











## AUTHOR'S DECLARATION

I, **Aqsa Khalil**, hereby state that no portion of the work referred to in this dissertation has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other University or institute of learning.

Student's Name: AQSA KHALIL

Signature Aqsa Khalil

Date \_\_\_\_\_





















































































































## 5.1 Proposed Framework:

The proposed framework provides a comprehensive understanding of institutions that hinder and restrict knowledge sharing and interconnectedness among key actors and activities in the telemedicine ecosystem. By outlining various components, the framework highlights critical issues like the absence of telemedicine education, lack of public-private partnerships, and non-cooperative attitudes among healthcare providers. Additionally, it emphasizes the influence of informal institutions, practices, and attitudes, such as resistance to change and mistrust. This holistic approach facilitates the identification of systemic challenges. It also sheds light on significant policy-making barriers that impede the progress of telemedicine. The framework underscores the limited collaboration with international organizations, which hinders knowledge sharing and the adoption of best practices. These barriers contribute to a fragmented telemedicine ecosystem, limiting its potential to improve healthcare accessibility and outcomes. Such restrictions in knowledge sharing impede the feedback loop among telemedicine actors, leading to delays in refining and improving telemedicine practices.

## **Chapter 6: Conclusion, Implications and Future Direction**

### **6.1 Conclusion:**

Prior researches show that Pakistan, in its 75-year history, has experienced one approved National Health Policy passed through Parliament (1990), two National Health Policies announced and approved by the ministerial Cabinet (1997, 2001) and one draft policy of 2010. None of the policies were translated into operational planning as the targets were overambitious and direction tended to be vague. The medical practice in the country is alarmingly unregulated.

The study rests on the premise that despite being widely acknowledged for supporting efficient and effective delivery of medical services, telemedicine adoption has not become an integral part of the healthcare system in Pakistan. Such disengagement deprives the healthcare system of delivering cost-effective and inclusive medical care. Given the criticality of the issue, the factors contributing to limited adoption of the industry cannot be ignored. Taking this in notice, this study explores the barriers contributing to the low adoption of telemedicine. This research contributes to the literature by investigating the barriers that are faced by actors in the innovation system. The research findings indicate that while technological limitations exist within the country, they are not the primary obstacles to progress. Instead, the main barriers stem from disconnected and uncoordinated efforts among various actors and institutions involved. It contributes to the existing literature by investigating the obstacles faced by actors within the National System of Innovation, including doctors, policymakers, academia, startup owners, and telemedicine analysts. By focusing on these stakeholders, the research aims to uncover the underlying issues hindering the widespread implementation of telemedicine. Main barriers stem from disconnected and uncoordinated efforts among the various actors and institutions involved. This fragmentation leads to inefficiencies and hampers the cohesive development of telemedicine initiatives. Moreover, the lack of a robust regulatory framework exacerbates these issues, as it fails to provide clear guidelines and standards for telemedicine practices. Without proper regulation, the trust and acceptance of telemedicine by both healthcare providers and patients remain low. Additionally, the absence of strategic operational planning further

complicates the adoption process, as initiatives often lack clear objectives and measurable outcomes as they are not backed by local research on prevailing issues. Addressing these challenges requires a multi-faceted approach that involves the active collaboration of all stakeholders within the innovation system. Policymakers need to create and enforce comprehensive regulations that support telemedicine adoption. Healthcare providers and institutions must work together to develop and implement strategic plans that align with national health policies. Furthermore, investment in infrastructure and training is essential to ensure that technological advancements can be effectively utilized.

In conclusion, while Pakistan faces significant barriers to the adoption of telemedicine, these challenges are not insurmountable. By fostering coordination and collaboration among all actors involved, and by establishing a clear and supportive regulatory framework, Pakistan can overcome these obstacles and integrate telemedicine into its healthcare system. This integration is crucial for delivering cost-effective, inclusive, and high-quality medical care to its population, ultimately improving the overall healthcare outcomes in the country.

