Telemedicine Adoption for Healthcare Delivery: A Systematic Review

Taif Ghiwaa¹, Imran Khan², Martin White³, Natalia Beloff⁴

Department of Computer Science and Information Systems, King Khalid University, Abha, Saudi Arabia¹ Department of Informatics, University of Sussex, Brighton, United Kingdom^{1,2,3,4}

Abstract-Telemedicine is the delivery of healthcare services using telecommunication and information technologies. The adoption of telemedicine has been promoted by advancements in technology, increased accessibility to the Internet, and the need for convenient and efficient healthcare delivery. Understanding the theoretical foundations of telemedicine adoption among healthcare providers and patients is crucial for successful acceptance and utilization. This systematic review aims to explore the theoretical frameworks and models that have been widely utilized to understand telemedicine adoption among healthcare providers and patients. A systematic search was conducted across two popular electronic databases, resulting in the inclusion of 21 relevant studies. The selected studies were analyzed to identify the theoretical perspectives employed in telemedicine adoption research. The key findings reveal that the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), the Unified Theory of Acceptance, and the Use of Technology (UTAUT) model are the most widely models used to illustrate the factors affecting telemedicine adoption among healthcare providers and patients through different countries and telemedicine contexts. Understanding these theoretical models is crucial for policymakers and healthcare professionals as it can provide insight into the key factors influencing the widespread adoption of telemedicine. This knowledge can serve as a guidance for crafting initiatives, and tailoring policies to promote the successful acceptance and utilization of telemedicine among providers and patients in diverse healthcare environments.

Keywords—Telemedicine; systematic review; technology acceptance model; adoption; telehealth; healthcare provider; patient

I. INTRODUCTION

The integration of Information and communication technology (ICT) in healthcare systems has revolutionized the delivery of healthcare services. Telemedicine, a branch of ICT, has emerged as a promising approach for delivering care remotely, overcoming distance barriers, enhancing clinical outcomes, increasing patient engagement [1], and reducing costs [2], [3]. It can be used to provide a range of clinical services, including consultations, diagnosis, treatment, monitoring, therapy process, and exchange of medical information by using electronic communication tools such as video conferencing, phone calls, or secure messaging [4]. Broadly, telemedicine includes two different types of services which are: store and forward (asynchronous), and real-time interactive (synchronous) [5], [6]. Thus, telemedicine is an excellent opportunity for health professionals to reach a wider community through remote provision of healthcare services.

Telemedicine and telehealth are often used interchangeably, but they have slightly different meanings [7]. Telemedicine specifically refers to the remote delivery of clinical healthcare services, while telehealth includes a broader scope of remote healthcare services, including both clinical and non-clinical aspects [4], [8]. Due to the inconsistent usage of the term telemedicine in the studies, it becomes difficult to define it precisely in relation to other terms. Therefore, during the search process, related terms like eHealth, mHealth, and telehealth were also taken into consideration. The studies included in the analysis focused on telemedicine as a means of providing patient-centered healthcare services over long distances.

An increasing world population, especially the elderly, [9] will require access to remote healthcare services, such as that potentially offered by integrating telemedicine with traditional healthcare practice. The COVID-19 pandemic has significantly accelerated this trend of adopting telemedicine [10]. With the pandemic forcing many people to stay at home, the use of telemedicine has become even more necessary to ensure that patients can continue to receive uninterrupted care. Accordingly, telemedicine has become an essential component of healthcare service delivery. Despite the great promise of telemedicine, its actual use is insufficient and has not achieved a prominent utilization outcome [11], [12]. The reasons behind this are not only the technical aspect but also the human behavioral aspect [13]. Thus, the acceptance of technology plays a crucial role in successfully implementing and consistently using it and is considered a significant factor in ensuring the effective implementation of IT systems.

Investigating the literature reveals a number of models are useful in understanding individuals' intentions to adopt ICT [14]. Some of these models include the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) [15], [16], Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) [17], Diffusion of Innovations Theory (DOI) [18], Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) [19], Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) [20], and Health Belief Model (HBM) [21]. These models introduce different factors that influence end users' behavior to adopt telemedicine. However, limited evidence exists regarding the optimal theory or model for understanding the acceptance of telemedicine in the realms of technology adoption and acceptance.

While individual studies explore theoretical constructs as predictors for telemedicine acceptance, there is a notable absence of a comprehensive overview that systematically analyzes these constructs, models, and factors influencing the acceptance of various types of telemedicine. This evaluation is essential from the standpoint of providers and patients, who are pivotal users of the telemedicine system. Furthermore, the authors of [22] and [23] pointed out the gap in knowledge, emphasizing that existing models are limited in scope and constrained by regional or national borders. Therefore, before suggesting a model to study telemedicine adoption, it is important to study systematically these models. Thus, this review is conducted to provide a comprehensive overview of the theories and models used to assess the behavioral intention in adopting telemedicine among healthcare providers and patients in different settings of telemedicine. The research will seek to answer:

RQ1. Which adoption theories and models are widely applied in the telemedicine context?

RQ2. What are the most prominent factors affecting telemedicine technology adoption from the end user's perspective in a different setting of telemedicine?

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: the study methods and materials are discussed in Section II, followed by Section III detailing our results. Finally, the discussion in Section IV is succeeded by an exploration of future research directions and limitations, followed by the conclusion in Section V.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A. Search Strategy

This systematic review was conducted based on the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines to ensure a systematic and transparent review process [24]. Two popular academic databases, including Scopus and PubMed, were selected to collect relevant studies published in the last decade (between 2012 and 2023) and available in English or Arabic languages. The Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome, and Study design (PICOS) framework was applied to establish the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review [25] (see Table I). The inclusion criteria encompassed studies focusing on telemedicine adoption theories and models among healthcare providers and patients. The search terms used a combination of PICOS components and were refined using Boolean operators. The search was conducted in March 2023. A specific search string can be found in Appendix 1.

| | Inclusion criteria | Exclusion criteria |
|--------------|---|--|
| Population | Patients, healthcare providers, nurses. | Not patient, not healthcare provider, not nurse. |
| Intervention | Telemedicine | Not telemedicine, no clinical services delivered to patients, no interaction with healthcare providers. |
| Outcome | Behavioral intention in adop- tion and acceptance of tech- nologies | Not based on theory, no adop- tion or acceptance. |
| Study design | studies published in English or Arabic language,full text access. | Reviews, studies not pub- lished in English or Arabic language. |

B. Search Result

The result of searching selected databases initially yielded 3,753 articles through electronic searches. In addition, manual searching yielded five articles from other sources. After removing duplicates and screening titles and abstracts, 230 articles were selected for full-text review. Finally, a total of

21 articles, meeting our inclusion criteria, were chosen for indepth analysis. Fig. 1 displays the PRISMA flow diagram for the search and selection process.

C. Data Extraction and Organization

Data from the included studies were extracted using a standardized form (see Table II). The extracted data included study characteristics (e.g., authors, year of publication, journal, the country where the study was conducted), theoretical frameworks employed, study design, population target, sample size, key constructors affecting telemedicine adoption in different contexts, and type of statistical analysis used in the study. The findings were summarized to fulfill the review's objectives by focusing on identified theories and their constructs in understanding telemedicine adoption among healthcare providers and patients.

| Data Extraction | Description |
|----------------------------|--|
| Study ID | Identifier of the study. |
| Title | Title of the study. |
| Author/s | Author/s name. |
| Year | Year of the publication. |
| Journal | Published Journal. |
| Country | Country/place where the research conducted. |
| Telemedicine application | Type of Telemedicine application. |
| Theory/Model | Type of theory/model used in the study. |
| Data collection Design | Method used to collect data. |
| Population Focus | The target of research participants. |
| Population Sampling | Number of research participants. |
| Components of theory/model | Constructor used to build theory/model. |
| Moderator components | A variable that influences the presence of a relationship between variables. |
| Statistical Analysis type | Type of analysis used to obtain the result. |

D. Quality of the Studies

A quality assessment checklist is essential for evaluating the methodological rigor and reliability of studies [26]. The quality assessment checklist of the included studies was adapted from [27] and includes five items, as presented in Table III. This checklist uses a 3-point scale where (1=Yes, 0.5=Partly, 0=No). The results of the quality assessment can be found in Appendix 2. Generally, all the included studies scored high in quality and passed the quality assessment, allowing us to proceed to the next step, which is analysis.

