terms of intensity and type of interactions between users and Addison Care. This non-
53 participatory data collection, e.g., documenting data using automatically protocolled technical
54 variables without having asked questions or the presence of an observer, will provide essential
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 information on the actual use, used functions, and user engagement with certain contents of the
4
5 product of interest.[46-48]
6

7
8 *Functional status.* The German translation [49] of the Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (iADL) scale
9
10 [50] will be applied to assess patients' functional status in terms of activities of daily living. The iADL is
11
12 a standardized instrument that measures functionality related to eight domains of daily living. It has
13
14 reported reliability coefficients ranging from 0.85 to 0.91.[51] Each domain is measured using either
15
16 three or four ability levels with 0 or 1 point per domain, resulting in a summary score of 8 points at
17
18 maximum. Due to a strong reference of some items to household aspects, gender-specific scores will
19
20 be used, e.g., 0 (low function, dependent) to 8 (high function, independent) for women and 0 to 5 for
21
22 men, respectively.[51]
23
24
25

26
27 *Quality of life.* Health-related quality of life will be measured by the German version of the Short-Form-
28
29 8-Questionnaire (SF-8).[52] The SF-8 assesses the 8 dimensions physical functioning, role physical (role
30
31 limitations because of physical health), bodily pain, general health, vitality, social functioning, role
32
33 emotional (role limitations because of emotional problems), and mental health, by one item each, and
34
35 along two scales 'physical component summary score' and 'mental component summary score'. The
36
37 items comprise of five- or six-point response scales that verbalize the extent to which each dimension
38
39 is present. In addition to single-item analysis, the two summary scores will be measured using a given
40
41 norm-based scoring method. Next to an adequate test-retest reliability [52], an overall internal
42
43 consistency between $\alpha=0.86$ and 0.92 have been reported.[53]
44
45
46
47

48
49 *Loneliness.* To assess participants' perception of social isolation and loneliness, the shortened, 3-item
50
51 German version [54, 55] of the UCLA (University of California, Los Angeles) Loneliness Scale will be
52
53 applied. Each item exhibits a five-level response scale (very often, often, sometimes, rarely, never) and
54
55 will be analysed item-by-item. Cronbach's alpha for the 3-item loneliness scale was 0.72.[54]
56
57

58
59 *Depression.* The German translation [56] of the Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS) will be used to
60
evaluate the presence of depression.[57, 58] The 8-item version will be applied to make the survey as

1
2
3 time-efficient as possible.[59] Participants are asked about selected symptoms of depressive states
4
5 over the past week using a dichotomous response format (no vs. yes). The total sum score of the GDS-8
6
7 is 0-8 points. Internal consistency with $\alpha > 0.80$ has been shown [59]. A recommended cut-off score of
8
9 GDS ≥ 3 indicating relevant indications of depression will be applied.

10
11
12
13 *Medication adherence.* Participants' adherence to their medication regimen will be measured by the
14
15 Stendal Adherence with Medication Score (SAMS).[60] SAMS consists of 18 items on a five-level
16
17 response scale (0-4) assessing fully adherent to nonadherent medication behaviour per item.[61]
18
19 Responses are summarized into a cumulative point scale (0-72), which can be categorized as fully
20
21 adherent (0), moderately adherent (1-10), and not adherent (>10). An overall internal consistency of
22
23 $\alpha = 0.83$ has been reported.[61]

24
25
26
27 *Self-management.* To assess participant's Self-Efficacy for Managing Chronic Diseases (SESG6), the
28
29 German version of the 6-item scale will be used.[62] The six items are rated with a 10-level Likert-type
30
31 scale (1 'not at all confident' to 10 'totally confident'). A mean score over at least four of the six items
32
33 will be calculated, thus allowing a maximum of two missing item responses. SESG6 has been attested
34
35 a high internal consistency measure of $\alpha = 0.93$. [62]

36
37
38
39 *Technology proficiency, readiness, and expectations.* A standardized face-to-face interview prior to the
40
41 use of Addison Care ('pre-use interview') will be performed to collect information on participant
42
43 technology proficiency and readiness (7 items) in terms of experience with and use of general
44
45 information and communication technologies (3 items) as well as expectations regarding the upcoming
46
47 use of the Addison Care technology (6 items). These closed-ended questions were derived from
48
49 empirical and theoretical literature [31, 32, 63] and further adapted by the research team.

50
51
52
53 *Sociodemographic and care provision variables.* Sociodemographic and care-relevant variables will be
54
55 collected by means of a short, standardized 9-item questionnaire. Age of participants, gender, living
56
57 situation, place of residence in terms of urbanization, care provision by relatives, and care provision
58
59 by ambulant/mobile care service will be assessed using closed-ended questions. Information on
60

1
2
3 documented primary diagnoses and existing additional chronic diseases will be collected using open-
4 ended questions and categorized applying the 11th revision of the International Classification of
5 Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD-11).[64]
6
7
8
9

