



Initial Trial and User Findings

Nigel Barnes, BT



Findings cover a range of areas

- Design
- Recruitment
- Provisioning
- Usability
- Acceptability
- Experiences
- What's next

Design of the SAPHE System

- Should not be disease specific
 - Existing care pathways well developed
- Should support complex patients
 - Co morbidity
 - Social and health care problems
 - Poor self management
- Provide insight into patient lifestyle – activity monitoring
- Provide reassurance – reduce anxiety
- Help target resources – prioritise visits
- Highlight patient events that are off the CM's immediate radar.

Recruitment

- Community Matrons have been keen to be involved
- Difficulty in identifying suitable patients from their caseload (~35/CM)
 - Patients individually approached
 - Time consuming
- Patient barriers
 - Workload issues
 - esp. training
 - Cognitive abilities
 - Patient anxiety
 - Fluctuations in health
 - Frequent admissions
 - Family status
- Inconvenience / disturbance
- Family issues
- “Big Brother”

Recruitment – alternate approaches

- Request for participation across all CM patients
 - High quality briefing material needed
 - System may not be appropriate for all those interested
- Link with secondary care and community discharge
 - Rapid installation required

Provisioning

- Dedicated local contact needed
 - Liaison with CMs
 - Patient recruitment
 - Ad-hoc technical support
- Installation involves patient engagement and education
- Reduction in installation time needed
 - 4-5 hours from scratch; 2-3 hours with pre-config
- Need for continued education and awareness after install

Usability – Community Matron

- Website has raised few issues
 - co-designed with CMs
- Mobile device has been main source of issue:
 - Battery life
 - Network connectivity (3G) and speed
 - Touch screen interface
 - Weight and size (along with other equipment)
- Mobile access is of value
 - Response to ad-hoc patient contact
 - Sharing data with patients
- Additional features
 - Reading of point values on graphs (hover-over) - *provided*
 - Summary SATS for all patients – *under development*

Usability - Patient

- Limited engagement needed to date without patient user interface.
- Main issues have been with eAR sensor:
 - Wearability
 - “Floppy ears!”, oxygen, glasses, hearing aids
 - Charging
 - Dexterity for mini-USB cables
- Scales – audibility of prompts

Acceptability

- Overall patients have accepted the technology very well
- They have tried to overcome some pitfalls
 - Strapping eAR to chest, use of headbands.
- Activity monitoring has largely blended into background
 - Occasional concern over bathroom monitoring
- Some concern over device calibration (BP)
- Patient interface should help compliance, education and motivation.
 - May raise new concerns once data can be seen

Experiences

- Reduced initial trial functionality has caused some confusion.
 - CMs and patients expecting features not yet available – e.g. patient interface
- Suggestion that monitoring may affect patient behaviour – *“I’m not staying in bed all day”*
- Activity shown to be of value to CM
 - Behavioural changes picked up that were symptomatic of health problems (sleep patterns and toilet usage)
- Proactive monitoring/alerting of system integrity needed
 - Offline sensors or systems not always picked up
 - Fault reporting by CMs may reduce overall perception

What's next

- Replacement eAR sensor
 - Belt/pocket worn sensor with finger SpO₂
- Roll-out of patient interface
 - Access to data on TV
 - Messaging from CM
- Enriched CM interface
 - Summary data
 - Thresholds and RAG rating of parameters
- Benefits analysis and process models



Thank you