## 6.2 Implications:

### *6.2.1. Theoretical Implications:*

This study contributes to the theoretical knowledge of telemedicine barriers in literature by conducting comprehensive research involving various stakeholders, such as doctors, start-up owners, analysts, and policymakers. It underscores the importance of interactive activities that need to be focused on to address these barriers effectively. By engaging with these diverse actors, the study provides a multi-faceted perspective on the challenges in telemedicine adoption. This approach not only enriches the existing body of knowledge but also highlights the critical role of collaboration and active engagement among stakeholders in overcoming the obstacles to telemedicine implementation.

### *6.2.2. Practical Implications*

This study offers three key contributions to practice: First, it reveals that Resistance to the adoption of telemedicine extends beyond just patients and doctors; it involves multiple external stakeholders who play crucial roles in supporting these practices. Moreover, even

within the realm of innovation, there are reservations regarding the potential of telemedicine. By uncovering such dimensions, this research brings out the intricacy of the issue and points out top barriers hindering the formulation of effective strategies and interventions to overcome such resistance.

Second, it highlights the fact that despite the strength of these innovations to deliver healthcare with better cost-saving models, there exist several institutional obstacles that may produce frictions in the adoption of e-health innovations. By doing so, it sows that the adoption of these innovations is not just an operational or technical decision, rather it is a broader decision.

Third, telemedicine start-up' owners and analysts shared an interesting viewpoint on incorporating business acumen from the industry experts into the national level policy making for telemedicine. This collaboration would not only aid the creators of telemedicine solutions but also attract international knowledge sharing from those interested in contributing to the health sector. Their involvement could amplify the impact of telemedicine initiatives, increase public awareness, and drive adoption, ultimately enhancing the effectiveness and reach of telemedicine services across Pakistan.

### *6.2.3. Limitations:*

The findings of this research may not be universally applicable to all healthcare systems or contexts. The barriers to telemedicine adoption could vary significantly depending on regional differences in healthcare infrastructure, cultural norms, and regulatory frameworks. Additionally, the research may have limitations related to the size and representativeness of the sample population studied.

### *6.3 Future Directions:*

Building on the findings of this study, it is crucial to explore innovation systems at regional and sectoral levels to gain a detailed understanding of the implementation problems of telemedicine at each level. This need is further underscored by the implications of the 18th Amendment, which has led to the devolution of power to the provinces. Conducting a comparative analysis when studying innovation systems at regional and sectoral levels facilitates the identification

of best practices and successful models of telemedicine adoption. These insights can be replicated in other regions or sectors to enhance their telemedicine implementation. comparative analysis. By comparing different regions and sectors, it is possible to identify best practices and successful models of telemedicine adoption. These insights can be leveraged to replicate success in other areas.

## References:

- Abugabah, A., Nizamuddin, N., & Alzubi, A. A. (2020). Decentralized telemedicine framework for a smart healthcare ecosystem. *IEEE Access*, 8, 166575–166588.  
<https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3021823>
- Alaboudi, A., Atkins, A., Sharp, B., Balkhair, A., Alzahrani, M., & Sunbul, T. (2016). 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*, 9(6), 725–733.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2016.09.001>
- Alenoghena, C. O., Ohize, H. O., Adejo, A. O., Onumanyi, A. J., Ohihoin, E. E., Balarabe, A. I., Okoh, S. A., Kolo, E., & Alenoghena, B. (2023). Telemedicine: A Survey of Telecommunication Technologies, Developments, and Challenges. *Journal of Sensor and Actuator Networks*, 12(2).  
<https://doi.org/10.3390/jsan12020020>
- Alsaawi, A. (2014). A CRITICAL REVIEW OF QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS. In *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences* (Vol. 3, Issue 4).  
<http://ssrn.com/abstract=2819536>  
<http://www.ejbss.com/recent.aspx>  
<https://ssrn.com/abstract=2819536>  
<http://www.ejbss.com/recent.aspx>
- Amjad, M. (2020). Telemedicine: Implementation, Challenges and Opportunities in the Global World. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1(2), 40–53.  
<https://doi.org/10.55737/qjssh.738748741>
- Aruleba, K., & Jere, N. (2022). Exploring digital transforming challenges in rural areas of South Africa through a systematic review of empirical studies. In *Scientific African* (Vol. 16). Elsevier B.V. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sciaf.2022.e01190>
- Ashfaq, A., Memon, S. F., Zehra, A., Barry, S., Jawed, H., Akhtar, M., Kirmani, W., Malik, F., Khawaja, A. W., Barry, H., Saiyid, H., Farooqui, N., Khalid, S., Abbasi, K., & Siddiqi, R. (2020). Knowledge and Attitude Regarding Telemedicine Among Doctors in Karachi. *Cureus*.  
<https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.6927>