10 **Semi-standardized research instruments**

11
12
13 *First experiences and encountered technical obstacles.* A qualitative, semi-structured brief telephone
14 interview ('mid-use interview') with users after one week of Addison interaction will be conducted.
15 Information about users' experiences to date, as well as previous effort and encountered challenges
16 in using the Addison Care technology will be collected. The user reports are to be recorded in an open-
17 ended documentation sheet.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 *User experience, fulfilled expectations, perceived enabling conditions for use and technology's social*
27 *influence, and health behaviour.* A comprehensive qualitative, semi-structured, face-to-face interview
28 will explore participants' perspectives with reference to the fulfilled expectations after the use of
29 Addison Care ('post-use interview'), perceived enabling conditions, and social influence in the use of
30 the technology, as well as the participant's experiences and adaptations of health behaviour. The
31 interview guide questions on user experience are based on the respective literature on UX research
32 [65], those on conditions and technology's social influence along the main factors of the UTAUT model
33 [31, 32], and those on health behaviours were developed against the background of the Health Action
34 Process Approach (HAPA).[66] The interview will be audio-recorded and transcribed. With reference
35 to the embedded mixed-methods approach, the four most striking individual ratings of the previously
36 collected standardized User Experience Questionnaire (UEQ) will be thematised and perceived changes
37 in secondary outcomes (functional status, quality of life, loneliness, depression, medication
38 adherence) will be assessed using open-ended questions. To address their perspectives on the use of
39 Addison Care, an optional topical block of guided questions will be operationalized.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 *Task performance scenario and think-aloud protocol.* Finally, to gain insight into user thoughts,
59 decision-making processes, and how they experience the Addison Care technology, a structured
60

1
2
3 observation with an accompanying think-aloud protocol will be applied.[67] Participants will be asked
4
5 to perform a set of specific tasks with Addison Care while verbally expressing their immediate
6
7 thoughts, and explaining their reactions during system interaction. Task performance and participant
8
9 comments will be documented using a structured observation sheet.
10
11

12
13 [Figure 2 about here]
14
15

16 **User safety and data management**

17
18 During the two weeks study period, medical emergencies, acute deterioration in health or care needs,
19
20 patients' feelings of insecurity, or hospital admissions will constitute reasons to end the participation
21
22 early. Formal health services in the community setting will be informed about the use of Addison Care
23
24 by their clients. Informal caregivers of the participants will be educated about Addison Care and are
25
26 instructed to contact the support team in need of help (see Figure 2).
27
28
29

30
31 Figure 2 provides detailed information on the different data retrieved during participants'
32
33 enrolment. Personal information of participants will be accessed by the support team only, who will
34
35 monitor the dashboard and assist with any user problems. Dashboard access is granted by login data
36
37 provided by Addison Care USA.
38
39

40
41 All data retrieved empirically (see figure 2) will be saved on study-specific computers during data
42
43 collection and stored in password-protected folders on the support team storage after completed data
44
45 collection. User engagement data will be stored on Addison Tablet PC for short periods of time being
46
47 but regularly exported onto the server from the clinical dashboard and after the end of the pilot study
48
49 transferred to study-specific computers. All personal data will be stored at a server in Berlin in
50
51 Germany and encrypted. According to European Union General Data Protection Regulations,
52
53 participants have the right to view all stored data or choose to delete their data at any given time as
54
55 long as their data has not been anonymized by code yet.
56
57
58

59 **Analysis**

60

1
2
3 Various data will be organized and triangulated in data sets Quan 1-4 and Qual 1-3 (see Figure 2) for
4 analysis that fit the relevant phenomenon of interest. Final integration of overall results will take place
5 upon conclusion of the study [37] and will be summarized with a joint display by using a mixed methods
6 matrix.[68]
7
8
9

10
11
12 Participants` characteristics will be statistically described using information on socio-demographics,
13 living and care provision, quality of life, health literacy, activities of daily living, and medication
14 adherence (Quan 1, Figure 2).
15
16
17
18

19
20
21 A thematic content analysis of the qualitative data gained from interviews and observations in
22 encounters 4 and 5 (see Figure 2) will be performed, expanding the deductively developed code by
23 inductive inputs.[69] Deductive codes prepared from theoretical pre-considerations will include the
24 concepts of user experience as well as usability. Coding strategy will separate the two phenomena
25 during the coding process. User experience results will be produced by triangulating the results of the
26 User Experience Questionnaire (Quan 3) as well as code system elements gathered in qualitative data
27 sets (Qual 1, 2, 3). These three data sets will provide usability results after interviews are transcribed
28 and coded. The codes will then be merged with the SUS results (Quan 3) to get a clear picture of
29 obstacles and acceptance. User Engagement data will track usage events like logins, reminders, and
30 overall Addison-user-interaction over the 2-week usage period - resulting in data set Quan 4 (see Figure
31 2). To facilitate the subsequent main study, deductive codes for the area of a feasibility study are also
32 included in the coding strategy.[70] All quantitative data will be analyzed using common descriptive
33 statistics.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 51 **Ethics and dissemination**

52 53 54 **Ethical considerations**

55
56
57 This pilot study was approved by the ethics committee of the German Society for Nursing Science (21-
58 037) to ensure that the research is done in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and in line with
59
60

1
2
3 the current legislation authority (see Supplementary 3). The pilot study is registered in the German
4
5 Clinical Trials Register (ID: DRKS00025992).
6
7

8 **Dissemination**

9

10
11 The results are intended to be published in peer-reviewed journals and disseminated through
12
13 conference papers.
14
15

16 **Overview**

17

18
19 This protocol presents research that assesses the feasibility, acceptability, experience, engagement,
20
21 and usability of Addison Care – a health technology and virtual avatar for older persons with chronic
22
23 diseases in their own home.
24
25

26
27 For this purpose, we culturally adopted the Addison Care technology and its functions (tutorial,
28
29 medication management, testing vital signs) to explore participants' acceptance and experiences of
30
31 the health technology and the virtual avatar.
32
33

34
35 For older adults with chronic diseases, the overarching goal of self-management is to enhance their
36
37 quality of life and maintain independence, all while supporting formal and informal caregivers.
38
39

