

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Intended health care utilisation in cases of severe COVID-19 and inflammatory gastrointestinal disease – results of a population survey with vignettes

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2021-057644
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	22-Sep-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Klein, Jens; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf Center for Psychosocial Medicine, Institute of Medical Sociology Strauß, Annette; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf Center for Psychosocial Medicine, Department of General Practice and Primary Care Koens, Sarah; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Institute of Medical Sociology Schäfer, Ingmar; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf Center for Psychosocial Medicine, Department of General Practice and Primary Care von dem Knesebeck, Olaf; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf Center for Psychosocial Medicine, Institute of Medical Sociology
Keywords:	HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, ACCIDENT & EMERGENCY MEDICINE, COVID-19, PRIMARY CARE, PUBLIC HEALTH, SOCIAL MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

Title:

Intended health care utilisation in cases of severe COVID-19 and inflammatory gastrointestinal disease – results of a population survey with vignettes

Authors:

Klein, J.¹, Strauß, A.², Koens, S.¹, Schäfer, I.², von dem Knesebeck O.¹

Institutions:

¹Institute of Medical Sociology, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

²Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

Corresponding author:

Jens Klein, PhD

University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf

Institute of Medical Sociology

Martinstraße 52

20247 Hamburg

Germany

+49 040 7410 51617

j.klein@uke.de

Abstract

Objectives: To examine variations in intended health care utilisation in severe cases of COVID-19 and inflammatory gastrointestinal disease (IGD).

Design: Representative cross-sectional telephone survey.

Setting and participants: 1,207 randomly drawn adults of the city of Hamburg, Germany, between November 2020 and January 2021.

Outcome measures: Different vignettes with severe symptoms were presented varying in sex, age (child, middle-aged person, older person), daytime (Tuesday morning or Tuesday evening) and disease (COVID-19 or IGD), while the degree of urgency was equivalent for all cases. The respondents were asked for the intended health care utilisation resulting in three different alternatives: general practitioner (GP)/paediatrician, medical on-call service ("116117"), and emergency care (accident & emergency department, emergency practice, rescue service). In multivariate analyses, associations of characteristics of the vignettes and participants (sex, age, education, migration background) with intended health care utilisation were tested.

Results: Regarding the vignettes' characteristics, intended utilisation of GP/paediatrician is associated with female sex, higher age, daytime (morning) and COVID-19 symptoms, the medical on-call service with male sex, daytime (evening) and COVID-19 symptoms, and the emergency medicine with younger age, daytime (evening) and IGD. Women chose more often the GP/paediatrician, men preferred emergency medicine. Higher educated persons more often chose the medical on-call service while people with a migration background decided less often for medical on-call service and emergency medicine.

Conclusions: Despite comparable urgency the findings suggest variations of intended health care utilisation depending on characteristics of the vignettes and respondents. Information about health care alternatives has to be improved among vulnerable groups and clear pathways for adequate health care utilisation has to be further developed.

Strengths and Limitations of this study

- This is one of the first studies that analyse intended health care utilisation among the German general population using case vignettes of severe symptoms (COVID-19 and inflammatory gastrointestinal diseases).
- The vignette design provides a standardised stimulus and comparability between symptoms and urgency.
- The survey was conducted during the second peak of the COVID-19 pandemic and provides information about health care utilisation under extraordinary conditions.
- No observed or reported behaviour was analysed, but intended utilisation.

Introduction

In the past decade, utilization of urgent and emergency care services became an important topic in various countries [1–4]. The reasons to visit emergency departments (ED) are multi-layered and, next to lower access barriers, convenience and the belief in higher care quality, the subjective perception of urgency is one of the main causes for the utilization of emergency care [3–9]. However, the vast majority of the studies analysed characteristics and behaviour of patients which already entered emergency care facilities. Studies among the general population that surveyed the knowledge, beliefs, and intended utilization when severe symptoms occur are very rare. Moreover, various studies have shown a tremendous impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on health care utilisation among all age groups [10,11]. A systematic review of 81 studies across 20 countries found out that health care utilisation decreased by about a third during the pandemic in the first six months of 2020 [11]. A further systematic overview reported reductions of hospitalisations for cardiovascular diseases and their management ranging from 20% to 73% until February 2021 in numerous countries [12]. This decline of health care utilization was also prevalent in Germany in various outpatient, inpatient and emergency care facilities indicating a changed behaviour even when severe symptoms occur [11–16]. Hence, the increasing morbidity and mortality leads to an ongoing debate about changed utilisation pattern and the avoiding of ED due to fear of contracting COVID-19 although acute treatment is mandatory [17].