Babatunde, A. O., Abdulazeez, A. O., Adeyemo, E. A., Uche-Orji, C. I., & Saliyu, A. A. (2021). Telemedicine in Low and Middle Income Countries: Closing or Widening the Health Inequalities Gap? *European Journal of Environment and Public Health*, 5(2), em0075  
<https://doi.org/10.21601/ejeph/10777>

Bashshur, R. L., Shannon, G. W., Smith, B. R., Alverson, D. C., Antoniotti, N., Barsan, W. G., Bashshur, N., Brown, E. M., Coye, M. J., Doarn, C. R., Ferguson, S., Grigsby, J., Krupinski, E. A., Kvedar, J. C., Linkous, J., Merrell, R. C., Nesbitt, T., Poropatich, R., Rheuban, K. S., ... Yellowlees, P. (2014). The empirical foundations of telemedicine interventions for chronic disease management. *Telemedicine and E-Health*, 20(9), 769–800.  
<https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2014.9981>

Batsis, J. A., DiMilia, P. R., Seo, L. M., Fortuna, K. L., Kennedy, M. A., Blunt, H. B., Bagley, P. J., Brooks, J., Brooks, E., Kim, S. Y., Masutani, R. K., Bruce, M. L., & Bartels, S. J. (2019). Effectiveness of Ambulatory Telemedicine Care in Older Adults: A Systematic Review. In *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* (Vol. 67, Issue 8, pp. 1737–1749). Blackwell Publishing Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.15959>

Berwick, D. M. (n.d.). *Disseminating Innovations in Health Care*. <https://jamanetwork.com/>

Bitar, H., & Alismail, S. (2021). The role of eHealth, telehealth, and telemedicine for chronic disease patients during COVID-19 pandemic: A rapid systematic review. In *Digital Health* (Vol. 7). SAGE Publications Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20552076211009396>

Campling, N. C., Pitts, D. G., Knight, P. V., & Aspinall, R. (2017). A qualitative analysis of the effectiveness of telehealthcare devices (i) are they meeting the needs of end-users? *BMC Health Services Research*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-017-2408-8>

Cannavacciuolo, L., Capaldo, G., & Ponsiglione, C. (2023). Digital innovation and organizational changes in the healthcare sector: Multiple case studies of telemedicine project implementation. *Technovation*, 120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2022.102550>

Dickey, A. M., & Wasko, M. M. L. (2023). Digital Disparities in Patient Adoption of Telemedicine: A Qualitative Analysis of the Patient Experience. *International Journal of Healthcare Information Systems and Informatics*, 18(1). <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJHISI.318043>

Chakraborty, I., Ilavarasan, P. V., & Edirippulige, S. (2021). Health-tech startups in healthcare service delivery: A scoping review. In *Social Science and Medicine* (Vol. 278). Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.113949>

Edquist, C. (2004). Science and Public Policy Final remarks Reflections on the systems of innovation approach. In *Science and Public Policy* (Vol. 31, Issue 6). Beech Tree Publishing. [www.circle.lu.se](http://www.circle.lu.se).