TABLE III. QUALITY ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

| No. | Question |
|-----|---|
| 1 | Is the study related to telemedicine adoption and its application? |
| 2 | Does the study use adoption theories or models? |
| 3 | Does the study explicitly present the research methodology? |
| 4 | Does the data collection procedure outline in the study? |
| 5 | Are the study findings clearly presented and added to the literature? |

III. RESULTS

A. Characteristics of Included Studies

After reviewing studies from the last decade, the number of publications remained limited, with only a few studies until 2018. It was in that year when there was a noticeable surge in interest regarding telemedicine adoption, a trend that continued



Fig. 1. The PRISMA flow diagram of studies search and selection.

during and beyond the COVID-19 pandemic. Fig. 2 illustrates the growth of publications over the last decade.



Fig. 2. Number of articles published by year.

As previously mentioned, various frameworks, theoretical models, and their extensions have been developed to comprehend user intentions for adopting ICT, particularly in the context of telemedicine. Among the 21 studies included in the review, TAM and UTAUT with their extension were identified to be the highest models used compared to others. As shown in Fig. 3, the TAM model and its extension were used 13 times, UTAUT was used nine times, TPB six times, HBM four times, DOI three times, and the remaining models were used only once. This diversity of models reflects the complexity of telemedicine adoption process and underscores the importance of a different approach to understanding users' attitude toward this innovation.

The distribution of countries related to the included telemedicine studies varies. Developed countries contributed the most, with 14 studies, in contrast to developing countries, which had 6 studies. The USA had the highest number of studies, with 4, followed by Australia with 3 studies. Each of the following countries Netherlands, Canada, and Germany had 2 studies, while France had only one. In developing countries, China had 2 studies, whereas the remaining countries, including the Philippines, Malaysia, India, and Saudi Arabia, had one study each. This international diversity in research reflects the global significance and varied perspectives on telemedicine adoption especially in the developing countries.

In terms of research design, most of the studies relied on quantitative methodologies. One study employed a mixedmethod approach, while 5 studies utilized qualitative research methods, including interviews (4 studies) and focus groups (1 study). There is a round balancing between publications focused on patients (12 studies) and those directed to providers (9 studies), covering a wide array of telemedicine applications. Details of the most important extracted data from these studies are presented in Table IV. For the complete set of extracted data, please refer to Appendix 3.

B. Telemedicine Applications

Telemedicine has a wide range of applications that are transforming the way healthcare services are accessed and delivered worldwide. Remote consultations, telerehabilitation, remote monitoring, mental health services, tele palliative care, teledermoscopy services, and teleneurology are examples of telemedicine applications that were covered and analyzed in the included studies. Among the included studies, a total of 5 studies focused on telemedicine services in general [13],



Fig. 3. Frequency of theories and models used to explain the adoption of telemedicine.

[28]–[31], and the other 5 studies on telemonitoring [32]– [36]. A total of 3 studies were dedicated to remote mental health services - Telepsychotherapy [37]–[39], while 4 studies centered around telerehabilitation [40], [41], and tele palliative care [42], [43], each with 2 studies. The remaining studies were designed for teleneurology [44], teledermoscopy [45], teleconsultations [46], and group-based telemedicine [47], each with one study. Telemedicine is reshaping the landscape of healthcare, with a diverse array of applications that have been examined in recent studies.

Each application of telemedicine has its own factors that may influence its users' intentions, whether for the patient or provider. According to the analysis of the studies [13], [32]– [34], [39], [43], [45], [47], the most important factors shared by most studies of telemedicine applications are perceived usefulness and ease of use, which are key determinants of users' attitudes and behavioral intentions for the TAM model. This indicates that telemedicine applications that are easy to understand and bring desired benefits as needed have a higher chance of influencing user behavior to adopt the applications [13], [28], [35].

Other significant factors repeated in most studies are social influence and facilitating conditions from the UTAUT model. The literature highlighted that social influence is a significant predictor because the opinions of colleagues for providers and family or friends of patients strongly influence user behavior. Additionally, the availability of technological and organizational support shows a positive connection with usefulness and ease to use the technology [48], [49], thus, it has a better chance of influencing user behavior to adopt telemedicine. For an overview of the factors affecting each telemedicine application among healthcare providers and patients, see Appendix 4.

C. Overview of Telemedicine Adoption Factors

Telemedicine adoption is influenced by numerous factors, which are rooted in various theoretical frameworks to adopt the technology. Although some factors are synonyms to each other for example, insecure and perceived risk, it has been classified and counted its frequencies based on the identical general terminology (have the same meaning with different terms). These factors have been categorized into 5 groups, adapted

| Study | Year Country Data collection method Theory/Model | | Constructs | | | |
|---------------------|--|---------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| Patient | | | | | | |
| [28] | 2020 | KSA | survey | UTAUT, TTF | Awareness, Self-efficacy, Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Social Influence, Facilitating Condition, TTF | |
| [37] | 2022 | USA | survey | UTAUT, TAM3, TPB | Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Social Influence, Facili- tating Condition, Anxiety, Attitude | |
| [29] | 2021 | China | survey | - | Trust the sponsor of a healthcare website, Gender, Age, Educational level, City Income level, Consumer type | |
| [45] | 2016 | Australia | survey | TAM, TRA, DOI, UTAUT | Perceived Usefulness, Ease of Use, Trust, Attitude/intention, Subjective Norm, Compatibility, Facilitator | |
| [40] | 2019 | Netherlands | interview | UTAU | Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Social Influence, Facili- tating Condition | |
| [30] | 2023 | India | survey | Push-Pull Mooring(PPM), HBM,UTAUT2 | Push Effects (Inconvenience and Perceived Healthcare Risk), Pull Effects (Opportunity for alternatives and Ubiquitous care) , Mooring effects (Trust in telemedicine) , Inertia (Habit, Switching Cost). | |
| [46] | 2023 | Germany | survey | UTAU, External variables | Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Social Influence, Com- puter Proficiency, Knowledge about digital health care solutions (Awareness), Depressive symptoms. | |
| [33] | 2023 | USA | survey | TAM | Perceived Usefulness, Ease of Use. | |
| [47] | 2019 | USA | mixed method | TRAM, External variables | Perceived Usefulness, Ease of Use, Innovativeness, Optimism, Discomfort, Insecurity, Group readiness, HIV-related privacy concerns. | |
| [34] | 2019 | USA | interview | FITT, UTAUT2,TAM, TAM3 | Fit between individuals and task: (Motivation/ Engagement, Self- efficacy) Fit between individuals and technology: (Preference for device design, HIV status, Customized alert ,Ease of use) Fit between task and technology: (System functionality, Self-awareness). | |
| [35] | 2021 | France | survey | UTAUT,HBM, UTAUT2 | Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Social Influence, Facili- tating Condition, Perceived risk, Financial cost | |
| [36] | 2021 | Not mentioned | survey | ТАМ, ТРВ, ТАМЗ,НВМ | Interpersonal Influence, Personal Innovativeness, Trustworthiness, Attitude ,Self-efficacy, Health Interest ,Perceived Value. | |
| Healthcare Provider | | | | | | |
| [32] | 2021 | Australia | survey | TAM, TPB | Perceived Usefulness, Ease of Use, Attitude. | |
| [39] | 2013 | Canada | survey | TAM, TPB | Perceived Usefulness, Ease of Use, Attitude. | |
| [38] | 2020 | Germany | Interview/focus group | DOI, External variables | Perceived benefit, Avaliability of designed room. | |
| [42] | 2022 | Netherlands | survey | UTAUT,TPB,TAM3,DOI | Outcome expectancy, Effort expectancy, Facilitating Condition, Social Influence, Attitude, Anxiety, Self-efficacy, Personal Innovativeness. | |
| [41] | 2020 | Australia | interview | TAM,HBM,External variables | Context of use,Perceived Benefits,Technical and connectivity is- sues Client capability and compatibility,Lack of physical pres- ence,Balancing the service and user needs. | |
| [31] | 2017 | China | survey | - | Authenticity and reliability of data, Awareness, Previous experience. | |
| [44] | 2022 | Philippine | survey | UTAUT, TPB | Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Social Influence, Facili- tating Conditions, Attitude. | |
| [13] | 2014 | Malaysia | survey | UTAUT, TAM, TPB,TAM3, External variables | Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Self-efficacy, Organizational Culture, Facilitating Conditions. | |
| [43] | 2020 | Canada | interview | TAM | Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use. | |

TABLE IV. MOST IMPORTANT EXTRACTED DATA FOR THE INCLUDED STUDIES

from [27], to study the adoption of telemedicine among healthcare providers and patients. These categories include individual factors, organizational factors, technological factors, security factors, and health factors. The following sections will discuss the factors of each category separately. Fig. 4 shows the factors influencing healthcare providers and patients based on the aforementioned classifications. The results show that, individual factors play a vital role in the successful adoption of telemedicine for both providers and patients as it occupied around half of the percentages among other factors. Additionally, technological, and organizational factors are considered more important for providers than patients.



