A Pooled Electronic Consultation Program to Improve Access to Genetics Specialists Emma K. Folkerts BS^{1,2}, Renée C. Pelletier MS CGC^{1,2}, Daniel C. Chung, MD^{3,4,5}, Susan A. Goldstein, MS⁶, Douglas S. Micalizzi, MD^{4,5}, PhD, Kristen M. Shannon MS CGC⁴, David A. Sweetser MD PhD^{5,7}, Eugene K. Wong MS CGC¹, Heidi L. Rehm, PhD^{1,2,5}, Leland E. Hull MD,

MPH^{5,8}

¹Center for Genomic Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA

²The Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, MA

³Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Medicine, Mass General Hospital

⁴Massachusetts General Hospital Cancer Center, Boston, MA

⁵Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA

⁶Massachussetts General Physicians Organization, Massachusetts General Hospital,

Boston, MA

⁷Division of Medical Genetics and Metabolism, Department of Pediatrics, Massachusetts

General Hospital, Boston, MA

⁸Division of General Internal Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA

Corresponding Author:

Leland E. Hull, MD, MPH

Division of General Internal Medicine

Massachusetts General Hospital

100 Cambridge St, 16th Floor

Boston, MA 02114

C: (914) 420-9250

Financial Support: Dr. Hull is supported by the National Human Genome Research Institute of the National Institutes of Health (K08HG012221).

Conflicts of Interest: The authors have no relevant conflicts of interest to disclose.

Prior Presentations: Folkerts E, Pelletier R, Wong EK, Shannon K, Rehm H, Hull L.

Implementation of a Genetics & Genomics eConsultation Program Platform Presentation on

11/19/22 at NSGC Annual Conference 2022, Nashville TN.

Word Count (Main Text): 900

Number of Tables:1

Number of Figures:1

Keywords: e-Consult, genomics, primary care, genetics, delivery model, EHR

Abstract:

Innovative service delivery models are needed to increase access to genetics specialists. Electronic consultation (e-Consult) programs can connect clinicians with specialists. At Massachusetts General Hospital, an e-Consult service was created to address genomics-related questions. In its first year, the e-Consult service triaged 153 requests and completed 122 in an average of 3.2 days. Of the 95 e-Consults with actionable recommendations, there was documentation that most ordering clinicians followed through (82%). A variety of providers used the service, although the majority (77%) were generalists. E-Consult models should be considered as one way to increase access to genetics care.

Introduction:

Access to genetic subspecialists for care-related questions is often limited.^{1–3} Electronic consultations (e-Consults) have been trialed across diverse health systems to provide expedited access to specialists.^{4–6} e-Consult programs within genetics and genomics programs care have emerged as models to address access issues by providing first-pass triage of genetics questions, answering simple questions that do not require a visit (thus freeing access for additional patient care), as well as educating generalists on genetics care topics that could be directly applied to future patients.

Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH) is an academic medical center in Boston, MA, where several specialties offer clinical genetics care.⁷ In April 2021, we launched a pooled e-Consult program to provide timely access to subspecialists from three different clinics, The MGH Center for Cancer Risk Assessment, MGH Medical Genetics and Metabolism, and the MGH Preventive Genomics Clinic. Clinicians order an e-Consult through the electronic health record (**EHR**), select a reason for the e-Consult from a prespecified list, and enter a patientspecific clinical question with the option to add additional data or relevant reports. A genetic counseling assistant performs initial triage of submitted e-Consults by directing inquiries to a specific speciality in the "pool" of genetics specialists based on the clinical content. The answering specialist reviews the patients' EHR data and sends an electronic response to the submitting clinician, which is then documented in the EMR. Sometimes, a genetic counselor or another staff member may investigate the submitted topic and draft a response. E-Consults can be declined at any point in the process.

We characterized the patients and clinicians utilizing the e-Consult program and the e-Consult processes during the program's first year.

4

Methods:

We performed a retrospective observational analysis of e-Consult data that the Mass General Brigham Institutional Review Board approved.

We characterized the providers ordering, the providers responding to, and the patients for whom e-Consults were ordered between April 2021 and March 2022, as well as the content of and outcomes of e-Consults that were collected over this period. We obtained our data from 1) the Mass General Physicians Organization (MGPO) e-Consult database, which pulls relevant data from the EHR, 2) publicly available MGH websites characterizing providers and their clinics, and 3) chart review. We characterized patients (age at order, legal sex, and self-reported race), providers submitting e-Consults (degree and specialty), and providers responding to e-Consults (specialty). We characterized e-Consults by several factors: turnaround time, the prespecified reason for the e-Consult, e-Consult recommendation type (actionable v. no action recommended), and recommendation follow-through by the submitting provider (Yes vs. No/Not Documented).