El-Rashidy, N., El-Sappagh, S., Riazul Islam, S. M., El-Bakry, H. M., & Abdelrazek, S. (2021). Mobile health in remote patient monitoring for chronic diseases: Principles, trends, and challenges. In *Diagnostics* (Vol. 11, Issue 4). Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI). <https://doi.org/10.3390/diagnostics11040607>

Fuentes, R. A., & Soto, A. R. (2015). Non-technological innovations in Chilean agricultural firms: What motivates the decision to innovate and the propensity of innovation? *Ciencia e Investigacion Agraria*, 42(2), 171–179. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-16202015000200004>

Gates, B. (2020). Responding to Covid-19 — A Once-in-a-Century Pandemic? *New England Journal of Medicine*, 382(18), 1677–1679. <https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmp2003762>

George, A. S., & Hovan George, A. S. (2023). *Partners Universal International Innovation Journal (PUIIJ) Telemedicine: A New Way to Provide Healthcare*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8075850>

Grimshaw, J. M., Eccles, M. P., Lavis, J. N., Hill, S. J., & Squires, J. E. (2012). Knowledge translation of research findings. *Implementation Science*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-7-50>

Hair, J. F., Page, M., & Brunsveld, N. (n.d.). *Essentials of Business Research Methods; Fourth Edition*.

Haleem, A., Javaid, M., Singh, R. P., & Suman, R. (2021). Telemedicine for healthcare: Capabilities, features, barriers, and applications. In *Sensors International* (Vol. 2). KeAi Communications Co. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sintl.2021.100117>

- Hathaliya, J. J., & Tanwar, S. (2020). An exhaustive survey on security and privacy issues in Healthcare 4.0. In *Computer Communications* (Vol. 153, pp. 311–335). Elsevier B.V. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comcom.2020.02.018>
- Herold, R., van den Berg, N., Dörr, M., & Hoffmann, W. (2018). Telemedical Care and Monitoring for Patients with Chronic Heart Failure Has a Positive Effect on Survival. *Health Services Research*, *53*(1), 532–555. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12661>
- Hills, A. (n.d.). *Operational Challenges Faced by Healthcare Start-ups in Pharma Sector in India*.
- Ittefaq, M., Seo, H., Abwao, M., & Baines, A. (2022). Social media use for health, cultural characteristics, and demographics: A survey of Pakistani millennials. *Digital Health*, *8*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20552076221089454>
- Kamal, S. A., Shafiq, M., & Kakria, P. (2020). Investigating acceptance of telemedicine services through an extended technology acceptance model (TAM). *Technology in Society*, *60*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2019.101212>
- Kim, S. S. (2009). Individualism and collectivism: Implications for women. *Pastoral Psychology*, *58*(5–6), 563–578. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11089-009-0236-4>
- Kruse, C. S., Pacheco, G. J., Vargas, B., Lozano, N., Castro, S., & Gattu, M. (2022). Leveraging Telehealth for the Management of Breast Cancer: A Systematic Review. In *Healthcare (Switzerland)* (Vol. 10, Issue 10). MDPI. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare10102015>
- Latif, S., Rana, R., Qadir, J., Ali, A., Imran, M. A., & Younis, M. S. (2017). Mobile Health in the Developing World: Review of Literature and Lessons from a Case Study. In *IEEE Access* (Vol. 5, pp. 11540–11556). Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2017.2710800>
- Lotta, A., Klippel, E., Kira, S. D., Stiedenroth, S., Prof, S., & Brosius, C. (n.d.). On and under the Surface. *SOUTH ASIA INSTITUTE Health and Society in South Asia Series*.
- Lundvall, B.-Å., Rasmussen, P., & Lorenz, E. (2008). Education in the Learning Economy: A European Perspective. *Policy Futures in Education*, *6*(6), 681–700. <https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2008.6.6.681>