Generally, in the German health care system, three options are provided when severe symptoms occur [18]: (1) to contact the general practitioner (GP)/paediatrician (or in some cases a specialist), (2) to contact the medical on-call service, or (3) to utilize emergency medicine (accident and emergency departments, emergency practices, rescue service). In 2012, a nationwide telephone number (116117) was introduced to provide a medical on-call service for treatment outside normal appointment times. Even in acute cases and within normal appointment times, patients can receive medical treatment here. They can use this service to ask for advice and to make medical appointments, and alternatively, a home visit by the doctor can be

1
2
3 arranged. The present study is focused on two types of diseases: inflammatory gastrointestinal diseases
4 (IGD) and COVID-19. In terms of a potential COVID-19 infection, the following recommendations are given
5
6 in Germany by the Federal Ministry of Health [19]: Affected people should stay at home, reduce contacts to
7
8 a bare minimum and get in touch with a doctor by phone. Outside of surgery opening hours, one can also
9
10 call the medical on-call service by dialling the nationwide number 116117 and wait for further instructions.
11
12 In case of an emergency, it is recommended to dial “112” for rescue service. Regarding gastrointestinal
13
14 diseases, international data show that these symptoms are a prevalent driver of ED visits [20], and
15
16 moreover, they are the most common reasons for visiting ED in Germany in 2019 while ED consultations
17
18 due to acute upper respiratory tract infections highly increased in 2020 [21].
19
20
21
22
23

24 The well-established Behavioral Model of Health Services Use by Ronald Andersen (6th revision)
25
26 distinguishes between predisposing, enabling and need factors of health care use on individual and
27
28 contextual level [22,23]. It aims to explain disparities in ambulatory and hospital services use by including
29
30 various factors in the conceptual model. Major individual predisposing factors are sex, age, education and
31
32 ethnicity. Enabling is characterised by income, health insurance status and the organisation of health
33
34 services for the individual. Need factors comprise the self-perception and the objective measurement of
35
36 health and functional status. Over the years, the health care system was included into the model to give
37
38 recognition to the importance of national health policy, the resources and their organisation [23]. Against
39
40 the background of the current organisation of urgent and emergency care services in Germany, the present
41
42 study introduces the individual predisposing factors sex, age, education and ethnicity into the analyses. Self-
43
44 perceived and objective need is represented by the use of vignettes (please see Methods). The evaluated
45
46 need is equivalent by introducing the same urgency in every case vignette. In contrast, the perceived need
47
48 is varied by changing the patient’s characteristics in the vignettes. A further concern of the study is the
49
50 adequate navigation within the health care system when utilising health services with severe symptoms. In
51
52 the conceptual models of health literacy, a major domain is the navigation within the health care system
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 and the decision making concerning health care in everyday life [24]. Thus, a major recommendation of The
4
5 German National Action Plan Health Literacy is to facilitate navigation within the health care system
6
7 including emergency medicine [25]. Studies have shown associations between low health literacy and more
8
9 frequent as well as inadequate health care use, including emergency care [26,27]. In addition, predisposing
10
11 factors as lower education and a migration background are associated with more frequent or inadequate
12
13 emergency care utilization [7,28–30], even though findings are in some cases ambiguous [31,32].