Fig. 4. Classify factors affecting the adoption of telemedicine from (A) provider's perspective. (B) patient's perspective.

1) Individual Factors: As a definition, individual factors refer to the personal attributes, beliefs, attitudes, and characteristics of an individual that influence their decision to accept, adopt, or resist the use of new technology [50]. Individual factors for telemedicine adoption represented 45% for providers and around half for patients. Fig. 5 summarizes the individual factors and analyzes their frequencies based on the number of using them in the included studies from both providers' and patients' perspectives. The findings of the analysis showed that social influence is the most important factor influencing patients which was repeated 6 times [28], [35], [37], [40], [45], [46]. The second most important factor is attitude, which was repeated 3 times [36], [37], [45], followed by personal innovativeness [36], [47], self-efficacy [34], [36], awareness [28], [46], and habit [30], [40], each of which was repeated 2 times. Furthermore, the remaining set of factors include group readiness [47], optimism [47], motivation, engagement [34], compatibility [45], and other demographic characteristics such as age, gender [29], [35], computer skills, education, and socioeconomic status [29], [34], [46], each of which was mentioned only once. Finally, the lack of control of technology was mentioned in one study as a barrier [47].

Contradictory to that, the most important factor influencing providers is the attitude which was mentioned 5 times [13], [32], [39], [42], [44]. Other important factors were repeated 2 times including social influence [42], [44], self-efficacy [13], [42], and experience [31], [44]. Additionally, personal innovativeness [42], awareness [31], voluntariness [44], and client capabilities [41] factors were mentioned one time for each as a success predictor. However, anxiety [42] and lack of physical presence [41] were reported once for each as barriers.In summary, the analysis of individual factors affecting telemedicine adoption reveals that social influence and attitude are key drivers for patients, while providers are primarily influenced by their attitude.



Fig. 5. Individual factors that influence the adoption of telemedicine for providers and patients.

2) Organizational Factors: Organizational factors refer to the various aspects and characteristics within healthcare institutions that influence the overall organization's operations, performance, efficiency, and quality of care provided. These characteristics including as examples infrastructure, resource allocation, and training programs [51]. The review showed that the facilitating conditions factor is the significant facilitator for adopting telemedicine where it was repeated in the included studies 3 times for providers [13], [42], [44] and 5 times for patients [28], [35], [37], [40], [45]. Government policy, top management support, project team capacity, and external suppliers' capacity are examples of the facilitators mentioned in the included studies from the providers' perspective whereas technical and connectivity issues were mentioned as barriers for patients.

Another important factor for patients was the type of the hospital which was mentioned once [29]. On the other hand, the organizational culture factor influences providers' intention to adopt telemedicine and it was mentioned once in the included studies [13]. It is noteworthy that, the culture and values within an organization can either facilitate or hinder technology adoption and that rely on reinforcement of the top management of the organization and its policies to the adaptability, change, and support the innovation through the use of technology [13], [52]. Additionally, the findings of one study confirmed that patients tend to trust public hospitals more than private ones, thus affecting their intention to adopt telemedicine services provided by these hospitals [29]. In summary, organizational factors including facilitating conditions, government policy, and organizational culture shape the adoption of telemedicine in healthcare institutions.

3) Technological Factors: The technological factors for telemedicine adoption represented 41% for providers and 30% for patients. It refers to the technological components and considerations in the design, implementation, communication infrastructure, and related technologies that enable the delivery of remote healthcare. As shown in Fig. 6, the most common factors for patients were effort expectancy and performance expectancy [28], [35], [37], [40], [46], which were derived from the UTAUT model. They were mentioned in the included studies 5 times each. Other important factors that influenced the patients were perceived usefulness and ease to use [33],

[45], [47] which stem from the TAM model, and they were repeated 3 times for each. Task technology fit (TTF) and cost were also considered factors for patients which were repeated 2 times each. The remaining set of factors was repeated once in the included studies including perceived benefit [36], availability of the service [30], system functionality [34], customizing the functionality of the device [34], and computer proficiency [46].



Fig. 6. Technological factors that influence the adoption of telemedicine for providers and patients.

In contrast, the most important factors for providers were perceived usefulness and ease to use which were mentioned 3 times [32], [39], [43]. Indeed, when the providers find telemedicine user-friendly and help them to improve their work with less effort then, they are more likely to integrate telemedicine into their practice and adopt it. Furthermore, other important factors from the providers' perspective were effort expectancy [42], [44] and perceived benefit [38], [41] were mentioned 2 times for each factor. Finally, performance expectancy [44], balancing the service and users' need [41], outcome expectancy [42], and availability of designed room [38] were facilitators that influenced the adoption and they were repeated once for each factor. In discussing the perceived benefits of telemedicine, the literature highlights that it offers a wide range of benefits that positively impact their practice, patient care, and overall healthcare delivery. These benefits contribute to improved efficiency of time and cost, help patients access support, and enhance the quality of care [38], [41], [53]. In summary, the adoption of telemedicine is significantly influenced by various technological factors that differ between providers and patients, with both groups placing a strong emphasis on the ease of use and perceived usefulness.

4) Security Factors: The security factors related to telemedicine adoption represented 5% for each provider and patient. It is defined as the level of protection and assurance that healthcare providers and patients have regarding the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of sensitive information and data transmitted, stored, or accessed during telemedicine interactions [54]. The most important security factor from the providers' perspective is the authenticity and reliability of data from remote patient monitoring, and it serves as a barrier that negatively influences telemedicine adoption [31]. Whereas the patients' behavioral intention was influenced by two factors: perceived trust and perceived risk which were repeated in the included studies four and two times respectively. The perceived

trust ranges between privacy [47], trust in general [36], trust in the organization [29] and trust in telemedicine [45]. Moreover, the included studies identify the perceived risk in the context of losing to reach the desired outcome when using technology as it may not work properly [35], [47]. So, all security factors are considered barriers. This is due to the sensitive nature of healthcare data and the potential risks associated with remote communication and data exchange.

5) Health Factors: The factors related to health are likely to influence the behavioral intention of patients just, and it represented 11% among other factors. As it was defined, health factors refer to both the benefits and challenges that telemedicine brings to the healthcare landscape [55]. Health interests, perceived health risks, health conditions, and depressive symptoms are factors identified in the included studies once for each factor. The perceived health risk associated with telemedicine includes risk management, human resource, clinical risk, technology risk, and regulatory issues [30]. With regard to health interests, when individuals have a strong interest in maintaining their health and accessing healthcare services, they are more likely to adopt telemedicine as a convenient and accessible option [36]. Moreover, people with depressive symptoms are more likely to seek for professional treatment as telemedicine gives the option to receive treatment from home thus, adopting and accepting care through telemedicine [46].

IV. DISCUSSION

Studying the behavioral intention of end users to adopt telemedicine has attracted research attention recently. The reasons behind that are the importance of understanding user perspectives, predicting adoption rates, and designing effective strategies to promote telemedicine adoption. By taking users' intentions and preferences into account, healthcare organizations can foster a positive telemedicine experience and maximize the potential benefits of this innovative healthcare delivery method.

The fundamental goal of this review is to summarize the different factors based on various acceptance theories that might influence healthcare providers and patients to adopt telemedicine through different applications. The findings of the review showed that the TAM and UTAUT models are the most important models in adopting and accepting telemedicine. This result is consistent with the study conducted to evaluate the different acceptance models and theories in the healthcare sector [56]. From a user-centered perspective, it has been noticed that the UTAUT model was used more frequently by patients than by providers to explain telemedicine acceptance. This is due to its inclusion of variables associated with social influence, which is likely to be more important for patients than for providers. In contrast, the TAM model was used for investigating the acceptance of providers more than for patients. As it was mentioned earlier, the functional characteristics of the technology to be free of effort and compatible with the desired need are good determinants for adopting telemedicine by users.