- Martins, C., Oliveira, T., & Popovič, A. (2014). Understanding the internet banking adoption: A unified theory of acceptance and use of technology and perceived risk application. *International Journal of Information Management*, *34*(1), 1–13.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2013.06.002>
- Mahdi, S. S., Allana, R., Battineni, G., Khalid, T., Agha, D., Khawaja, M., & Amenta, F. (2022). The promise of telemedicine in Pakistan: A systematic review. In *Health Science Reports* (Vol. 5, Issue 1). John Wiley and Sons Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hsr2.438>
- Mishra, A., & Pandey, N. (2023). Global entrepreneurship in healthcare: A systematic literature review and bibliometric analysis. In *Global Business and Organizational Excellence* (Vol. 42, Issue 5, pp. 9–21). John Wiley and Sons Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.22193>
- Myers, M. D., Chughtai, H., Davidson, E., Tsibolane, P., & Young, A. G. (2020). Studying the other or becoming the other: Engaging with indigenous peoples in is research. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, *47*, 382–396. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.04718>
- Nittari, G., Khuman, R., Baldoni, S., Pallotta, G., Battineni, G., Sirignano, A., Amenta, F., & Ricci, G. (2020). Telemedicine Practice: Review of the Current Ethical and Legal Challenges. In *Telemedicine and e-Health* (Vol. 26, Issue 12, pp. 1427–1437). Mary Ann Liebert Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2019.0158>
- Paul, D. L., Pearlson, K. E., Mcdaniel, R. R., Pearlson, K. E., & Mcdaniel, R. R. (1999). Assessing Technological Barriers to Telemedicine: Technology-Management Implications. In *IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON ENGINEERING MANAGEMENT* (Vol. 46, Issue 3).
- Sapci, A. H., & Sapci, H. A. (2019). Digital continuous healthcare and disruptive medical technologies: m-Health and telemedicine skills training for data-driven healthcare. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare*, *25*(10), 623–635. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1357633X18793293>
- Sundin, P., Callan, J., & Mehta, K. (2016). Why do entrepreneurial mHealth ventures in the developing world fail to scale? *Journal of Medical Engineering and Technology*, *40*(7–8), 444–457. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03091902.2016.1213901>

Waller, M., & Stotler, C. (2018). Telemedicine: a Primer. In *Current Allergy and Asthma Reports* (Vol. 18, Issue 10). Current Medicine Group LLC 1. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11882-018-0808-4>

Wernhart, A., Gahbauer, S., & Haluza, D. (2019). eHealth and telemedicine: Practices and beliefs among healthcare professionals and medical students at a medical university. *PLoS ONE*, *14*(2). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0213067>

Choi, H., & Zo, H. (2019). Assessing the efficiency of national innovation systems in developing countries. *Science and Public Policy*, *46*(4), 530-540.

Pan, T. -W., Hung, S. -W., and Lu, W. -M. (2010) 'DEA Performance Measurement of the National Innovation System in Asia and Europe', *Asia-Pacific Journal of Operational Research*, *27*/03: 369–92.

Toedtling, F., and Trippel, M. (2005) 'One Size Fits All?: Towards a Differentiated Regional Innovation Policy Approach', *Research Policy*, *34*/8: 1203–19.

Aoki, N., Dunn, K. I. M., Johnson-Throop, K. A., & Turley, J. P. (2003). Outcomes and methods in telemedicine evaluation. *Telemedicine Journal and e-Health*, *9*(4), 393-401.

Berryman, D. R. (2019). Ontology, epistemology, methodology, and methods: Information for librarian researchers. *Medical reference services quarterly*, *38*(3), 271-279.

Bilal, W., Qamar, K., Siddiqui, A., Kumar, P., & Essar, M. Y. (2022). Digital health and telemedicine in Pakistan: Improving maternal healthcare. *Annals of Medicine and Surgery*, *81*, 104425.