14
15
16
17 Against this background, three research questions are addressed: (1) How does the intended health care
18
19 utilisation in severe cases vary depending on the characteristics of the cases (symptoms (COVID-19 vs.
20
21 inflammatory gastrointestinal disease (IGD)), daytime as well as sex and age of the afflicted person)? (2)
22
23 How does the intended health care utilisation in severe cases vary depending on the characteristics of the
24
25 respondents (sex, age, education, migration background, parenthood, personal affection)? (3) Does the
26
27 intended health care utilization follow the official national recommendations for a COVID-19 infection?
28
29
30

31 32 **Methods**

33 34 *Study design and sample*

35
36 Cross-sectional data was assessed via computer assisted telephone interviews (CATI) between November
37
38 2020 and January 2021 in Hamburg, Germany. The sample was randomly drawn using all possible telephone
39
40 numbers in Hamburg, including non-registered numbers via random digital dialling [33]. On different
41
42 weekdays, repeated calls were made by trained interviewers. The Kish selection grid was used to randomly
43
44 choose the target person in the respected household [34]. To analyse decisions for utilization, 24 different
45
46 vignettes (case stories) were used. Based on former research projects [35,36], a number of about n=50
47
48 participants per vignette (i.e. total N=1,200) was considered sufficient to identify medium sized differences.
49
50 The gross sample included 2,756 randomly selected persons. Of these, 961 (34.9 %) could not be reached
51
52 and 588 (21.3 %) refused to participate leading to a total number of 1,207 participants (response rate: 43.8
53
54
55
56
57 %). The study was approved by the Local Psychological Ethics Committee at the Center for Psychosocial
58
59
60

1
2
3 Medicine, University Medical Center Hamburg (No. LPEK-0200). Respondents gave their informed consent
4 for the participation and the use of their data. Consents and refusals were documented by the interviewers.
5
6
7

8 *Vignettes*

9

10 Vignettes were used as a stimulus at the beginning of the survey (please see Supplement 1). They were
11 designed in cooperation with primary care physicians, emergency physicians, geriatricians, paediatricians
12 and nursing staff. Two groups of prevalent diseases were selected for the vignettes: COVID-19 and
13 inflammatory gastrointestinal diseases (IGD). Additionally, vignettes were varied according to sex (female,
14 male), age (12 years (child), 49 years (middle-aged person), 72 years (older person)), and daytime (Tuesday,
15 8 a.m.; Tuesday, 8 p.m.) resulting in N=24 vignettes randomly assigned to the respondents. Presented
16 symptoms of both diseases were severe and comparable regarding urgency of treatment. In terms of
17 inflammatory gastrointestinal symptoms, typical and frequent diseases for the different age groups were
18 selected: appendicitis (child), cholecystitis (middle-aged person), and diverticulitis (older person). Inspired
19 by the Manchester-Triage-Score [37], urgency of treatment was indicated by fever or elevated temperature
20 and severe pain in all three gastrointestinal vignettes. A hospitalization (own initiative or referral by a
21 physician) for further diagnostics or treatment is required in all three cases. Symptoms of the COVID-19
22 vignette were based on guidelines and information provided by the Robert Koch Institute [38]. The
23 recommended proceeding when these symptoms occur is described above. All vignettes were audio-
24 recorded by a clearly speaking trained person. The audio files were directly played to the respondents
25 followed by a standardized questionnaire (total interview time: about 15 min.).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 *Measures*

47

48 In the beginning of the interview, one of the vignettes was presented to the respondents. To assess intended
49 utilization behaviour in the presented case, the respondents were requested to answer following open
50 ended question: "Who would you turn to first for help in the place of Mrs. X. / Mr. X / in the place of the
51 parents of...?" The interviewers were provided with a list of possibilities to facilitate the documentation.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Three major options of intended utilization could be categorised: general practitioner (GP/paediatrician),
4 medical-on call service (“116117”), and emergency medicine facilities (accident and emergency department,
5 emergency practice, rescue service). These three categories were recoded as dummy variables (yes/no).
6
7 Furthermore, the following characteristics of the respondents were introduced: age (age groups: 18- 40, 41-
8 60, ≥ 60 years), sex, education (years of schooling: ≤ 9, 10, ≥ 12), having children (yes/no), and migration
9 background (no/2nd generation/1st generation). A person has a migration background, if he/she or one of
10 his/her parents was born abroad. Respondents with an migration background who were born abroad and
11 migrated to Germany were classified as 1st generation migrants, while German-born descendants of 1st
12 generation migrants were considered as 2nd generation migrants [39]. Finally, respondents were asked
13 whether they ever had been affected by such complaints (yes/no). Sample characteristics are shown in Table
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 1.