Patient and provider demographics were summarized descriptively. Next, we outlined the reasons for e-Consult submission and the outcomes of e-Consults.

Results:

Of 153 e-Consults submitted in the program's first year, 122 were completed (80%), and 31 were declined (Figure 1). The reasons for declined e-Consults are summarized in Figure 1. A minority of e-Consults related to patients over age 65 (8%); patients were primarily female and White (**Table 1**). Both physicians and nurse practitioners submitted e-Consults; a greater proportion of nurse practitioner e-Consults were declined (39%) compared to physiciansubmitted e-Consults (18%). Clinicians requesting e-Consults represented a large range of

5

specialties, although the majority (80/104, 77%) were generalists such as internists, general pediatricians, and family medicine physicians. Most e-Consults were triaged to Medical Genetics and Metabolism (90/122, 73%), followed by Cancer Genetics (n=31, 25%). All clinicians answering e-consults were physicians.

The top pre-specified reasons ordering providers selected for e-Consult submission were a personal or family history of cancer (n=37), suspicion or knowledge of a known syndrome or genetic disorder (n=35), and reasons not captured by the other prespecified fields (free text, n=25) (**Figure 1**). E-Consults were answered with a median of 2.0 days . Most completed e-Consults resulted in at least one actionable recommendation for the submitting clinician (95/122); 82% (78/95) of those with an actionable recommendation had documented evidence of follow-through.

Discussion

With increasing indications for incorporating genetics into patient care, building systems to improve access to genetics expertise is paramount. In the first year of our e-Consult program, diverse questions were submitted by clinicians from various specialties, especially generalist providers. As primary care clinicians have endorsed poor knowledge and comfort providing genetics care to their patients,^{8,9} the successful use of the e-Consult program by generalists is encouraging because such programs can provide a system for interacting and learning from genetics experts.

Our data suggest that an e-Consult program can help to reduce unnecessary visits. There were several potential sources of saved visits that we observed. For example, of the 122 e-Consults answered, 27 recommended no further action, 10 recommended non-genetics lab testing, and 8 advised screening plans. In addition, e-Consult recommendations can also

6

improve the efficiency of subsequent genetics evaluations, such as when familial genetic testing was recommended first (18/122 answered e-Consults), to enhance the utility of subsequent genetics evaluations. Further studies should assess the impact of e-consults on access to genetics services across the hospital system.¹⁰

Finally, a significant number of e-Consults (20%) were declined. The primary reasons for declining were either clinical (e.g., appropriate specialist not in the e-Consult "pool" of providers) or process errors (e.g., duplicate order entries). To scale the program, we aim to resolve clinical barriers to using the program, such as recruiting additional specialists from fields of high demand to join the consult "pool," refining workflows, and further educating referring providers on the appropriate use of the E-Consult program.