40
41 The goal of this pilot study is to further our understanding of the potential issues and challenges that
42
43 will be used as the foundations for a larger randomized control study.
44
45

46
47 One of the strengths of this study is the use of the health technology for a longer period of time and
48
49 with real patients in a natural setting. Another strength lies in the cultural adaption of the health
50
51 technology and its integration in a telecare framework. The integrated voice and touch interaction with
52
53 the avatar 'Addison' should also contribute to improve the human-computer interaction.
54
55

56 **Limitations**

57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Possible limitations of the pilot study are the lack of results on usability or acceptance of the US
4
5 American version of Addison Care that we can refer to. Cultural adaption and translation into German
6
7 therefore might not be the only reason for a suboptimal user experience. Interviews allow to gain
8
9 insight into this issue. The effectiveness of the extensive data collection process has to be proven as
10
11 well as the recruitment process. The highly selective sample of the pilot study will diminish ethnical or
12
13 socio-economic diversity which will be introduced thoroughly in the study following the pilot. Within
14
15 the qualitative branch of the mixed-methods study we seek sufficient richness of data but do not
16
17 expect to achieve a data saturation. The study's time line may be influenced by COVID-19 pandemic
18
19 recruitment-wise as well as by pandemic regulations in Germany which cannot be foreseen at the
20
21 current situation. Because we do not have an influence on the stability of the Internet connection, this
22
23 could be another source of uncertainty. Finally, it is not the aim of the pilot study to show effects on
24
25 the health status of the users. But the multiple instruments for testing health status-associated
26
27 phenomena should provide adequacy to show such effects in a subsequent main study.
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Contributors**

34
35
36 SK, NaS, JD, PK, NN, JO, ES, SP, MB, MK, REM and BM participated in the design of the study protocol.
37
38 SK, NaS, PK, JD, TK, and ES drafted the protocol manuscript. MB, BH, BM, SP, AW, DL, AvZ and JO
39
40 critically revised and commented on its previous versions and the final version. All authors critically
41
42 reviewed the manuscript and agreed on submission.
43
44
45

46 **Acknowledgements**

47
48
49 We acknowledge the Department of General Practice and Health Services Research, University
50
51 Hospital Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany for access to the German version of the SESG6.
52
53

54 **Funding**

55
56
57 This work is supported by Electronic Caregiver, Inc., Las Cruces, New Mexico, USA (no grant number)
58
59
60

Declarations

1
2
3 The study protocol has been approved by the ethic committee of the German Society for Nursing
4
5 Science (21-037) and is registered in the German Clinical Trials Register (ID: DRKS0002599).
6
7

8 **Conflict of interest**

9

10
11 ES, BH, and MB are employees of Electronic Caregiver, Las Cruces, New Mexico, United States
12
13

14 **Figure legend**

15
16
17 Figure 1 Addison Care functions in German version (Reproduced with permission from
18
19 <https://electroniccaregiver.com>)
20
21

22
23 Figure 2 Study flow, phenomenon of interest, instruments, data sets, and settings
24
25


26 **REFERENCES**

- 27
28
29
30 1. Maresova P, Javanmardi E, Barakovic S, Barakovic Husic J, Tomsone S, Krejcar O, et al.
31 Consequences of chronic diseases and other limitations associated with old age – a scoping review.
32 BMC Public Health. 2019;19(1):1431.
33 2. Griffith LE, Gilsing A, Mangin D, Patterson C, van den Heuvel E, Sohel N, et al. Multimorbidity
34 Frameworks Impact Prevalence and Relationships with Patient-Important Outcomes. Journal of the
35 American Geriatrics Society. 2019;67(8):1632-40.
36 3. Marengoni A, Angleman S, Melis R, Mangialasche F, Karp A, Garmen A, et al. Aging with
37 multimorbidity: a systematic review of the literature. Ageing research reviews. 2011;10(4):430-9.
38 4. Neil-Sztramko SE, Coletta G, Dobbins M, Marr S. Impact of the AGE-ON Tablet Training
39 Program on Social Isolation, Loneliness, and Attitudes Toward Technology in Older Adults: Single-
40 Group Pre-Post Study. JMIR Aging. 2020;3(1):e18398-e.
41 5. Wonggom P, Tongpeth J, Newman P, Du H, Clark R. Effectiveness of using avatar-based
42 technology in patient education for the improvement of chronic disease knowledge and self-care
43 behavior: a systematic review protocol. JBI Evidence Synthesis. 2016;14(9):3-14.
44 6. Riegel B, Jaarsma T, Strömberg A. A Middle-Range Theory of Self-Care of Chronic Illness.
45 Advances in Nursing Science. 2012;35(3):194-204.
46 7. Banbury A, Nancarrow S, Dart J, Gray L, Dodson S, Osborne R, et al. Adding value to remote
47 monitoring: Co-design of a health literacy intervention for older people with chronic disease
48 delivered by telehealth - The telehealth literacy project. Patient Education & Counseling.
49 2020;103(3):597-606.
50 8. Sheppard JP, Tucker KL, Davison WJ, Stevens R, Aekplakorn W, Bosworth HB, et al. Self-
51 monitoring of Blood Pressure in Patients With Hypertension-Related Multi-morbidity: Systematic
52 Review and Individual Patient Data Meta-analysis. American Journal of Hypertension.
53 2020;33(3):243-51.
54 9. Bailey SC, Oramasionwu CU, Wolf MS. Rethinking adherence: a health literacy-informed
55 model of medication self-management. Journal of health communication. 2013;18 Suppl 1(Suppl
56 1):20-30.
57
58
59
60