27
28 *(Table 1 here)*
29

30
31 The sample was weighted for sex, age and educational level on the basis of official statistics of the
32 population in Hamburg in 2020 [40,41]. Chi²-tests have shown an effective weighting indicating no
33 significant differences between the study sample and the population in Hamburg in terms of sex, age and
34 education.
35
36
37
38
39

40 *Analyses*

41
42
43 Bivariate analyses of intended utilisation of the different care facilities were calculated using crosstabs
44 including Person’s Chi²-test. For multivariate analyses, binary logistic regressions were conducted.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3 the models. Analyses were carried out using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences SPSS 26 [42] and
4
5 the R statistical package [43].
6
7

8 **Results**

9

10 Bivariate analyses are shown in Table 2. In terms of characteristics of the vignettes, there were significant
11
12 differences ($p < 0.05$) in intended utilization according to sex and symptoms. Respondents to whom a COVID-
13
14 19 vignette was presented more frequently have chosen the GP/paediatrician or medical on-call service
15
16 than emergency medicine as first option for medical support. Regarding characteristics of the respondents,
17
18 significant differences emerged for sex, age, education, migration background, and personal affection.
19
20

21
22 *(Table 2 here)*
23
24

25 Results of the multivariate regression analysis show that the GP/paediatrician was chosen significantly more
26
27 often when the afflicted person in the vignette was female, middle aged or older, and had been affected by
28
29 COVID-19 symptoms (Table 3). There was a more than 2-fold likelihood of choosing the GP/paediatrician
30
31 when COVID-19 was presented in the vignette (OR: 2.15, CI: 1.67-2.77). Moreover, this option was less
32
33 favoured when symptoms occurred in the evening. In contrast, the option of medical on-call service was
34
35 more prevalent in male case vignettes and when the symptoms occurred in the evening. Similar to
36
37 GP/paediatrician, the medical on-call service was chosen more often when the COVID-19 vignette was
38
39 presented (OR: 2.88, CI: 2.01-4.18). Emergency medicine (accident and emergency department/emergency
40
41 practice/rescue service) was more often mentioned when children were affected, when symptoms were
42
43 gastrointestinal, and occurred in the evening. Regarding respondents' characteristics, women favoured the
44
45 GP/paediatrician while men rather preferred emergency medicine. Furthermore, higher educated persons
46
47 favoured the medical on-call service compared to the lowest status group (OR 2.15, CI 1.34-3.52). People
48
49 with migration background (especially 2nd generation) less often chose medical on-call service and
50
51 emergency medicine than non-migrants.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *(Table 3 here)*
4
5

6 **Discussion**

7
8 In this study, the intended utilisation of different care facilities in a German metropolis was examined using
9
10 varied case vignettes of severe COVID-19 and inflammatory gastrointestinal diseases (IGD). The results show
11
12 that both, the characteristics of the vignettes and the characteristics of the respondents are associated with
13
14 the intended utilisation. In terms of the vignettes' characteristics, the intended utilisation of
15
16 GP/paediatrician is associated with female sex, higher age, daytime (morning) and COVID-19 symptoms, the
17
18 medical on-call service with male sex, daytime (evening) and COVID-19 symptoms, and the emergency
19
20 medicine with young age, daytime (evening) and gastrointestinal symptoms. Regarding the respondents'
21
22 characteristics, women chose more often the GP/paediatrician, men preferred emergency medicine. Higher
23
24 educated persons more often chose the medical on-call service while people with a migration background
25
26 decided less often for medical on-call service and emergency medicine. Thus, although case stories were
27
28 similar regarding urgency of treatment, results suggest variations of intended health care utilisation
29
30 according to characteristics of the afflicted person and the respondents.
31
32
33
34
35