Byus, K. (2018). Observe, orient, decide, act: A subjectivist model of entrepreneurial decision making. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 349-362.

Chen, S., Cheng, A., & Mehta, K. (2013). A review of telemedicine business models. *Telemedicine and e-Health*, *19*(4), 287-297.

Chen, Q., Xu, D., Fu, H., & Yip, W. (2022). Distance effects and home bias in patient choice on the Internet: Evidence from an online healthcare platform in China. *China Economic Review*, *72*, 101757.

- Cho, K. (2018). Critical Review on the Conventional Concept of Entrepreneurship and the Components of Its Definition. *The Korea Entrepreneurship Society*, 13(6), 98-125.
- Chu, C., Cram, P., Pang, A., Stamenova, V., Tadrous, M., & Bhatia, R. S. (2021). Rural telemedicine use before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: repeated cross-sectional study. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 23(4), e26960.
- DalGLISH, S. L., Khalid, H., & McMahon, S. A. (2020). Document analysis in health policy research: the READ approach. *Health policy and planning*, 35(10), 1424-1431.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American journal of theoretical and applied statistics*, 5(1), 1-4.
- Farooqi, M., Ullah, I., Irfan, M., Taseer, A. R., Almas, T., Hasan, M. M., ... & Nagarajan, V. R. (2021). The revival of telemedicine in the age of COVID-19: benefits and impediments for Pakistan. *Annals of Medicine and Surgery*, 69.
- Greenhalgh, T., Vijayaraghavan, S., Wherton, J., Shaw, S., Byrne, E., Campbell-Richards, D., & Morris, J. (2016). Virtual online consultations: advantages and limitations (VOCAL) study. *BMJ open*, 6(1), e009388.
- Hathcoat, J. D., Meixner, C., & Nicholas, M. C. (2019). Ontology and epistemology.
- Kane, G. C., Palmer, D., Phillips, A. N., Kiron, D., & Buckley, N. (2015). Strategy, not technology, drives digital transformation. *MIT Sloan Management Review and Deloitte University Press*, 14(1-25).
- Khawar, M. (2021). Benefits and challenges of Big Data in healthcare: A Systematic Review of the Pakistan Initiatives.
- Kimjeon, J., & Davidsson, P. (2022). External enablers of entrepreneurship: A review and agenda for accumulation of strategically actionable knowledge. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 46(3), 643-687.

Kruse, C. S., Pacheco, G. J., Vargas, B., Lozano, N., Castro, S., & Gattu, M. (2022, October). Leveraging Telehealth for the Management of Breast Cancer: A Systematic Review. In *Healthcare* (Vol. 10, No. 10, p. 2015). Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.

Lanivich, S. E., Smith, A., Levasseur, L., Pidduck, R. J., Busenitz, L., & Tang, J. (2022). Advancing entrepreneurial alertness: Review, synthesis, and future research directions. *Journal of Business Research*, *139*, 1165-1176.

Ly, B. A., Labonté, R., Bourgeault, I. L., & Niang, M. N. (2017). The individual and contextual determinants of the use of telemedicine: A descriptive study of the perceptions of Senegal's physicians and telemedicine projects managers. *PloS one*, *12*(7), e0181070.

MacFarlane, A., Harrison, R., & Wallace, P. (2002). The benefits of a qualitative approach to telemedicine research. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare*, *8*(2\_suppl), 56-57.

O'Donnell, O. (2007). Access to health care in developing countries: breaking down demand side barriers. *Cadernos de saude publica*, *23*, 2820-2834.

Paul, D. L., Pearlson, K. E., & McDaniel, R. R. (2021). Assessing technological barriers to telemedicine: technology-management implications. *IEEE Transactions on engineering management*, *46*(3), 279-288.

Raj, A., Dwivedi, G., Sharma, A., de Sousa Jabbour, A. B. L., & Rajak, S. (2020). Barriers to the adoption of industry 4.0 technologies in the manufacturing sector: An inter-country comparative perspective. *International Journal of Production Economics*, *224*, 107546.