Furthermore, it has been found that some studies use a single theoretical model [33], [40], [43], while others use more than one model [13], [28], [32], [34]–[37], [42], [44],

[45]. Although the TAM and UTAUT are the based models in most literature as it was mentioned above, other factors from different models were integrated with them to represent the acceptance in different contexts. TRA, TPB, DOI, HBM, and TTF are the models that were integrated parts of their predictors with the based model. According to Barrettee, it is useful to combine more than one model as each model focuses on different aspects of technology adoption, such as individual perceptions, organizational factors, or external influences. By combining multiple models, researchers can obtain a holistic view of the adoption process, considering various factors that may influence technology acceptance [57].

Another important factor integrated with the base model in 4 studies is perceived trust [29], [30], [36], [45]. It was observed to be essential for patients to accept modern healthcare delivery. Accordingly, healthcare organizations and telemedicine providers must proactively address trust-related concerns and demonstrate a commitment to maintaining the highest standards of security, privacy, and quality care delivery. Building and maintaining trust in telemedicine services are key to establishing a sustainable and patient-centric approach to modern healthcare delivery. One of the most important factors added to the base model in 8 studies [13], [32], [36], [37], [39], [42], [44], [45] is attitude from TPB model. The TPB model suggests that an individual's attitude toward a specific behavior strongly influences their intention to perform that behavior [19]. This implies that a positive attitude toward using telemedicine services is likely to promote its adoption among healthcare providers and patients. So, if individuals believe that telemedicine is eased to use and offers tangible benefits, such as convenience, improved access to care, improve work efficiency, and time savings, they are more likely to have a positive attitude toward its adoption [13], [32].

Additionally, the findings revealed that self-efficacy significantly influences adoption. It refers to an individual's belief in their ability to use technology effectively [36]. As stated by Bandura in his social cognitive theory [58], individuals' behaviors are influenced by their own capabilities to perform a particular task. So, patients with high self-efficacy are more likely to actively engage and accept telemedicine to receive healthcare. Besides that, self-efficacy can influence the healthcare providers' willingness to adopt and integrate telemedicine into their practice, where high self- efficacy makes them feel more confident in their ability to use virtual communication tools, maintain patient engagement, and conduct remote consultations and treatment effectively [42], [59].

The review also explored different key factors that were extensively employed in the included literature with the base models to understand the acceptance including awareness, innovativeness, and habit. According to Chen et al. [31], users with positive attitudes toward telemedicine reflect their great awareness of service benefits. Consequently, there is a direct relationship between users' awareness and their attitude, and thus their intention toward adopting telemedicine. Moreover, it is has found that innovativeness as a perceived advantage makes healthcare more accessible and efficient for a broader population [42], [47]. As a result, it improves the quality of healthcare delivery and maximizes patient engagement then its adoption. Regarding habit, authors in [30], and [40] indicate that building positive habits around telemedicine usage is crucial for its widespread adoption and long-term success. Consequently, telemedicine can become an established and habitual part of modern healthcare practices by addressing any barriers related to usability, trust, convenience, and positive outcomes.

A. Limitations and Future Research

The review has a few limitations, which gives an opportunity for further research. First, this review used only two databases for retrieving relevant studies. Including more databases could lead to richer results. Additionally, language bias could affect the results, papers not published in English or Arabic language were excluded. Third, the focus of the population in the included studies is for patients and healthcare providers including physicians and nurses. Future studies are encouraged to encompass different sets of the individual such as administrators, and health professionals as it may lead to in-depth knowledge and a full picture of the adoption process.

V. CONCLUSION

Telemedicine is an evolving field of healthcare that has revolutionized the way patients receive medical attention remotely. This systematic literature review identified the theoretical constructs associated with end-user adoption and acceptance of telemedicine. When reviewing included studies, it is obvious that TAM and UTAUT are the most widely technology acceptance models applied to the telemedicine context. Additionally, the constructs of TAM and UTAUT models were the most deployed factors to evaluate the acceptance and adoption of telemedicine. Adding to that other factors were integrated with the previous constructs including, attitude, self-efficacy, perceived trust, innovativeness, and habit.

Existing studies include various applications of telemedicine. Teleconsultations, telerehabilitation, telemonitoring, telepsychotherapy, tele palliative care, teledermoscopy services, and teleneurology are some examples of applications that are covered in this review. While some factors apply to all applications of telemedicine, others are validated to specific applications. Therefore, understanding the nuanced factors that impact the success of telemedicine in diverse healthcare contexts is crucial for optimizing patient care and healthcare delivery.

The review provided a classification analysis of the factors that influence telemedicine adoption among healthcare providers and patients. These categories include individual, organizational, technological, security, and health factors. In general, it has been noticed that individual factors occupied the largest percentage among other factors for both providers and patients. Social influence and attitude are the most significant factors at the individual level. At the organizational level, facilitating conditions is an essential factor for telemedicine adoption by both parties' providers and patients. Furthermore, perceived usefulness, ease of use, effort expectancy, and performance expectancy are important influencers at the technological level. Besides that, perceived trust was found to be a significant factor at the security level. Finally, at the health level, health interests, perceived health risks, health conditions, and depressive symptoms were identified to influence the patients' intention to adopt telemedicine.

The results of this review can provide insights to policymakers and healthcare organizations on the factors that influence end-user behavioral intention to adopt the modern healthcare delivery method. Understanding these factors is pivotal in crafting effective strategies for the widespread implementation of telemedicine. Moreover, recognizing the unique individual characteristics of end-users, such as their technological proficiency, awareness, and subjective norms, is essential. Tailoring telemedicine initiatives to meet the specific needs of diverse patient populations can significantly enhance the acceptance and utilization of this innovative approach to healthcare delivery. By acknowledging and accommodating these individual differences, healthcare systems can maximize the potential benefits of telemedicine, leading to improved patient outcomes and more efficient healthcare services.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. O'Connor, P. Andreev, and P. O'Reilly, "Mhealth and perceived quality of care delivery: a conceptual model and validation," *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, vol. 20, 02 2020.
- [2] J. Shen, S. Ghatti, N. Levkov, H. Shen, T. Sen, K. Rheuban, K. Enfield, N. Facteau, G. Engel, and K. Dowdell, "A survey of covid-19 detection and prediction approaches using mobile devices, ai, and telemedicine," *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 5, 12 2022.
- [3] A. Mubaraki, A. Alrabie, A. Sibyani, R. Aljuaid, A. Bajaber, and M. Mubaraki, "Advantages and disadvantages of telemedicine during the covid-19 pandemic era among physicians in taif, saudi arabia," *Saudi Medical Journal*, vol. 42, pp. 110–115, 01 2021.
- [4] S. Sood, V. Mbarika, S. Jugoo, R. Dookhy, C. Doarn, N. Prakash, and R. Merrell, "What is telemedicine? a collection of 104 peer-reviewed perspectives and theoretical underpinnings," *Telemedicine journal and e-health : the official journal of the American Telemedicine Association*, vol. 13, pp. 573–90, 11 2007.
- [5] M. Alsaleh, V. Watzlaf, D. DeAlmeida, and A. Saptono, "Evaluation of a telehealth application (sehha) used during the covid-19 pandemic in saudi arabia: Provider experience and satisfaction," *Perspectives in health information management*, vol. 18, p. 1b, 10 2021.
- [6] M. Hassibian and S. Hassibian, "Telemedicine acceptance and implementation in developing countries: Benefits, categories, and barriers," *Razavi International Journal of Medicine*, vol. Inpress, 08 2016.
- [7] HealthIT.gov. (2019, Oct) What is telehealth? how is telehealth different from telemedicine? [Online]. Available: https://www.healthit. gov/faq/what-telehealth-how-telehealth-different-telemedicine
- [8] F. Fatehi and R. Wootton, "Telemedicine, telehealth or e-health? a bibliometric analysis of the trends in the use of these terms," *Journal of telemedicine and telecare*, vol. 18, 12 2012.
- [9] W. H. Organization. (2022, Oct) Ageing and health. [Online]. Available: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ageing-and-health
- [10] Y.-R. Hong, J. Lawrence, D. Williams, and A. M. Iii, "Population-level interest and telehealth capacity of us hospitals in response to covid-19: Cross-sectional analysis of google search and national hospital survey data," *JMIR Public Health and Surveillance*, vol. 6, 2020.
- [11] H. Nadri, B. Rahimi, H. Lotfnezhad Afshar, M. Samadbeik, and A. Garavand, "Factors affecting acceptance of hospital information systems based on extended technology acceptance model: A case study in three paraclinical departments," *Appl Clin Inform*, vol. 09, pp. 238– 247, 04 2018.
- [12] M. Douglas, J. Xu, A. Heggs, G. Wrenn, D. Mack, and G. Rust, "Assessing telemedicine utilization by using medicaid claims data," *Psychiatric Services*, vol. 68, pp. 173–178, 02 2017.
- [13] S. Zailani, M. Gilani, D. Nikbin, and M. Iranmanesh, "Determinants of telemedicine acceptance in selected public hospitals in malaysia: Clinical perspective," *Journal of medical systems*, vol. 38, p. 111, 09 2014.
- [14] A. Alqudah, M. Al-Emran, and K. Shaalan, "Technology acceptance in healthcare: A systematic review," *Applied Sciences*, vol. 11, p. 10537, 11 2021.

