

Digital Platforms in Primary Care: Leveraging Asynchronous Consultations to Support Management of Cardiometabolic Diseases and Risk Factors

Journal of Primary Care & Community Health

Volume 16: 1–2

© The Author(s) 2025

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/21501319251345721

journals.sagepub.com/home/jpc



Zare et al¹ found that structured consultations between patients and pharmacists, delivered through a 12-month Medication Therapy Management programme, reduced uncontrolled hypertension. This suggests that systematic approaches to patient-professional interactions, a modifiable aspect of care, can support improved cardiovascular disease management. Alongside workforce changes, including the introduction of allied health professionals such as pharmacists, digital technologies are also reshaping primary care and creating new opportunities to manage cardiometabolic conditions and risk factors.

Evidence suggests that patient-centred consultations, which consider the needs, expectations and preferences of individual patients, are associated with improved cardiovascular disease risk factors such as glycated haemoglobin (HbA1c), blood pressure and lipid profiles.^{2–5} This is supported by a recent review showing that tailored patient-provider communication helps chronic disease self-management.⁶ Our 2016 systematic review and meta-analysis of interventions to alter patient-practitioner consultations in patients with type 2 diabetes found inconclusive effects on cardiovascular risk factors, likely due to variations in intervention design, context and patient populations.⁷ Although the effects were inconclusive, the consultation remains an important alterable component of care that may influence long-term health outcomes.

Before the COVID-19 pandemic, evaluations of digital consultation tools in UK primary care showed low uptake, limited impact on clinical workflow and mixed experiences among patients and staff.^{8–11} Online systems such as WebGP, AskMyGP, Tele-Doc and eConsult were mostly used for administrative or relatively minor clinical issues, often by younger and more affluent patients, with limited reach to older adults.^{11–13} Although some patients found these platforms convenient, digital requests frequently required telephone or face-to-face consultation follow-up, thereby reducing any anticipated efficiency gains.¹¹

Since the COVID-19 pandemic, the use of online tools in primary and community care has accelerated, driven by national digital transformation policies.¹⁴ In particular, the UK National Health Service aims to ‘put digital tools in place

so patients can be supported with high-quality information that equips them to take greater control over their health and care’.¹⁵ Patients can submit symptoms, photographs or administrative queries through digital platforms, which are reviewed asynchronously by primary care teams. A systematic review found that asynchronous consultations were effective for diagnosis, prescribing medications, timely care, and patient convenience but were associated with increased workload and disrupted workflow.¹⁶

Digital tools could gather structured data, provide self-management prompts and trigger timely lifestyle or behavioural interventions. Some pre-consultation questionnaires also incorporate elements of patient-centred care, including questions about patients’ ideas, concerns and expectations for the consultation or contact.¹⁷ However, the current focus on operational metrics, such as appointment rates, convenience, costs and patient satisfaction, is a missed opportunity to improve clinical outcomes. Moreover, improved access does not necessarily translate into better health outcomes. Easier access may preferentially benefit relatively healthy individuals from higher socioeconomic groups, who are more likely to present with minor illnesses, rather than those with unmet health needs.¹⁸

There is also a risk that digital-first models worsen inequalities, as users of online consultation systems tend to be younger, more affluent and digitally literate.^{11–13} Groups at higher risk of cardiovascular disease, including older adults, ethnic and racial minorities and those from deprived areas, may be underrepresented. In addition to these demographic disparities, uptake of digital technologies in primary care also varies geographically, with some regions in England classified as digitally disengaged, particularly in parts of London.¹⁹ It is encouraging that in Zare et al’s¹ study, which included virtual meetings between pharmacists and patients, 78% of participants were Black, and 40% had Medicaid insurance. Future evaluations must focus on whether digital systems improve outcomes for those most at risk, not just those most able to use them.

Digital consultations, including pre-consultation questionnaires, are changing how patients interact with primary care. However, there is little evidence that they improve the



Creative Commons Non Commercial CC BY-NC: This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons

Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) which permits non-commercial use,reproduction and distribution of the work without further permission provided the original work is attributed as specified on the SAGE and Open Access pages (<https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/open-access-at-sage>).

management of cardiometabolic diseases or their associated risk factors. If digital systems are to deliver more than administrative efficiency, they must be redesigned to support structured management of diseases and their risk factors and evaluated against clinical endpoints. Otherwise, they risk entrenching a reactive, episodic model of care that does not lead to meaningful population health gains.