10. Heapy AA, Higgins DM, Cervone D, Wandner L, Fenton BT, Kerns RD. A Systematic Review of Technology-assisted Self-Management Interventions for Chronic Pain: Looking Across Treatment Modalities. *The Clinical Journal of Pain*. 2015;31(6):470-92.
11. Pfaeffli Dale L, Dobson R, Whittaker R, Maddison R. The effectiveness of mobile-health behaviour change interventions for cardiovascular disease self-management: A systematic review. *European journal of preventive cardiology*. 2016;23(8):801-17.
12. Morton K, Dennison L, May C, Murray E, Little P, McManus RJ, et al. Using digital interventions for self-management of chronic physical health conditions: A meta-ethnography review of published studies. *Patient Education and Counseling*. 2017;100(4):616-35.
13. Krick T, Huter K, Domhoff D, Schmidt A, Rothgang H, Wolf-Ostermann K. Digital technology and nursing care: a scoping review on acceptance, effectiveness and efficiency studies of informal and formal care technologies. *BMC health services research*. 2019;19(1):400.
14. Maresova P, Tomson S, Lameski P, Madureira J, Mendes A, Zdravevski E, et al. Technological Solutions for Older People with Alzheimer's Disease: Review. *Curr Alzheimer Res*. 2018;15(10):975-83.
15. Edmunds M, Tuckson R, Lewis J, Atchinson B, Rheuban K, Fanberg H, et al. An Emergent Research and Policy Framework for Telehealth. *EGEMS (Washington, DC)*. 2017;5(2):1303.
16. Hale TM, Jethwani K, Kandola MS, Saldana F, Kvedar JC. A Remote Medication Monitoring System for Chronic Heart Failure Patients to Reduce Readmissions: A Two-Arm Randomized Pilot Study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2016;18(5):e91.
17. Mehta SJ, Hume E, Troxel AB, Reitz C, Norton L, Lacko H, et al. Effect of Remote Monitoring on Discharge to Home, Return to Activity, and Rehospitalization After Hip and Knee Arthroplasty: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(12):e2028328-e.
18. Su D, Michaud TL, Estabrooks P, Schwab RJ, Eiland LA, Hansen G, et al. Diabetes Management Through Remote Patient Monitoring: The Importance of Patient Activation and Engagement with the Technology. *Telemed J E Health*. 2019;25(10):952-9.
19. Hoppe KK, Williams M, Thomas N, Zella JB, Drewry A, Kim K, et al. Telehealth with remote blood pressure monitoring for postpartum hypertension: A prospective single-cohort feasibility study. *Pregnancy hypertension*. 2019;15:171-6.
20. Michaud TL, Siahpush M, Schwab RJ, Eiland LA, DeVany M, Hansen G, et al. Remote Patient Monitoring and Clinical Outcomes for Postdischarge Patients with Type 2 Diabetes. *Population health management*. 2018;21(5):387-94.
21. Foster MV, Sethares KA. Facilitators and barriers to the adoption of telehealth in older adults: an integrative review. *Computers, informatics, nursing : CIN*. 2014;32(11):523-33; quiz 34-5.
22. Wongom P, Kourbelis C, Newman P, Du H, Clark RA. Effectiveness of avatar-based technology in patient education for improving chronic disease knowledge and self-care behavior: a systematic review. *JBI database of systematic reviews and implementation reports*. 2019;17(6):1101-29.
23. Bott N, Wexler S, Drury L, Pollak C, Wang V, Scher K, et al. A Protocol-Driven, Bedside Digital Conversational Agent to Support Nurse Teams and Mitigate Risks of Hospitalization in Older Adults: Case Control Pre-Post Study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2019;21(10):e13440.
24. Cassell J. Embodied Conversational Agents: Representation and Intelligence in User Interfaces. *AI Magazine*. 2001;22(4):67.
25. Gardiner P, Hempstead MB, Ring L, Bickmore T, Yinusa-Nyahkoon L, Tran H, et al. Reaching women through health information technology: the Gabby preconception care system. *American journal of health promotion : AJHP*. 2013;27(3 Suppl):eS11-20.
26. Shaked NA. Avatars and virtual agents - relationship interfaces for the elderly. *Healthcare technology letters*. 2017;4(3):83-7.
27. McLaughlin H. Service-user research in health and social care. Los Angeles: SAGE. Los Angeles: SAGE; 2009.
28. Kelders SM, van Zyl LE, Ludden GDS. The Concept and Components of Engagement in Different Domains Applied to eHealth: A Systematic Scoping Review. *Front Psychol*. 2020;11:926-


- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 29. Sousa VEC, Dunn Lopez K. Towards Usable E-Health. A Systematic Review of Usability
- 5 Questionnaires. *Appl Clin Inform.* 2017;8(2):470-90.
- 6 30. Dabbs A, Myers BA, Mc Curry KR, Dunbar-Jacob J, Hawkins RP, Begey A, et al. User-centered
- 7 design and interactive health technologies for patients. *Computers, informatics, nursing : CIN.*
- 8 2009;27(3):175-83.
- 9 31. Venkatesh V, Morris MG, Davis GB, Davis FD. User acceptance of information technology:
- 10 Toward a unified view. *Mis Quarterly.* 2003;27(3):425-78.
- 11 32. Holden RJ, Karsh BT. The technology acceptance model: its past and its future in health care.
- 12 *Journal of biomedical informatics.* 2010;43(1):159-72.
- 13 33. Czaja SJ, Charness N, Fisk AD, Hertzog C, Nair SN, Rogers WA, et al. Factors predicting the use
- 14 of technology: findings from the Center for Research and Education on Aging and Technology
- 15 Enhancement (CREATE). *Psychology and aging.* 2006;21(2):333-52.
- 16 34. Kim BY, Lee J. Smart Devices for Older Adults Managing Chronic Disease: A Scoping Review.
- 17 *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth.* 2017;5(5):e69.
- 18 35. Hoque R, Sorwar G. Understanding factors influencing the adoption of mHealth by the
- 19 elderly: An extension of the UTAUT model. *International journal of medical informatics.* 2017;101:75-
- 20 84.
- 21 36. ECG. Electronic Caregiver 2020 (Available from: <https://electroniccaregiver.com/>).
- 22 37. Creswell JW, Plano Clark VL. Designing and conducting mixed methods research. 2 ed.
- 23 Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 2011.
- 24 38. Chan AW, Tetzlaff JM, Gøtzsche PC, Altman DG, Mann H, Berlin JA, et al. SPIRIT 2013
- 25 explanation and elaboration: guidance for protocols of clinical trials. *Bmj.* 2013;346:e7586.
- 26 39. Vaughn J, Summers-Goeckerman E, Shaw RJ, Shah N. A Protocol to Assess Feasibility,
- 27 Acceptability, and Usability of Mobile Technology for Symptom Management in Pediatric Transplant
- 28 Patients. *Nursing research.* 2019;68(4):317-23.
- 29 40. Giunti G, Rivera-Romero O, Kool J, Bansi J, Sevillano JL, Granja-Dominguez A, et al. Evaluation
- 30 of More Stamina, a Mobile App for Fatigue Management in Persons with Multiple Sclerosis: Protocol
- 31 for a Feasibility, Acceptability, and Usability Study. *JMIR Res Protoc.* 2020;9(8):e18196.
- 32 41. Laugwitz B, Held T, Schrepp M. Construction and Evaluation of a User Experience
- 33 Questionnaire2008. 63-76 p.
- 34 42. Schrepp M, Hinderks A, Thomaschewski J. Design and Evaluation of a Short Version of the
- 35 User Experience Questionnaire (UEQ-S). *International Journal of Interactive Multimedia and Artificial*
- 36 *Intelligence.* 2017;4(6):103-8.
- 37 43. Ruegenhagen E, Rummel B. System Usability Scale – jetzt auch auf Deutsch. SAP User
- 38 Experience Community 2015 (Available from: [https://experience.sap.com/skillup/system-usability-](https://experience.sap.com/skillup/system-usability-scale-jetzt-auch-auf-deutsch/)
- 39 [scale-jetzt-auch-auf-deutsch/](https://experience.sap.com/skillup/system-usability-scale-jetzt-auch-auf-deutsch/)).
- 40 44. Brooke J. SUS: a “quick and dirty” usability. *Usability evaluation in industry.* 1996:189.
- 41 45. Lewis JR. The System Usability Scale: Past, Present, and Future. *International Journal of*
- 42 *Human-Computer Interaction.* 2018;34(7):577-90.
- 43 46. Taki S, Lymer S, Russell CG, Campbell K, Laws R, Ong KL, et al. Assessing User Engagement of
- 44 an mHealth Intervention: Development and Implementation of the Growing Healthy App
- 45 Engagement Index. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth.* 2017;5(6):e89.
- 46 47. Lalmas M, O'Brien H, Yom-Tov E. Measuring User Engagement. *Synthesis Lectures on*
- 47 *Information Concepts, Retrieval, and Services.* 2014;6(4):1-132.
- 48 48. Triberti S, Kelders SM, Gaggioli A. User engagement. In: Gemert-Pijnen Lv, Kelders SM, Kip H,
- 49 Sanderman R, editors. *eHealth Research, Theory and Development A Multi-Disciplinary Approach.*
- 50 London: Routledge; 2018. p. 271-89.
- 51 49. MDK -K-CG. https://kcgeriatrie.de/Assessments_in_der_Geriatrie/Documents/iadl.pdf 2020
- 52 (26.08.2020). Available from:
- 53 https://kcgeriatrie.de/Assessments_in_der_Geriatrie/Documents/iadl.pdf.
- 54 50. Lawton MP, Brody EM. Assessment of older people: self-maintaining and instrumental
- 55 activities of daily living. *The Gerontologist.* 1969;9(3):179-86.
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 51. Deppermann KM, Friedrich C, Herth F, Huber RM. (Geriatric assessment and diagnosis in
- 5 elderly patients). *Onkologie*. 2008;31 Suppl 3:6-14.
- 6 52. Ware J, Kosinski M, Dewey J, Gandek B, Kisinski M, editors. How to score and interpret single-
- 7 item health status measures: a manual for users of the SF-Y" Health Survey2001.
- 8 53. Yiengprugsawan V, Kelly M, Tawatsupa B. SF-8TM Health Survey. In: Michalos AC, editor.
- 9 *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands; 2014. p.
- 10 5940-2.
- 11 54. Hughes ME, Waite LJ, Hawkey LC, Cacioppo JT. A Short Scale for Measuring Loneliness in
- 12 Large Surveys: Results From Two Population-Based Studies. *Research on aging*. 2004;26(6):655-72.
- 13 55. Kantar P. SOEP-Core – 2017: Personenfragebogen, Stichproben A-L3. *SOEP Survey Papers*
- 14 563: Series A. Berlin: DIW/SOEP; 2018.
- 15 56. Validität und Reliabilität einer deutschen Version der Geriatrischen Depressionsskala (GDS).
- 16 (Validity and reliability of a German version of the Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS).) (press release).
- 17 Germany: Hogrefe Verlag GmbH & Co. KG1999.
- 18 57. Sheikh JI, Yesavage JA. Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS): recent evidence and development of
- 19 a shorter version. *Clinical Gerontologist: The Journal of Aging and Mental Health*. 1986.
- 20 58. Allgaier AK, Kramer D, Mergl R, Fejtkova S, Hegerl U. (Validity of the geriatric depression scale
- 21 in nursing home residents: comparison of GDS-15, GDS-8, and GDS-4). *Psychiatrische Praxis*.
- 22 2011;38(6):280-6.
- 23 59. Jongenelis K, Gerritsen DL, Pot AM, Beekman AT, Eisses AM, Kluiters H, et al. Construction and
- 24 validation of a patient- and user-friendly nursing home version of the Geriatric Depression Scale. *Int J*
- 25 *Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2007;22(9):837-42.
- 26 60. Prell T, Grosskreutz J, Mendorf S, Franke GH, Witte OW, Kunze A. Clusters of non-adherence
- 27 to medication in neurological patients. *Research in social & administrative pharmacy : RSAP*.
- 28 2019;15(12):1419-24.
- 29 61. Franke G, Küch D, Jagla-Franke M. Die Erfassung der Medikamenten-Adhärenz bei
- 30 Schmerzpatientinnen und -patienten2019.
- 31 62. Freund T, Gensichen J, Goetz K, Szecsenyi J, Mahler C. Evaluating self-efficacy for managing
- 32 chronic disease: psychometric properties of the six-item Self-Efficacy Scale in Germany. *Journal of*
- 33 *evaluation in clinical practice*. 2013;19(1):39-43.
- 34 63. Seifert A, Schelling H. Digitale Senioren. Nutzung von Informations- und
- 35 Kommunikationstechnologien (IKT) durch Menschen ab 65 Jahren in der Schweiz im Jahr 20152015.
- 36 64. World Health Organization. International classification of diseases for mortality and
- 37 morbidity statistics (11th Revision). 2018 (Available from: <https://icd.who.int/en/>).
- 38 65. Goodman E, Kuniavsky M, Moed A. Observing the user experience : a practitioner's guide to
- 39 user research. Waltham, MA:: Morgan Kaufmann; 2012.
- 40 66. Schwarzer R, Fleig L. Von der Risikowahrnehmung zur Änderung des Gesundheitsverhaltens.
- 41 *Zentralblatt für Arbeitsmedizin, Arbeitsschutz und Ergonomie*. 2014;64(5):338-41.
- 42 67. Jaspers MW, Steen T, van den Bos C, Geenen M. The think aloud method: a guide to user
- 43 interface design. *Int J Med Inform*. 2004;73(11-12):781-95.
- 44 68. O'Cathain A, Murphy E, Nicholl J. Three techniques for integrating data in mixed methods
- 45 studies. *Bmj*. 2010;341:c4587.
- 46 69. Mayring P. *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken*. 12. ed. Weinheim/Basel:
- 47 Beltz Verlag; 2015.
- 48 70. Bowen DJ, Kreuter M, Spring B, Cofta-Woerpel L, Linnan L, Weiner D, et al. How we design
- 49 feasibility studies. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2009;36(5):452-7.
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60