Consults % of (n=122, Kow (n=31, Kow (N=153) Total 80%) % 20%) %Patient Characteristics (N=153 Distinct Patients)Age at Time of Referral0-1749 32% 4796%24%18 to 343825%2874%1026%35 to 645435%3870%1630% $>=65$ 128%975%325%SexMale5133%4384%816%Female9965%7778%2222%RaceAsian43%4100%00%Black43%375%125%Mile12179%9579%2621%Unknown159%1280%320%Referring Clinician DegreeMD/DO (n=94)13588%11182%2418%MD/DO (n=94)13586%3971%1629%Pediatrics (n=77)5536%3971%1629%Pediatrics (n=11)1912%1365%735%Family Medicine orI13%1365%735%Referring Clinician DegreeII10%26%Pediatrics (n=27)3624%3494%26%Pedi		Total e-	o () o	Accepted		Declined		
(N-135) Full30 7070Patient Characteristics (N=153 Distinct Patients)Age at Time of Referral0-1749 32% 4796%24%18 to 3438 25% 2874%1026%35 to 6454 35% 3870%1630%>=6512 8% 975%325%SexMale51 33% 4384%816%Female9965%7778%2222%RaceAsian4 3% 4100%00%Black4 3% 375%125%Hispanic85%788%113%Other11%1100%00%White12179%9579%2621%Unknown159%1280%320%Referring Clinician DegreeMD/DO (n=94)13588%11182%2418%NP (n=10)1812%1165%739%Referring Clinician SpecialtyInternal Medicine (n=37)5536%3971%1629%Pediatric Sub (n=11)1912%1895%15%Family Medicine orMed/Peds (n=16)2013% <t< th=""><th></th><th>Consults (N-153)</th><th>% of Total</th><th>(n=122, 000/)</th><th></th><th>(n=31, 209/)</th><th>Row</th></t<>		Consults (N-153)	% of Total	(n=122, 000/)		(n=31, 209/)	Row	
Particle Function Characteristics (V=155 Distance Function)Age at Time of Referral $0-17$ 49 32% 47 96% 2 4% 18 to 34 38 25% 28 74% 10 26% 35 to 64 54 35% 38 70% 16 30% >=6512 8% 9 75% 3 25% SexMale 51 33% 43 84% 8 16% Female99 65% 77 78% 22 22% RaceAsian4 3% 4 100% 0 0% Black4 3% 3 75% 1 25% Hispanic8 5% 7 88% 1 13% Other1 1% 1 100% 0 0% White121 79% 95 79% 26 21% Unknown15 9% 12 80% 3 20% Referring Clinician DegreeMD/DO (n=94)135 88% 111 82% 24 18% NP (n=10)18 12% 11 65% 7 39% Referring Clinician SpecialtyInternal Medicine (n=37)55 36% 39 71% 16 29% Pediatrics (n=27) 36 24% 34 94% 2 6% Pediatrics (n=10)13 8% 13 65% 7 3	Datiant Chanactanistics (N-	(IN-133)	I Utal Dationts	00 /0)	/0	2070)	/0	
Age at finite of Refer in0-1749 32% 47 96% 2 4% 18 to 3438 25% 28 74% 10 26% 35 to 64 54 35% 38 70% 16 30% >=6512 8% 9 75% 3 25% SexMale 51 33% 43 84% 8 16% Female 99 65% 77 78% 22 22% RaceAsian 4 3% 4 100% 0 0% Black 4 3% 3 75% 1 25% Hispanic8 5% 7 88% 1 13% Other1 1% 1 100% 0 0% White121 79% 95 79% 26 21% Unknown15 9% 12 80% 3 20% Referring Clinician Characteristics (N=104 Distinct Clinicians)Referring Clinician DegreeUnknown15 9% 12 80% 3MD/DO (n=94)135 88% 111 82% 24 18% NP (n=10)18 12% 11 65% 7 39% Referring Clinician SpecialtyI 15% 39 71% 16 29% Pediatric Sub (n=11)19 12% 18 95% 1 5% Family Medicine orI 13 65% 7 35%	Age at Time of Referral							
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Age at Time of Kelefrai	40	270/	17	06%	2	10/	
18 to 343823%2874%1020%35 to 645435%3870%1630% $\geq =65$ 128%975%325%SexMale5133%4384%816%Female9965%7778%2222%RaceAsian43%4100%00%Black43%375%125%Hispanic85%788%113%Other11%1100%00%White12179%9579%2621%Unknown159%1280%320%Referring Clinician Characteristics (N=104 Distinct Clinicians)Referring Clinician DegreeMD/DO (n=94)13588%11182%2418%NP (n=10)1812%1165%739%Referring Clinician SpecialtyInternal Medicine (n=37)5536%3971%1629%Pediatrics (n=27)3624%3494%26%Pediatric Sub (n=11)1912%1895%15%Family Medicine orMed/Peds (n=16)2013%1365%7	18 ± 24	49	3270 250/	47	9070 740/	10	4/0 260/	
35 10 043435 %3870%1030% $\geq =65$ 128%975%325%SexMale5133%4384%816%Female9965%7778%2222%RaceAsian43%4100%00%Black43%375%125%Hispanic85%788%113%Other11%1100%00%White12179%9579%2621%Unknown159%1280%320%Referring Clinician Characteristics (N=104 Distinct Clinicians)Referring Clinician DegreeMD/DO (n=94)13588%11182%2418%NP (n=10)1812%1165%739%Referring Clinician SpecialtyInternal Medicine (n=37)5536%3971%1629%Pediatric Su (n=11)1912%1895%15%Family Medicine orMed/Peds (n=16)2013%1365%Med/Peds (n=16)2013%1365%Med/Peds (n=10)138%10REI (n=3) <th< td=""><td>10 to 54</td><td>50 54</td><td>25%</td><td>20</td><td>7470</td><td>10</td><td>2070</td></th<>	10 to 54	50 54	25%	20	7470	10	2070	