Mohammad S Razai 

Primary Care Unit (PCU), Department of Public Health
and Primary Care (PHPC), University of Cambridge,
Cambridge, UK


Hajira Dambha-Miller

Primary Care Research Centre, University of
Southampton, Southampton, UK

Simon Griffin

Primary Care Unit (PCU), Department of Public Health
and Primary Care (PHPC), University of Cambridge,
Cambridge, UK

ORCID iD

Mohammad S Razai  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6671-5557>

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship and/or publication of this article: MSR is an NIHR Clinical Lecturer in Primary Care. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

References

1. Zare H, Amuta AC, Rodriguez de Bittner M, et al. Evaluating the impact of the medication therapy management program on patients' blood pressure and obesity: a pre-post study. *J Prim Care Community Health*. 2025;16:21501319251332721.
2. Griffin SJ, Kinmonth A-L, Veltman MW, et al. Effect on health-related outcomes of interventions to alter the interaction between patients and practitioners: a systematic review of trials. *Ann Fam Med*. 2004;2(6):595-608.
3. McWhinney IR, Freeman T. *Textbook of Family Medicine*. Oxford University Press; 2009.
4. Slingerland AS, Herman WH, Redekop WK, et al. Stratified patient-centered care in type 2 diabetes: a cluster-randomized, controlled clinical trial of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness. *Diabetes Care*. 2013;36(10):3054-3061.
5. Dambha-Miller H, Day A, Kinmonth AL, et al. Primary care experience and remission of type 2 diabetes: a population-based prospective cohort study. *Fam Pract*. 2021;38(2):140-145.
6. Iroegbu C, Tuot DS, Lewis L, et al. The influence of patient-provider communication on self-management among patients with chronic illness: a systematic mixed studies review. *J Adv Nurs*. 2025;81(4):1678-1699.
7. Dambha-Miller H, Cooper AJ, Kinmonth AL, et al. Effect on cardiovascular disease risk factors of interventions to alter consultations between practitioners and patients with type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of trials in primary care. *Health Expect*. 2017;20(6):1218-1227.
8. Carter M, Fletcher E, Sansom A, et al. Feasibility, acceptability and effectiveness of an online alternative to face-to-face consultation in general practice: a mixed-methods study of webGP in six Devon practices. *BMJ Open*. 2018;8(2):e018688.
9. Casey M, Shaw S, Swinglehurst D. Experiences with online consultation systems in primary care: case study of one early adopter site. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2017;67(664):e736-e743.
10. Cowie J, Calveley E, Bowers G, et al. Evaluation of a digital consultation and self-care advice tool in primary care: a multi-methods study. *Int J Environ Res public Health*. 2018;15(5):896.
11. Edwards HB, Marques E, Hollingworth W, et al. Use of a primary care online consultation system, by whom, when and why: evaluation of a pilot observational study in 36 general practices in South West England. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7(11):e016901.
12. Eccles A, Hopper M, Turk A, et al. Patient use of an online triage platform: a mixed-methods retrospective exploration in UK primary care. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2019;69(682):e336-e344.
13. Jones RB, Tredinnick-Rowe J, Baines R, et al. Use and usability of GP online services: a mixed-methods sequential study, before and during the COVID-19 pandemic, based on qualitative interviews, analysis of routine eConsult usage and feedback data, and assessment of GP websites in Devon and Cornwall, England. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(3):e058247.
14. UK Government. A plan for digital health and social care. 2022. Accessed May 22, 2025. <https://shorturl.at/UKMwH>
15. NHS. 2023/24 priorities and operational planning guidance. 2023. Accessed May 22, 2025. <https://www.england.nhs.uk/publication/2023-24-priorities-and-operational-planning-guidance/>
16. Leighton C, Cooper A, Porter A, et al. Effectiveness and safety of asynchronous telemedicine consultations in general practice: a systematic review. *BJGP open* 2024;8(1).
17. Accurx. Patient Triage: What information do patients submit? 2025. Accessed May 22, 2025. <https://support accurx.com/en/articles/4246197-patient-triage-what-information-do-patients-submit>
18. Willemsen RF, Aardoom JJ, van der Galiën O, et al. A digital platform to support communication and organization in the general practice: evaluation of healthcare usage and costs using claims data of a health insurer. *Int J Med Inform*. 2024;181:105296.
19. Allcock JA, Zhuang M, Li S, et al. Landscape of digital technologies used in the national health service in England: content analysis. *JMIR Form Res*. 2024;8:e51859.