25 Figure 1: Addison Care functions in German version (Figure 1 reproduced with permission from
26 <https://electroniccaregiver.com>)

27 90x50mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Notes: * in case of the presence of relatives: semi-structured interview with relatives about their impressions and experiences towards AC; AC Addison Care, GDS Geriatric Depression Scale, iADL Instrumental Activities of Daily Living Scale, SAMS Stendal Adherence with Medication Score, SESGG Self-Efficacy for Managing Chronic Disease 6-item Scale, SF-8 Health Related Quality of Life Short-Form-8-Questionnaire, SUS System Usability Scale, UCLA University of California Los Angeles Loneliness Scale, UE User Engagement, UEQ User Experience Questionnaire, US Usability, UX User Experience

Figure 2: Study flow, phenomenon of interest, instruments, data sets, and settings

90x138mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Supplement 1: SPIRIT Checklist



STANDARD PROTOCOL ITEMS: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INTERVENTIONAL TRIALS

SPIRIT 2013 Checklist: Recommended items to address in a clinical trial protocol and related documents*

Section/item	Item No	Description	Protocol adherence: addressed on page number
Administrative information			
Title	1	Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, interventions, and, if applicable, trial acronym	Y:01
Trial registration	2a	Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry	Y:02
	2b	All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set	Y
Protocol version	3	Date and version identifier	NA
Funding	4	Sources and types of financial, material, and other support	Y:16
Roles and responsibilities	5a	Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors	Y:01, 16
	5b	Name and contact information for the trial sponsor	Y:16
	5c	Role of study sponsor and funders, if any, in study design; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report; and the decision to submit the report for publication, including whether they will have ultimate authority over any of these activities	Y:16
	5d	Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre, steering committee, endpoint adjudication committee, data management team, and other individuals or groups overseeing the trial, if applicable (see Item 21a for data monitoring committee)	Y:09, 13