- [15] V. Venkatesh and F. Davis, "A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies," *Management Science*, vol. 46, pp. 186–204, 02 2000.
- [16] V. Venkatesh and H. Bala, "Technology acceptance model 3 and a research agenda on interventions," *Decision Sciences - DECISION SCI*, vol. 39, pp. 273–315, 05 2008.
- [17] V. Venkatesh, M. Morris, G. Davis, and F. Davis, "User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view," *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 27, pp. 425–478, 09 2003.
- [18] R. EM, Diffusion of Innovations (4th ed.). New York: The Free Press, 1995.
- [19] I. Ajzen, "The theory of planned behaviour: Reactions and reflections," *Psychology and health*, vol. 26, pp. 1113–27, 09 2011.
- [20] M. Fishbein, I. Ajzen, and A. Belief, "Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research," *Contemporary Sociology*, vol. 6, 03 1977.
- I. M. Rosenstock, "Historical origins of the health belief model," *Health Education Monographs*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 328–335, 1974.
 [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1177/109019817400200403
- [22] A. Alaboudi, A. Atkins, B. Sharp, A. Balkhair, M. Alzahrani, and T. Sunbul, "Barriers and challenges in adopting saudi telemedicine network: The perceptions of decision makers of healthcare facilities in saudi arabia," *Journal of Infection and Public Health*, vol. 9, 09 2016.
- [23] A. Albahri, J. Alwan, Z. Taha, S. Fawzi, R. Amjed, A. Zaidan, O. Albahri, B. Bahaa, A. Alamoodi, and M. Alsalem, "Iot-based telemedicine for disease prevention and health promotion: State-of-the-art," *Journal* of Network and Computer Applications, 10 2020.
- [24] D. Moher, A. Liberati, J. Tetzlaff, and D. Altman, "Research methods and reporting. preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the prisma statement," *Br Med J*, vol. 339, pp. 332– 339, 07 2009.
- [25] J. Higgins, J. Thomas, J. Chandler, M. Cumpston, T. Li, M. Page, and V. Welch, "Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions," *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*, 09 2019.
- [26] M. Al-Emran, V. Mezhuyev, A. Kamaludin, and K. Shaalan, "The impact of knowledge management processes on information systems: A systematic review," *International Journal of Information Management*, vol. 43, pp. 173–187, 12 2018.
- [27] M. Al-rawashdeh, P. Keikhosrokiani, B. Belaton, M. Alawida, and A. Zwiri, "Iot adoption and application for smart healthcare: A systematic review," *Sensors*, vol. 22, p. 5377, 07 2022.
- [28] M. Yamin and B. Alyoubi, "Adoption of telemedicine applications among saudi citizens during covid-19 pandemic: An alternative health delivery system," *Journal of Infection and Public Health*, vol. 13, 10 2020.
- [29] L. Liu and L. Shi, "Chinese patients' intention to use different types of internet hospitals: Cross-sectional study on virtual visits," *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, vol. 23, p. e25978, 08 2021.
- [30] N. Dogra, S. Bakshi, and A. Gupta, "Exploring the switching intention of patients to e-health consultations platforms: blending inertia with push–pull–mooring framework," *Journal of Asia Business Studies*, vol. ahead-of-print, 01 2022.
- [31] P. Chen, L. Xiao, Z. Gou, L. Xiang, X. Zhang, and P. Feng, "Telehealth attitudes and use among medical professionals, medical students and patients in china: A cross-sectional survey," *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, vol. 108, 09 2017.
- [32] V. Brunelli, J. Fox, and D. Langbecker, "Disparity in cancer survivorship care: A cross-sectional study of telehealth use among cancer nurses in australia," *Collegian*, vol. 28, 01 2021.
- [33] M. Finco, G. Cay, M. Lee, J. Garcia, E. Salazar, T.-W. Tan, D. Armstrong, and B. Najafi, "Taking a load off: User perceptions of smart offloading walkers for diabetic foot ulcers using the technology acceptance model," *Sensors*, vol. 23, p. 2768, 03 2023.
- [34] H. Cho, G. Sanabria, M. Saylor, M. Gradilla, and R. Schnall, "Use of the fitt framework to understand patients' experiences using a real-time medication monitoring pill bottle linked to a mobile-based hiv selfmanagement app: A qualitative study," *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, vol. 131, 08 2019.

- [35] W. Ben Arfi, I. Nasr, T. Khvatova, and Y. Ben Zaied, "Understanding acceptance of ehealthcare by iot natives and iot immigrants: An integrated model of utaut, perceived risk, and financial cost," *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, vol. 163, 11 2020.
- [36] M. I. Hossain, A. Fadhil, A. Hussin, N. Iahad, and A. Sadiq, "Factors influencing adoption model of continuous glucose monitoring devices for internet of things healthcare," *Internet of Things*, vol. 15, p. 100353, 01 2021.
- [37] V. Békés, K. Aafjes-Van Doorn, and B. Bőthe, "Assessing patients' attitudes towards telepsychotherapy: The development of the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology -patient version," *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*, vol. 29, 06 2022.
- [38] M. Haun, I. Stephan, M. Wensing, M. Hartmann, M. Hoffmann, and H.-C. Friederich, "Intent-to-adopt video-based integrated mental healthcare and characteristics of its supporters: A mixed-methods study among general practitioners applying diffusion of innovations theory," *JMIR Mental Health*, vol. 7, 09 2020.
- [39] J. Monthuy-Blanc, S. Bouchard, C. Maïano, and M. Seguin, "Factors influencing mental health providers' intention to use telepsychotherapy in first nations communities," *Transcultural psychiatry*, vol. 50, 05 2013.
- [40] C. Bakker, J. Huirne, F. Schaafsma, C. Geus, H. Bonjer, and J. Anema, "Electronic health program to empower patients in returning to normal activities after colorectal surgical procedures: Mixed-methods process evaluation alongside a randomized controlled trial (preprint)," 04 2018.
- [41] T. Ownsworth, D. Theodoros, L. Cahill, A. Vaezipour, R. Quinn, M. Kendall, W. Moyle, and K. Lucas, "Perceived usability and acceptability of videoconferencing for delivering community-based rehabilitation to individuals with acquired brain injury: A qualitative investigation," *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, vol. 26, pp. 47–57, 01 2020.
- [42] R. Evering, M. Postel, H. van Os-Medendorp, M. Bults, and M. den Ouden, "Intention of healthcare providers to use video-communication in terminal care: a cross-sectional study," *BMC Palliative Care*, vol. 21, 11 2022.
- [43] M. Nguyen, J. Fujioka, K. Wentlandt, N. Onabajo, I. Wong, R. Bhatia, O. Bhattacharyya, and V. Stamenova, "Using the technology acceptance model to explore health provider and administrator perceptions of the usefulness and ease of using technology in palliative care," *BMC palliative care*, vol. 19, p. 138, 09 2020.
- [44] G. Pagaling, A. Espiritu, M. Dellosa, C. F. Leochico, and P. Pasco, "The practice of teleneurology in the philippines during the covid-19 pandemic," *Neurological Sciences*, vol. 43, 11 2021.
- [45] C. Horsham, L. Loescher, D. Whiteman, P. Soyer, and M. Janda, "Consumer acceptance of patient-performed mobile teledermoscopy for the early detection of melanoma," *The British journal of dermatology*, vol. 175, 04 2016.
- [46] A. Esber, M. Teufel, L. Jahre, J. Schmitten, E.-M. Skoda, and

A. Bäuerle, "Predictors of patients' acceptance of video consultation in general practice during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic applying the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology model," *DIGITAL HEALTH*, vol. 9, p. 205520762211493, 01 2023.