Jobs 12 8% 9 13% 3 23% Sex Male 51 33% 43 84% 8 16% Female 99 65% 77 78% 22 22% Race Asian 4 3% 4 100% 0 0% Black 4 3% 3 75% 1 25% Hispanic 8 5% 7 88% 1 13% Other 1 1% 1 100% 0 0% White 121 79% 95 79% 26 21% Unknown 15 9% 12 80% 3 20% Referring Clinician Degree MD/DO (n=94) 135 88% 111 82% 24 18% Referring Clinician Specialty 11 65% 7 39% Referring Clinician Specialty 11 65% 7 35%	55 t0 04	12	55%0 00/	38	7070	10	30% 250/	
Male 51 33% 43 84% 8 16% Female 99 65% 77 78% 22 22% Race 4 3% 4 100% 0 0% Black 4 3% 4 100% 0 0% Black 4 3% 3 75% 1 25% Hispanic 8 5% 7 88% 1 13% Other 1 1% 1 100% 0 0% White 121 79% 95 79% 26 21% Unknown 15 9% 12 80% 3 20% Referring Clinician Degree MD/DO (n=94) 135 88% 111 82% 24 18% NP (n=10) 18 12% 11 65% 7	>=03	12	8%0	9	/3%0	3	23%0	
Male51 3.5% 4.3 84% 8 16% Female99 65% 77 78% 22 22% RaceAsian4 3% 4 100% 0 0% Black4 3% 3 75% 1 25% Hispanic8 5% 7 88% 1 13% Other1 1% 1 100% 0 0% White 121 79% 95 79% 26 21% Unknown15 9% 12 80% 3 20% Referring Clinician Characteristics (N=104 Distinct Clinicians)Referring Clinician DegreeMD/DO (n=94) 135 88% 111 82% 24 18% NP (n=10)18 12% 11 65% 7 39% Referring Clinician SpecialtyInternal Medicine (n=37) 55 36% 39 71% 16 29% Pediatrics (n=27) 36 24% 34 94% 2 6% Pediatric Sub (n=11) 19 12% 18 95% 1 5% Family Medicine or $Med/Peds$ (n=16) 20 13% 13 65% 7 35% Adult Sub (n=10) 13 8% 10 77% 3 23%	Sex	51	220/	42	0.407	0	1.60/	
Female 99 65% // /8% 22 22% Race Asian 4 3% 4 100% 0 0% Black 4 3% 3 75% 1 25% Hispanic 8 5% 7 88% 1 13% Other 1 1% 1 100% 0 0% White 121 79% 95 79% 26 21% Unknown 15 9% 12 80% 3 20% Referring Clinician Characteristics (N=104 Distinct Clinicians) Referring Clinician Degree Z4 18% MD/DO (n=94) 135 88% 111 82% 24 18% NP (n=10) 18 12% 11 65% 7 39% Referring Clinician Specialty Internal Medicine (n=37) 55 36% 39 71% 16 29% Pediatric Sub (n=11) 19 12% 18	Male	51	33%	43	84% 700/	8	16%	
Race Asian 4 3% 4 100% 0 0% Black 4 3% 3 75% 1 25% Hispanic 8 5% 7 88% 1 13% Other 1 1% 1 100% 0 0% White 121 79% 95 79% 26 21% Unknown 15 9% 12 80% 3 20% Referring Clinician Characteristics (N=104 Distinct Clinicians) 3 20% 3 20% Referring Clinician Degree MD/DO (n=94) 135 88% 111 82% 24 18% NP (n=10) 18 12% 11 65% 7 39% Referring Clinician Specialty Internal Medicine (n=37) 55 36% 39 71% 16 29% Pediatrics (n=27) 36 24% 34 94% 2 6% Pediatric Sub (n=11) 19 12% 18 95% 1 5% Family Medicine	Female	99	65%	//	/8%	22	22%	
Asian 4 3% 4 100% 0 0% Black 4 3% 3 75% 1 25% Hispanic 8 5% 7 88% 1 13% Other 1 1% 1 100% 0 0% White 121 79% 95 79% 26 21% Unknown 15 9% 12 80% 3 20% Referring Clinician Characteristics (N=104 Distinct Clinicians) Referring Clinician Degree 24 18% MD/DO (n=94) 135 88% 111 82% 24 18% NP (n=10) 18 12% 11 65% 7 39% Referring Clinician Specialty 11 82% 24 18% Internal Medicine (n=37) 55 36% 39 71% 16 29% Pediatrics (n=27) 36 24% 34 94% 2 6% Family Medicine or	Race		20/		1000/	0	00/	
Black 4 3% 3 75% 1 25% Hispanic 8 5% 7 88% 1 13% Other 1 1% 1 100% 0 0% White 121 79% 95 79% 26 21% Unknown 15 9% 12 80% 3 20% Referring Clinician Characteristics (N=104 Distinct Clinicians) Referring Clinician Degree X <thx< th=""> X <thx< th=""></thx<></thx<>	Asian	4	3%	4	100%	0	0%	
Hispanic85%788%113%Other11%1100%00%White12179%9579%2621%Unknown159%1280%320%Referring Clinician Characteristics (N=104 Distinct Clinicians)Referring Clinician DegreeMD/DO (n=94)13588%11182%2418%NP (n=10)1812%1165%739%Referring Clinician SpecialtyInternal Medicine (n=37)5536%3971%1629%Pediatrics (n=27)3624%3494%26%Pediatric Sub (n=11)1912%1895%15%Family Medicine or $Md/Peds (n=16)$ 2013%1365%735%Adult Sub (n=10)138%1077%323%REI (n=3)107%880%220%	Black	4	3%	3	75%	1	25%	