Scott Kruse, C., Karem, P., Shifflett, K., Vegi, L., Ravi, K., & Brooks, M. (2018). Evaluating barriers to adopting telemedicine worldwide: a systematic review. *Journal of telemedicine and telecare*, *24*(1), 4-12.

Sittig, D. F., Wright, A., Coiera, E., Magrabi, F., Ratwani, R., Bates, D. W., & Singh, H. (2020). Current challenges in health information technology–related patient safety. *Health Informatics Journal*, *26*(1), 181–189. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1460458218814893>

- Standing, C., Standing, S., Gururajan, R., Fulford, R., & Gengatharen, D. (2018). Coming to Terms with Knowledge Management in Telehealth. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 35(1), 102–113. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sres.2443>
- Sundin, P., Callan, J., & Mehta, K. (2016). Why do entrepreneurial mHealth ventures in the developing world fail to scale? *Journal of Medical Engineering and Technology*, 40(7–8), 444–457. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03091902.2016.1213901>
- Tachakra, S., Wang, X. H., Istepanian, R. S. H., & Song, Y. H. (2003). Mobile e-Health: The Unwired Evolution of Telemedicine. In *TELEMEDICINE JOURNAL AND e-HEALTH* (Vol. 9, Issue 3). [www.liebertpub.com](http://www.liebertpub.com)
- Talwar, S., Dhir, A., Islam, N., Kaur, P., & Almusharraf, A. (2023). Resistance of multiple stakeholders to e-health innovations: Integration of fundamental insights and guiding research paths. *Journal of Business Research*, 166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114135>
- Taylor, L. A., Nong, P., & Platt, J. (2023). Fifty Years of Trust Research in Health Care: A Synthetic Review. *Milbank Quarterly*, 101(1), 126–178. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.12598>
- Van Dyk, L., Groenewald, M., & Abrahams, J. F. (2010). Towards a regional innovation system for telemedicine in South Africa. *2nd International Conference on EHealth, Telemedicine, and Social Medicine, ETELEMED 2010, Includes MLMB 2010; BUSMMed 2010*, 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1109/eTELEMED.2010.8>
- Zhang, X., & Zaman, B. uz. (2020). Adoption mechanism of telemedicine in underdeveloped country. *Health Informatics Journal*, 26(2), 1088–1103. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1460458219868353>

## Appendices

### Appendix 1 Interview Guide

**Research Purpose:** The objective of the research is to identify the key institutions, actors and activities involved in Online Healthcare Delivery and explore the barriers in its adoption.

1. What is your name?
2. Which organization do you work in?
3. What is your position at work?
4. How many years of work experience do you have in the health sector?
5. What is your understanding of telemedicine?
6. What is the product or service your organization offers in terms of healthcare/telemedicine?  
(specify the type of services being offered)
7. What associated risks do you see with Telemedicine or digital health?
8. Which regulatory bodies & government institutions that you know of, are actively monitoring telemedicine practices in Pakistan?
9. Can you please discuss existing regulations or policy framework regarding online health delivery in Pakistan as per your knowledge?
10. How do you see the impact of 18<sup>th</sup> amendment on healthcare sector of Pakistan? (Power being devolved to provinces)
11. Any kind of barriers/hindrances your organization had to face by the Ministry of Health and other government bodies?
12. Apart from the institutional and regulatory bodies, can you point out other key players involved in telemedicine ecosystem?
13. What kind of barriers you had to face from these players you mentioned?

14. What barriers do you see in collaborating with telemedicine startups or digital health stakeholders?
15. How do you see the role of universities and academia in the context of telemedicine?
16. What kind of barriers/hindrances your organization had to face from the consumers' side?
17. Any other barriers?
18. What kind of support or cooperative activities do you expect from the government institutions?
19. What support or cooperative activities do you expect from other stakeholders of telemedicine ecosystem?