- [47] S. Marhefka, D. Turner, and E. Lockhart, "Understanding women's willingness to use e-health for hiv-related services: A novel application of the technology readiness and acceptance model to a highly stigmatized medical condition," *Telemedicine and e-Health*, vol. 25, 08 2018.
- [48] L. Chen and A. Aklikokou, "Determinants of e-government adoption: Testing the mediating effects of perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use," *International Journal of Public Administration*, vol. 43, pp. 1– 16, 09 2019.
- [49] R. Wu, Z. Wu, J. Wen, Y. Cai, and Y. Li, "Extrinsic and intrinsic motivation as predictors of bicycle sharing usage intention: An empirical study for tianjin, china," *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 225, 04 2019.
- [50] S. Kaphle, S. Chaturvedi, I. Chaudhuri, R. Krishnan, and N. Lesh, "Adoption and usage of mhealth technology on quality and experience of care provided by frontline workers: Observations from rural india," *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, vol. 3, p. e61, 05 2015.
- [51] A. Carvalho and P. Santos, "Medication adherence in patients with arterial hypertension: The relationship with healthcare systems' organizational factors," *Patient Preference and Adherence*, vol. 13, p. 1761–1774, 10 2019.
- [52] D. Bangert and R. Doktor, "Implementing store-and-forward telemedicine: Organizational issues," *Telemedicine journal and ehealth : the official journal of the American Telemedicine Association*, vol. 6, pp. 355–60, 02 2000.
- [53] J. Doran and J. Lawson, "The impact of covid-19 on provider perceptions of telemental health," *Psychiatric Quarterly*, vol. 92, 09 2021.
- [54] V. Garg and J. Brewer, "Telemedicine security: A systematic review," *Journal of Diabetes Science and Technology*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 768–777, 2011, pMID: 21722592. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1177/193229681100500331
- [55] J. Matusitz and G.-M. Breen, "Telemedicine: Its effects on health communication," *Health communication*, vol. 21, pp. 73–83, 02 2007.
- [56] A. Alqudah, M. Al-Emran, and K. Shaalan, "Technology acceptance in healthcare: A systematic review," *Applied Sciences*, vol. 11, p. 10537, 11 2021.
- [57] C. Barrette, "Usefulness of technology adoption research in introducing an online workbook," *System*, vol. 49, 04 2015.
- [58] A. Bandura, "Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change," *Psychological Review*, vol. 84, pp. 191–215, 01 1977.
- [59] L. Goldin, G. Cohen, C. Mueller, and A. Salles, "The relationship between self-efficacy and well-being among surgical residents," *Journal* of Surgical Education, vol. 76, 09 2018.

Appendices Appendix 1: Database Search String

Search String (Scopus):

| 1.Population | patient* OR provider* OR doctor* OR physician OR nurse* OR HCP | 11,296,563 | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| AND | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.Intervention | Telemedicine OR "Remote Consultation" OR "virtual clinic" OR virtual-clinic OR "tele medicine" OR tele-medicine OR telehealth OR tele-health OR "mobile health" OR mHealth OR m-health OR eHealth OR e-health OR "remote consultation" OR teleconsultation* OR tele-consultation* OR "tele consultation*" OR "video consultation*" OR "virtual consultation"* OR televisit* OR tele-visit* OR "tele visit*" OR eVisit* OR e-visit* OR "video visit*" OR "remote visit*" OR "virtual visit*" OR "video encounter*" OR "remote encounter*" OR "virtual encounter*" OR telediagnos* OR "tele- diagnos*" OR "tele diagnos*" OR "remote diagnos*" OR "video conferenc*" OR "video time video" OR "synchronous video" | 7315 | | | | | | | | |
| | AND | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.Outcome | factor* OR influence OR determin* OR predict* OR "acceptance model" OR accept* OR satisfaction OR adopt* OR "adopt* model" OR "information system success model" OR theory OR theories OR framework* OR "behavioral intention" OR "intention to use" | 31,302,427 | | | | | | | | |
| Result | 1 AND 2 AND 3 | 1804 | | | | | | | | |

Search String (PubMed):

| 1.Population | patient* OR provider* OR doctor* OR physician OR nurse* OR HCP | 162,264 | |
|-------------------------|---|---------|--|
| | | | |
| | AND | | |
| 2.Intervention | Telemedicine OR "Remote Consultation" OR "virtual clinic" OR virtual- clinic OR "tele medicine" OR tele-medicine OR telehealth OR tele-health OR "mobile health" OR mHealth OR m-health OR e-health OR "remote consultation*" OR teleconsultation* OR tele-consultation* OR "tele consultation" OR "video consultation*" OR "virtual consultation"* OR televisit* OR tele-visit* OR "tele visit*" OR eVisit* OR e-visit* OR "video visit*" OR "remote visit*" OR "virtual visit*" OR "video encounter*" OR "remote encounter*" OR "virtual encounter*" OR telediagnos* OR "tele-diagnos*" OR "tele diagnos*" OR videoconferenc* OR "video conferenc*" OR "real-time video" OR "synchronous video" | 4,438 | |
| | | | |
| 3.Outcome | factor* OR influence OR determin* OR predict* OR "acceptance model" OR accept* OR satisfaction OR adopt* OR "adopt* model" OR "information system success model" OR theory OR theories OR framework* OR "behavioral intention" OR "intention to use" | 139,233 | |
| Result | 1 AND 2 AND 3 | 1949 | |
| Selected free full text | Books and Documents, Classical Article, Clinical Study, Controlled Clinical Trial, Corrected | and | |

Selected free full text, Books and Documents, Classical Article, Clinical Study, Controlled Clinical Trial, Corrected and Republished Article, Humans, Arabic, English.

Appendix 2: Quality Assessment Result

Quality assessment scores for included review studies.

| Study ID | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | Score |
|----------|-----|-----|----|----|----|-------|
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 6 | 0.5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.5 |
| 7 | 1 | 0.5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.5 |
| 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 10 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 11 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 12 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 13 | 0.5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.5 |
| 14 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 15 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 16 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 17 | 0.5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.5 |
| 18 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 19 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 20 | 0.5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.5 |
| 21 | 0.5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.5 |