Other11%1100%00%White12179%9579%2621%Unknown159%1280%320%Referring Clinician Characteristics (N=104 Distinct Clinicians)Referring Clinician Degree11182%2418%MD/DO (n=94)13588%11182%2418%NP (n=10)1812%1165%739%Referring Clinician Specialty1165%739%Internal Medicine (n=37)5536%3971%1629%Pediatrics (n=27)3624%3494%26%Pediatric Sub (n=11)1912%1895%15%Family Medicine or1365%735%Adult Sub (n=10)138%1077%323%REI (n=3)107%880%220%	Hispanic	8	5%	7	88%	1	13%	
White12179%9579%2621%Unknown159%1280%320%Referring Clinician Characteristics (N=104 Distinct Clinicians)Referring Clinician DegreeMD/DO (n=94)13588%11182%2418%NP (n=10)1812%1165%739%Referring Clinician SpecialtyInternal Medicine (n=37)5536%3971%1629%Pediatrics (n=27)3624%3494%26%Pediatric Sub (n=11)1912%1895%15%Family Medicine or	Other	1	1%	1	100%	0	0%	
Unknown159%1280%320%Referring Clinician Characteristics (N=104 Distinct Clinicians)Referring Clinician DegreeMD/DO (n=94)13588%11182%2418%NP (n=10)1812%1165%739%Referring Clinician SpecialtyInternal Medicine (n=37)5536%3971%1629%Pediatrics (n=27)3624%3494%26%Pediatric Sub (n=11)1912%1895%15%Family Medicine or323%1077%323%Med/Peds (n=16)2013%1077%323%REI (n=3)107%880%220%	White	121	79%	95	79%	26	21%	
Referring Clinician Characteristics (N=104 Distinct Clinicians)Referring Clinician DegreeMD/DO (n=94)13588%11182%2418%NP (n=10)1812%1165%739%Referring Clinician SpecialtyInternal Medicine (n=37)5536%3971%1629%Pediatrics (n=27)3624%3494%26%Pediatric Sub (n=11)1912%1895%15%Family Medicine or35%35%Med/Peds (n=16)2013%1365%735%Adult Sub (n=10)138%1077%323%REI (n=3)107%880%220%	Unknown	15	9%	12	80%	3	20%	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Referring Clinician Charac	cteristics (N=	104 Disti	nct Clinician	s)			
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Referring Clinician Degree	e						
NP (n=10)1812%1165%739%Referring Clinician SpecialtyInternal Medicine (n=37)5536%3971%1629%Pediatrics (n=27)3624%3494%26%Pediatric Sub (n=11)1912%1895%15%Family Medicine or735%1365%735%Med/Peds (n=16)2013%1365%735%Adult Sub (n=10)138%1077%323%REI (n=3)107%880%220%	MD/DO (n=94)	135	88%	111	82%	24	18%	
Referring Clinician SpecialtyInternal Medicine (n=37)5536%3971%1629%Pediatrics (n=27)3624%3494%26%Pediatric Sub (n=11)1912%1895%15%Family Medicine or735%735%Med/Peds (n=16)2013%1077%323%Adult Sub (n=10)138%1077%323%REI (n=3)107%880%220%	NP (n=10)	18	12%	11	65%	7	39%	
Internal Medicine (n=37)55 36% 39 71% 16 29% Pediatrics (n=27) 36 24% 34 94% 2 6% Pediatric Sub (n=11) 19 12% 18 95% 1 5% Family Medicine or 7 35% 7 35% Med/Peds (n=16) 20 13% 13 65% 7 35% Adult Sub (n=10) 13 8% 10 77% 3 23% REI (n=3) 10 7% 8 80% 2 20%	Referring Clinician Specia	lty						
Pediatrics (n=27) 36 24% 34 94% 2 6% Pediatric Sub (n=11) 19 12% 18 95% 1 5% Family Medicine or	Internal Medicine (n=37)	55	36%	39	71%	16	29%	
Pediatric Sub (n=11) 19 12% 18 95% 1 5% Family Medicine or	Pediatrics (n=27)	36	24%	34	94%	2	6%	
Family Medicine or 20 13% 13 65% 7 35% Adult Sub (n=10) 13 8% 10 77% 3 23% REI (n=3) 10 7% 8 80% 2 20%	Pediatric Sub (n=11)	19	12%	18	95%	1	5%	
Med/Peds (n=16)2013%1365%735%Adult Sub (n=10)138%1077%323%REI (n=3)107%880%220%	Family Medicine or							
Adult Sub (n=10)138%1077%323%REI (n=3)107%880%220%	Med/Peds (n=16)	20	13%	13	65%	7	35%	
REI (n=3) 10 7% 8 80% 2 20%	Adult Sub (n=10)	13	8%	10	77%	3	23%	
	REI (n=3)	10	7%	8	80%	2	20%	
Responding Clinician Specialty (N=12 Distinct Clinicians)**	Responding Clinician Spec	ialty (N=12 I	Distinct C	Clinicians)**				
Medical Genetics N/A N/A 90 73% N/A N/A	Medical Genetics	N/A	N/A	90	73%	N/A	N/A	
Cancer Genetics N/A N/A 31 25% N/A N/A	Cancer Genetics	N/A	N/A	31	25%	N/A	N/A	
Preventive Genomics N/A N/A 3 2% N/A N/A	Preventive Genomics	N/A	N/A	3	2%	N/A	N/A	