Introduction

1				
2	Background and rationale	6a	Description of research question and justification for undertaking the trial, including summary of relevant studies (published and unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervention	Y:03-06, 08
3				
4				
5				
6				
7		6b	Explanation for choice of comparators	NA
8	Objectives	7	Specific objectives or hypotheses	Y:08
9				
10	Trial design	8	Description of trial design including type of trial (eg, parallel group, crossover, factorial, single group), allocation ratio, and framework (eg, superiority, equivalence, noninferiority, exploratory)	Y:08
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17	Methods: Participants, interventions, and outcomes			
18				
19	Study setting	9	Description of study settings (eg, community clinic, academic hospital) and list of countries where data will be collected. Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained	Y:09, Figure 2
20				
21				
22	Eligibility criteria	10	Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable, eligibility criteria for study centres and individuals who will perform the interventions (eg, surgeons, psychotherapists)	Y:09
23				
24				
25	Interventions	11a	Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication, including how and when they will be administered	Y:07-08, Figure 2
26				
27		11b	Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a given trial participant (eg, drug dose change in response to harms, participant request, or improving/worsening disease)	Y:13
28				
29				
30	Outcomes	11c	Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any procedures for monitoring adherence (eg, drug tablet return, laboratory tests)	Y:09-11, Figure 2
31				
32		11d	Relevant concomitant care and interventions that are permitted or prohibited during the trial	NA
33				
34	Outcomes	12	Primary, secondary, and other outcomes, including the specific measurement variable (eg, systolic blood pressure), analysis metric (eg, change from baseline, final value, time to event), method of aggregation (eg, median, proportion), and time point for each outcome. Explanation of the clinical relevance of chosen efficacy and harm outcomes is strongly recommended	Y:10
35				
36				
37				
38				
39				
40				
41				
42				
43				
44				
45				
46				
47				
48				
49				
50				
51				
52				
53				
54				
55				
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				

1				
2	Participant	13	Time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any	Y:09, Figure
3	timeline		run-ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for	2
4			participants. A schematic diagram is highly	
5			recommended (see Figure)	
6				
7	Sample size	14	Estimated number of participants needed to achieve	Y:09
8			study objectives and how it was determined, including	
9			clinical and statistical assumptions supporting any	
10			sample size calculations	
11				
12				
13	Recruitment	15	Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrolment	Y:09
14			to reach target sample size	
15				

Methods: Assignment of interventions (for controlled trials)

Allocation:

16				
17				
18				
19				
20	Sequence	16a	Method of generating the allocation sequence (eg,	NA
21	generation		computer-generated random numbers), and list of any	
22			factors for stratification. To reduce predictability of a	
23			random sequence, details of any planned restriction (eg,	
24			blocking) should be provided in a separate document that	
25			is unavailable to those who enrol participants or assign	
26			interventions	
27				
28				
29				
30	Allocation	16b	Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (eg,	NA
31	concealment		central telephone; sequentially numbered, opaque,	
32	mechanism		sealed envelopes), describing any steps to conceal the	
33			sequence until interventions are assigned	
34				
35				
36	Implementation	16c	Who will generate the allocation sequence, who will enrol	NA
37			participants, and who will assign participants to	
38			interventions	
39				
40	Blinding	17a	Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg,	NA
41	(masking)		trial participants, care providers, outcome assessors,	
42			data analysts), and how	
43				
44				
45		17b	If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is	NA
46			permissible, and procedure for revealing a participant's	
47			allocated intervention during the trial	
48				

Methods: Data collection, management, and analysis

49				
50				
51	Data collection	18a	Plans for assessment and collection of outcome,	Y:10-13
52	methods		baseline, and other trial data, including any related	
53			processes to promote data quality (eg, duplicate	
54			measurements, training of assessors) and a description	
55			of study instruments (eg, questionnaires, laboratory	
56			tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known.	
57			Reference to where data collection forms can be found, if	
58			not in the protocol	
59				
60				

1				
2		18b	Plans to promote participant retention and complete	Y
3			follow-up, including list of any outcome data to be	
4			collected for participants who discontinue or deviate from	
5			intervention protocols	
6				
7	Data	19	Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage,	Y: 12-13
8	management		including any related processes to promote data quality	
9			(eg, double data entry; range checks for data values).	
10			Reference to where details of data management	
11			procedures can be found, if not in the protocol	
12				
13				
14	Statistical	20a	Statistical methods for analysing primary and secondary	Y: 14-15
15	methods		outcomes. Reference to where other details of the	
16			statistical analysis plan can be found, if not in the	
17			protocol	
18				
19				
20		20b	Methods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and	X
21			adjusted analyses)	
22				
23		20c	Definition of analysis population relating to protocol non-	X
24			adherence (eg, as randomised analysis), and any	
25			statistical methods to handle missing data (eg, multiple	
26			imputation)	
27				
28				
29	Methods: Monitoring			
30				
31	Data monitoring	21a	Composition of data monitoring committee (DMC);	X
32			summary of its role and reporting structure; statement of	
33			whether it is independent from the sponsor and	
34			competing interests; and reference to where further	
35			details about its charter can be found, if not in the	
36			protocol. Alternatively, an explanation of why a DMC is	
37			not needed	
38				
39				
40		21b	Description of any interim analyses and stopping	Y: 13
41			guidelines, including who will have access to these	
42			interim results and make the final decision to terminate	
43			the trial	
44				
45				
46	Harms	22	Plans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing	Y: 13
47			solicited and spontaneously reported adverse events and	
48			other unintended effects of trial interventions or trial	
49			conduct	
50				
51				
52	Auditing	23	Frequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if	X
53			any, and whether the process will be independent from	
54			investigators and the sponsor	
55				
56				
57	Ethics and dissemination			
58				
59				
60				