| Study | L., | | | | | | | Data Collection | | | L | | | |
|----------|--|----------------------------------|------|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|--|
| ID | Title | Author | year | Journal | country | Telemedicine application | Theory/model | Design | Population NO. of | | Telemedicine application | component of the theory/model | moderator components | statistical analysis |
| _ | | | | | | | | | sampling | Focus | | wareser | | |
| | Adoption of telemedicine | | | | | | | | | | | self-efficacy | | |
| | applications among Saudi citizens during COVID-19 | | | | | | | | | | | TTF | | |
| | pandemic: An alternative health delivery system | Yamin M, Alwoubi B | 2020 | Journal of Infection | *54 | Telemedicine based wireless sensor network applications | UTAUT | SUPPRIM | 348 | natient | telemedicine | awareness self-efficary | 000 | structural equation |
| <u> </u> | income of the state of the stat | | | | | sensor network oppressions | | | | percent | | an energy | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Construct validity was assessed using exploratory |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | factor analysis (EFA) in SPSS and confirmatory factor |
| | Assessing patients' | | | | | | | | | | | | | analysis (CFA) in Mplus 8.7. |
| | attitudes towards telepsychotherapy: The | | | | | | | | | | | Parformance Expertance | | using two indicators (i.e., |
| | development of the | | | | | | | | | | | Effort Expectancy | | Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's) as using only |
| | acceptance and use of | Békés V., | | | | | | | | | | Social Influence Facilitating Condition | | Cronbach's alpha |
| , | technology-patient | Doorn K.A | 2022 | Clinical Psychology | 1154 | telensyrhotherany | UTAUT | SUDARY | 107 | natient | telepsychotherapy | Anxiety Attitudes | ion | weindens |
| <u> </u> | | ., | | une i pjenouncrep j | 0.071 | ((c)))((c))) | 0.000 | | | percent | | 100005 | | |
| | Chinese patients' intention to use different | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | types of internet hospitals: Cross-sectional | | | Journal of Medical | | | | | | | telemedicine | | | |
| 3 | study on virtual visits | Liu L., Shi L. | 2021 | Internet Research | China | internet hospital | _ | survey | 1653 | patient | covid-19 | - | non | logistic regression |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | perceived usefulness | | |
| | Consumer acceptance of | Horsham C., Loescher L.I. | | | | | | | | | | ease of use trust | | |
| | patient-performed mobile | Whiteman | 1 | | | | | | | | | attitude/intention | | |
| | early detection of | H.P., Janda | | British Journal of | | | | | | | teledermoscopy for the early | compatibility | | |
| 4 | melanoma | м. | 2016 | Dermatology | Australia | teledermoscopy | TAM | survey | 228 | patient | detection of melanoma | facilitators | non | not mentioned |
| | Disparity in cancer | Dama all'I I M | | | | | | | | | | and the descent of the second s | | |
| | sectional study of | Fox J.A., | | | | | | | | provider | | ease of use | | |
| s | telehealth use among cancer nurses in Australia | Langbecker D.H. | 2021 | Collegian | Australia | telemedicine | TAM | survey | 79 | provider - nurse | telemonitoring cancer survivorship | Attitude Intention to use | non | logistic regression. |
| Ē | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Electronic Health Program to Empower Patients in | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Returning to Normal Activities After Colorectal | den Bakker CM. Huirne | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Surgical Procedures: | IA, Sebastema | | | | | | | | | | Duformana amostana | anadas | |
| | Evaluation Alongside a | FG, de Geus | | | | | | | | | rehabilitation | Effort expectancy | age | |
| 6 | Randomized Controlled Trial | C, Bonjer HJ, Anema JR. | 2019 | J Med Internet Res | Netherlands | using the "ikherstel" program | UTAUT | interview | 14 | patient | Empower Patients After Colorectal Surgery | Social influence Facilitating and inhibiting conditions | experience voluntariness of use | |
| F | Puplicity the suitables | | | | | | | | | | | and all the second and a second as | | - |
| | intention of patients to e- | | | | | | | | | | | risk) | | |
| | health consultations platforms: blending inertia | Dogra N., | | | | | | | | | | pull effects (opportunity for alternatives and ubiquitous care) | | |
| , | with push-pull-mooring | Bakshi S., | 2072 | Journal of Asia Business Studios | India | telemericine | push-pull-mooring | Surpage/ | 413 | nations | telamadirina | mooring effects (trust) | 000 | structural equation |
| Ě | | ovpie A. | eves | ousmess studies | | | | | -10 | perceit | no-cimeorome | not on fright, switcing cost) | | mooring |
| | Factors influencing mental health providers' intention | Monthuy- Blanc J | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | to use telepsychotherapy | Bouchard S., | | Transcultured | | | | | | | telepsychotherapy | nerraised scelulears | | dimetural equation |
| 8 | communities | Maiano C., Séguin M. | 2013 | Psychiatry | Canada | telepsychotherapy | TAM | survey | 205 | provider | communities | ease of use | non | structural equation modeling |
| F | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | based integrated mental | Stephan I., | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | health care and the characteristics of its | Wensing M., Hartmann | | | | | DOI | | | | | | | |
| | supporters: Mixed | м., | | JMIR Mental | | mental health specialist video | Diffusion of | focus group, | | | telepsychotherapy | perceived benefit | | |
| 2 | methods study among general practitioners | Hoffmann M., | 2020 | Health | Germany | consultations (MHSVC) | Innovations Theory | interview | 0 | provider | mental health | availability | non | |
| | applying diffusion of | Friederich | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | anotocony catory | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | Outcome expectancy Effort expectancy | | |
| | Intention of healthcare | | | | | | | | | | | Attitude Social influence | | |
| | providers to use video- | Evering | | | | | | | | | | Facilitating conditions | | |
| | terminal care: a cross- | RPostel Mvan Os- | | | | | UTAUT | | | | app in palliative care | Anxiety Self-efficacy | | |
| 10 | sectional study | Medendorp H et al | 2022 | BMC Palliative Care | Netherlands | telemedicine | DOI | survey | 90 | provider | terminal care | Personal innovativeness | non | A multiple linear regression |
| | | Ownsworth | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Perceived Usability and Acceptability of | T., Theodoros | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Videoconferencing for Delivering Community | D., Cahill L., Vaezinour A | | | | | | | | | | the context or impetus for use | | |
| | Based Rehabilitation to | Quinn R., | | Journal of the | | | | | | | | perceived benefits | | |
| | Individuals with Acquired Brain Injury: A Qualitative | Kendall M., Moyle W., | | International Neuropsychological | | | | | | patient | rehabilitation for people with | potential problems and parameters around use | | |
| 11 | Investigation | Lucas K. | 2020 | Society | Australia | videoconferencing (VC) | там | interview | 30 | provider | acquired brain injury (ABI) | balancing the service and user needs | non | Thematic analysis |
| | Predictors of patients' | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | acceptance of video | Esher A | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | practice during the | Teufel M., | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic applying the | Jahre L., in der | | | | | | | | | | performance expectancy | | |
| | unified theory of | Schmitten J., | | | | | | | | | teleconcultation | effort expectancy | | |
| 12 | technology model | Băuerle A. | 2023 | Digital Health | Germany | telemedicine | UTAUT | survey | 371 | patient | covid-19 | computer proficiency | non | A hierarchical regression |
| | | Finco MG. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Taking a Load Off: User | Cay G, Lee | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Perceptions of Smart Offloading Walkers for | M, Garcia J, Salazar E, | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Diabetic Foot Ulcers Using the Technology | Tan TW, Armstrone | | | | Percentions of Smart Offloading | | | | | telemonitoring | nerreiverl usefulness | | |
| 13 | Acceptance Model | DG, Najafi B. | 2023 | Sensors (Basel) | USA | Walkers in adherence | TAM | survey | 21 | patient | Diabetic Foot Ulcers | ease of use | non | Chi-squared tests |
| | Telehealth attitudes and | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | use among medical professionals, medical | Chen P., Xiao | | | | | | | | provider | | advantaee | | |
| | students, and patients in | Xiang L., | | International | | | | | | patient | and a second state of | concern | | Department and the |
| 14 | unina: A cross-sectional survey | zhang X., Feng P. | 2017 | Journal of Medical Informatics | China | telemedicine | not theory | survey | 550 | medical student | teremedicine general | awareness usage | non | structural equation modeling |
| F | | - | | | | | | | | | [| - | | - |
| | | Fagaling G.T., Espiritu A.I., | 1 | | | | | | | | | performance expectancy | | |
| | The practice of | M.A.A., | | | | | | | | | | errort expectancy social influence | | |
| | teleneurology in the Philippines during the | Leochico C.F.D. Porr- | | Neurological | | | | | | | | facilitating conditions attitude | Experience | |
| 15 | COVID-19 pandemic | P.M.D. | 2022 | Sciences | Philippine | telemedicine | UTAUT | survey | 147 | provider | teleneurology | behavioral intention | Voluntariness | logistic regression analysis |
| - | Understanding Women's | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Willingness to Use e- | | | | | | | | | | | Innovativeness Ontimism | | |
| | Services: A Novel | | | | | | | | | | | Discomfort | | |
| | Application of the Technology Readiness and | Marhefka | | | | | | | | | | Insecurity Perceived Usefulness | | |
| | Acceptance Model to a | S.L., Turner | | Talamadicino or " | | | | | | | Group-based telemedicine | Ease-of-Use | | |
| 16 | Medical Condition | E. | 2019 | e-Health | USA | telemedicine | TRAM | mixed method | 91 | patient | program of WLH | HIV-related privacy concerns | - | logistic regression analysis |
| - | Use of the FITT framework | | | | | | | | | | | fit between individuals and task: | | |
| | to understand patients' | | | | | | | | | | | motivation | | |
| | time medication | a.u | | | | | | | | | | engagement | | |
| | monitoring pill bottle linked to a mobile-based | uho H, Flynn G, Saylor M, | | | | | | | | | telemonitoring | preference for device design | | |
| 17 | HIV self-management app: A qualitative study | Gradilla M, Schnall P | 2019 | Int I Med Inform | USA | telemedicine- monitoring | ETT | Interview | 38 | patien! | improving medication | HIV status customized alect | | thematic analysis |
| ř | | samell R. | | | - 471 | | | | | | | ease of use | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | system functionality | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | awareness | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | government policy external suppliers' capacity | | |
| | Determinants of | | | | | | | | | 1 | | project team's capacity top management support | | |
| | Telemedicine Acceptance In Selected Public | Zailani SGilani | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | perceived usefulness perceived ease of use | age | |
| 18 | Hospitals in Malaysia: Clinical Personanti | MNikbin D e | 2014 | Journal of Medical Systems | Malaysia | telemedicine | extended TAM | SULVEY | 117 | provide- | telemedicine arrentore | attitude | job title | |
| Ë— | Lister Perspective | | 2024 | -, | | | A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A | | | ,der | acceptance | | | |
| | Using the technology acceptance model to | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | explore health provider and administrator | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | erceived usefulness emote connection | | |
| | perceptions of the usefulness and ease of | Nguyen MFujioka | | | | | | | | 1 | | _ information-sharing platform ease of use | | |
| 19 | using technology in palliative care | /Wentlandt K et al | 2020 | Neurological Sciences | Canada | telemedicine | ТАМ | interview | 18 | provider | app in palliative care | Integration with existing IT systems user- friendly | | |
| F | Understanding r | | - | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | onerstanding acceptance of eHealthcare by IoT | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | performance expectancy | | |
| | immigrants: An integrated | Ben Arfi | | | | | | | | 1 | | social influence | | |
| L | perceived risk, and | wisen Nasr Khvatova T | | recnnological Forecasting and | | | | | | | telemonitoring | perceived risk | age | Structural equation |
| 20 | financial cost | et al | 2021 | Social Change | France | | UTAUT | survey | 268 | patient | ToT-based healthcare devices | financial cost | gender | modeling |
| | Factors influencing | | | | | | | | | | | Interpersonal Influence Personal Innovativeness | | |
| | adoption model of | Hossain | | | | | TAM TRA | | | | | Trustworthiness Attitude Toward a Wearable Desire | | |
| | monitoring devices for | MYusof AHustin A -+ | | Internat of This | not | | TPB SE (Self-efficience | | | 1 | telemonitorin- | Self-Efficacy | | Partial least square and |
| 21 | healthcare | al. | 2021 | (Netherlands) | mentioned | telemedicine | Theory) | survey | 97 | patient | Glucose Monitoring | Perceived Value | - | modelling |
| <u> </u> | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |

Appendix 3: Complete form of the Extracted Data.

| | E-mail E-mail | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--------------|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| Context of telemedicine | rocus | | Individual | Organizational and Environmental | Factors | Technological | Security | Frequency |
| Telerehabilitation | Provider | V | Client capability and compatibility | - | - | Perceived benefit | - | |
| | | | Lack of physical presence | | | · Balancing the service and user | | |
| | (Ownswort | | | | | needs. | | |
| | n et al., 2020) | | | | | The context for use Technical and connectivity | | |
| | | | | | | issues | | |
| | Patient | V | Social Influence | Eacilitating Condition | - | Performance Expectancy | - | |
| | (den | | Uskit | - Tuchhang Condition | | Effort Expectancy | | |
| | Bakker et | | • Habit | | | · Enort Expectancy | | |
| | al., 2019) | | | | | | | |
| Telemonitoring | Provider | 1 | | | | | - | |
| relemonitoring | Tiovider | v | Attitude | | | Perceived usefulness | | |
| | (Brunelli et | | | | | Ease to use | | |
| | al., 2021) Patient | 1 | | | | | | ease to use (2) |
| | | • | Motivation and engagement | Facilitating Condition | Health condition statues | Perceived usefulness | Trust | self-efficacy (2) |
| | (Hossain et | | Self-efficacy | Financial cost | The later second | Ease to use | | Social Influence (2) |
| | al., 2021) | | Social Influence | | Health Interest | Performance Expectancy | | |
| | (Finco et | | Attitude | | Perceived healthcare risk | Effort Expectancy | | |
| | al., 2023) | | Personal innovativeness | | | System functionality | | |
| | (Cho et al., | | Self-awareness | | | Perceived value | | |
| | 2019) | | • Age | | | Customize alert | | |
| | (Ben Arfi | | • Gender | | | | | |
| | et al., | | Preference of device design | | | | | |
| | 2021) | | . Selection of device design | | | | | |
| Telehealth applications in | Provider | \checkmark | Social Influence | Facilitating Condition | • | Outcome expectance | • | |
| palliative care | (Nguyen et | | Attitude | . aontaing condition | | Effort Expectancy | | |
| | al., 2020) | | - Anniate | | | - Enon Expectancy | | |
| | (David | | Anxiety | | | | | |
| | (Evering et al., 2022) | | Self-efficacy | | | | | |
| | , 2022) | | Personal innovativeness | | | | | |
| | patient | X | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | | | | | · | | | |
| Telepsychotherapy | Provider | \checkmark | Attitude | - | - | Perceived usefulness | - | |
| | (Haun et | | | | | Ease to use | | |
| | al., 2020) | | | | | Availability of designed | | |
| | (Monthuy- | | | | | room. | | |
| | Blanc et | | | | | Perceived benefit | | |
| | al., 2013) | | | | | | | |
| | Patient | V | Social Influence | Facilitating Condition | - | Performance Expectancy | - | |
| | (Békés et | | Anxiety | | | Effort Expectancy | | |
| | al., 2022) | | Attitude | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Teleneurology | Provider | V | | | | | | |
| | | • | Social Influence | Facilitating Condition | | Performance Expectancy | | |
| | (Pagaling | | Attitude | | | Effort Expectancy | | |
| | 2022) | | Experience | | | | | |
| | | | Voluntariness | | | | | |
| | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | |
| | patient | X | - | - | - | - | - | |
| Teledermoscopy | provider | Х | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Patient | \checkmark | Subjective norms | Facilitating Condition | | Perceived usefulness Trust | | |
| | (Horsham | | Attitude | 5 | | Ease to use | | |
| | et al., | | Compatibility | | | | | |
| | 2016) | | Companionity | | | | | |
| we have a strength of the stre | | v | | | | | | |
| releconsultation | Patient | X | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | | v | Social Influence | | Depressive symptoms | Performance Expectancy | | |
| | (Esber et | | Knowledge about digital health care solutions | | | Effort Expectancy | | |
| | a., 2023) | | SUMULIS | | | Computer proficiency | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Group-based telemedicine | provider | x | - | - | | | | |
| and a contraction | Patient | | Ontimism | - | - | Perceived usefulness | Privacy | |
| | (Marbaffra | | | | | Free to receive userumess | Invacy Incommit: | |
| | et al., | | - Innovativeness | | | - Lase to use | - insecurity | |
| | 2019) | | Discomion | | | | | |
| | | | Group readiness | | | | | |
| Televediai | Dres 1 | , | | | | | | |
| reiemedicine | rrovider | V | Attitude | Government policies | | Perceived usefulness | Authenticity and reliability of | ease to use (2) perceived usefulness (2) |
| | (Chen et | | Self-efficiency | Top management support | | Ease to use | of patients | |
| | al., 2017) | | Awareness | Project team capacity | | | | |
| | (Zailani et | | Previous experience | External suppliers' capacity | | | | |
| | al., 2014) | | | Health culture | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | Patient | \checkmark | Social Influence | Facilitating Condition | Perceived healthcare risk | Performance Expectancy | Trust in organization | |
| | (Yamin & | | Awareness | Cost | Hospital type | Effort Expectancy | Trust in telemedicine | |
| | Alyoubi, | | • Habit | Con | . nothing the | Task technology fit | | |
| | 2020) | | | | | I disk technology | | |
| | (Liu & Shi, | | - inconvenience | | | Dorquitous care | | |
| | 2021) | | Age | | | Perceived benefit | | |
| | (Dogra et | | • Gender | | | | | |
| | al., 2023) | | Education level | | | | | |
| | | | City income level | | | | | |
| | | | Consumer type | | | | | |
| | | | Self-efficiency | | | | | |
| | | | • | | | | | |

Appendix 4: List of the Factors Affecting Patients and Healthcare Providers in Different Telemedicine Applications.