Table 1. Characteristics of e-Consults Ordered (N=153 distinct e-Consults)

Abbreviations: e-Consult = Electronic Consultation; REI = reproductive endocrinology & infertility *Missing: Legal sex (3)

**All clinicians responding to e-consults were physicians. E-consult responses could be prepped for the physician by another team member for review and signature.

Figure 1. Outcomes of Submitted e-Consults



References

- Hoskovec, J. M. *et al.* Projecting the supply and demand for Certified Genetic Counselors: A workforce study. *J. Genet. Couns.* 27, 16–20 (2018).
- Dragojlovic, N. *et al.* The composition and capacity of the clinical genetics workforce in high-income countries: a scoping review. *Genet. Med.* 22, 1437–1449 (2020).
- Penon-Portmann, M., Chang, J., Cheng, M. & Shieh, J. T. Genetics workforce: distribution of genetics services and challenges to health care in California. *Genet. Med.* 22, 227–231 (2020).
- Ahmed, S. *et al.* Utility, Appropriateness, and Content of Electronic Consultations Across Medical Subspecialties. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 172, 641–647 (2020).
- Winchester, D. E. *et al.* Electronic consults for improving specialty care access for veterans.
 Am. J. Manag. Care 25, 250–253 (2019).
- Wasfy, J. H. *et al.* Initial results of a cardiac e-consult pilot program. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* 64, 2706–2707 (2014).
- Genetics and genomics. *Massachusetts General Hospital* https://www.massgeneral.org/genetics-and-genomics.
- Hauser, D., Obeng, A. O., Fei, K., Ramos, M. A. & Horowitz, C. R. Views Of Primary Care Providers On Testing Patients For Genetic Risks For Common Chronic Diseases. *Health Aff.* 37, 793–800 (2018).
- Haga, S. B., Kim, E., Myers, R. A. & Ginsburg, G. S. Primary Care Physicians' Knowledge, Attitudes, and Experience with Personal Genetic Testing. *Journal of Personalized Medicine* vol. 9 29 Preprint at https://doi.org/10.3390/jpm9020029 (2019).
- 10. Vimalananda, V. G. et al. Electronic consultations (e-consults) to improve access to

specialty care: a systematic review and narrative synthesis. J. Telemed. Telecare 21, 323-

330 (2015).