1				
2	Research ethics approval	24	Plans for seeking research ethics committee/institutional review board (REC/IRB) approval	Y: 14
3				
4				
5	Protocol amendments	25	Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC/IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators)	Y: 14
6				
7				
8				
9				
10	Consent or assent	26a	Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32)	Y: 09
11				
12				
13				
14				
15		26b	Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological specimens in ancillary studies, if applicable	NA
16				
17				
18				
19	Confidentiality	27	How personal information about potential and enrolled participants will be collected, shared, and maintained in order to protect confidentiality before, during, and after the trial	Y: 13-15
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25	Declaration of interests	28	Financial and other competing interests for principal investigators for the overall trial and each study site	Y: 16
26				
27				
28	Access to data	29	Statement of who will have access to the final trial dataset, and disclosure of contractual agreements that limit such access for investigators	NA
29				
30				
31				
32				
33	Ancillary and post-trial care	30	Provisions, if any, for ancillary and post-trial care, and for compensation to those who suffer harm from trial participation	NA
34				
35				
36				
37	Dissemination policy	31a	Plans for investigators and sponsor to communicate trial results to participants, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant groups (eg, via publication, reporting in results databases, or other data sharing arrangements), including any publication restrictions	Y: 15
38				
39				
40				
41				
42				
43				
44		31b	Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional writers	NA
45				
46				
47				
48		31c	Plans, if any, for granting public access to the full protocol, participant-level dataset, and statistical code	X
49				
50				
51	Appendices			
52				
53	Informed consent materials	32	Model consent form and other related documentation given to participants and authorised surrogates	X
54				
55				
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				

1
2 Biological 33 Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation, and storage of NA
3 specimens biological specimens for genetic or molecular analysis in
4 the current trial and for future use in ancillary studies, if
5 applicable
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

1. Informed Consent

Patient Consent Form

Name of patient in block letters:

Date of birth:

I agree to participate in the patient survey and use of the digital support platform "Addison Care" in the project PiloTT-A: Piloting of the virtual telecare technology "Addison".

I have been informed that I can decline to participate without any adverse consequences, especially regarding my medical care.

The Paracelsus Medical Private University Salzburg (Austria) is responsible for conducting the survey in the context of using "Addison Care" as a digital support service for medical care needs.

I have been informed by Mr./Mrs. in a detailed conversation about the nature, type, scope and significance of the survey, as well as the aims of using the Addison Care platform, and have received a copy of this consent form.

It has been explained to me for what purpose, to what extent, on what legal basis and for how long my data from the survey will be stored and what rights I have towards the responsible party with regard to my personal data. I have received a corresponding data protection declaration as well as an information letter.

Furthermore, I agree that the clinic's physicians will hand over my current list of medications to a member of the project team.

In addition, I have been informed that by using the Addison Care platform, my usage behavior of this technology will be transmitted to the Paracelsus Medical Private University, based on data known to me.

Furthermore, I have read the text of this patient information and consent form, which comprises a total of 9 pages. I have had sufficient time to decide. I have no further questions at this time.

I am aware that my participation in the project is voluntary and that I can revoke it at any time without giving reasons and without personal disadvantage for further medical and nursing treatment. In this case, the collected data will be completely deleted and I will be informed about it.

I declare that I am willing to participate in the research project and consent to the associated processing of my personal data and the usage data of the Addison Care platform, which are known to me.

I consent to the processing of my data collected as part of this clinical trial and as described in the "Data Protection" section of this document.

1
2
3 Insofar as special personal data within the meaning of Art. 9 DSGVO, such as health data, are
4 collected, my consent also relates to this information.
5

6 **I hereby declare my voluntary participation in the survey.**
7

8 I consent that any personal information I provide for the survey may be stored and scientifically
9 processed by the Paracelsus Medical Private University Salzburg.
10

11 My personal information will only be used for this research project. Once the survey has been
12 completed, it will no longer be possible to make any further link to me as a person.
13
14
15

16 _____
17
18 Date

16 _____
17
18 Patient's signature

19
20
21
22
23
24 _____
25
26 Date

19
20
21
22
23
24 _____
25
26 Surname, first name of the informing staff member
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Ethikkommission der DGP • Stockumer Straße 12 • 58453 Witten

Paracelsus Medizinische Privatuniversität
Herrn Univ.-Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Jürgen Osterbrink
Vorstand des Instituts für Pflegewissenschaft und -praxis
Strubergasse 21
A - 5020 Salzburg



Deutsche Gesellschaft für Pflegewissenschaft
(DGP) e. V.
Geschäftsstelle
Bürgerstr. 47
47057 Duisburg

Telefon: 0203 – 356793
info@dg-pflegewissenschaft.de

Ethikkommission der Deutschen Gesellschaft
für Pflegewissenschaft
(DGP) e.V.
Vorsitz Prof. Dr. Sabine Bartholomeyczik
Stockumer Str. 12
58453 Witten

Ethikkommission@dg-pflegewissenschaft.de

Your proposal no. 21-037 to the ethical review committee of the German Society of Nursing Science (EK-DGP)

Dear Mr. Osterbrink,

the EK-DGP discussed and evaluated your proposal

A pilot study of Addison Care, the Virtual Telecare Technology, - PiloTT-A (application no. 21-037)
submitted 2021-11-16.

The committee decided to give you an ethical approval.

Good luck for the project!

2021-12-27

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Sabine Bartholomeyczik', is written over the letter.

Prof. Dr. Sabine Bartholomeyczik
Chairperson EK-DGP