36 Symptoms of COVID-19 were correctly identified by 64% of the 599 respondents to whom the respective
37
38 vignette was presented (a correct answer was given when "COVID" or "Corona" was mentioned, data not
39
40 shown in detail). This suggests an improved information due to widespread campaigns about COVID-19
41
42 symptoms. A German study about coronavirus-related health literacy showed that, despite some confusion
43
44 about coronavirus information, the vast majority felt well informed [44]. In terms of a correct navigation
45
46 within the health care system, more than 80% of the respondents follow the official national
47
48 recommendations when symptoms of a COVID-19 infection occur by choosing the contact to an
49
50 GP/paediatrician (ideally via telephone) or to the medical on-call service ("116117"). Although emergency
51
52 care was more often chosen when symptoms of an IGD were presented, the first choice for the majority of
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the respondents also in this case was the GP/paediatrician potentially suggesting a reservation to
4 immediately visit the ED.
5
6

7
8 Generally, comparisons with previous literature are difficult as there are only few studies that analysed the
9 intended utilization among the general population using case vignettes. A German study with data from
10 2018 and a similar vignette design found out that 50% of the respondents knew the medical on-call service.
11
12 When explicitly asked for, 75% knew the service, but only 18% the correct number [45]. Further Data from
13 2015 to 2016 has shown similar results or even more lack of knowledge about the health care supply
14 including the medical on-call service [7,46,47]. In the present study, nearly 75% of the participants knew the
15 medical on-call service (data not shown). It can be assumed that the degree of popularity of this service
16 increased due to the pandemic and the connected campaigns regarding health care seeking. The result that
17 emergency care is more often preferred when a child was affected is supported by findings that the
18 perception of urgency is increased in case of ill children, and parents prefer to visit ED before contacting the
19 primary care provider [48,49]. The significant preference of medical on-call service and emergency care in
20 the evening is obvious due to restricted opening hours of practices. In the present study, a female vignette
21 lead to significantly more GP/paediatrician consultations and less on-call service utilization. A recent study
22 has shown that female patients' pain was more often underestimated compared with male patients' pain
23 [50]. Also, further treatment was differently estimated, as the respondents in the study believed that female
24 patients would more likely benefit from psychotherapy and male patients more likely from pain medicine.
25
26 There is no clear reference why female respondents more often chose the GP/paediatrician. Even though
27 women more often utilise health care in general, there is no evidence that female patients more often visit
28 the GP than men in Germany [51,52]. Actually, a recent study found a higher commitment to use the GP
29 among men [53]. A better knowledge about the comparatively new nationwide medical on-call service
30 ("116117") among higher educated people could be due to a generally better health literacy among higher
31 SES groups [54,55]. However, a significantly higher use of emergency medicine among lower educated
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 people is not shown [30]. The evidence in the literature about ED use among migrants is ambiguous
4 [7,28,31]. Our findings do not indicate that people with migration background more frequently tend to use
5
6 the ED.
7
8
9

10 Following Andersen's Behavioural Modell of Health Care Use [22], the findings indicate associations of
11 predisposing factors and perceived need with the choice of health service. Sex, age, education and migration
12 background are significantly related to individual health care utilisation. Moreover, the perception of need
13 varies depending on the different characteristics that are presented in the vignettes, even though urgency
14 is the same. However, it is still a challenge to figure out the reasons behind differences in health care
15 utilisation. Different utilisation behaviour could be due to differences in need, to differences in expectations
16 and preferences (e.g. individual/cultural preferences or health beliefs), to differences in information (e.g.
17 about service availability, navigation in the health care system, or wrong assumption of costs), or to formal
18 access barriers (e.g. charges, waiting times, travel distances, or lost wages when using health care during
19 work hours) [56]. To figure out the reasons behind the patient's behaviour is highly relevant for implications
20 in terms of possible interventions. The results suggest differences in information (e.g. about the medical-
21 on-call-service or further options), preferences (e.g. directly visiting ED on own initiative or expecting higher
22 expertise in ED) and perceived need due to sociodemographic characteristics.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 It is likely that the campaigns regarding health care seeking during the COVID-19 pandemic had an impact
42 on utilisation behaviour in our study. The use of the medical on-call service and primary care provider in
43 case of symptoms of a COVID-19 infection conforms to the official recommendations. However, among
44 people with lower education and with a migration background, information about health care options as
45 the medical on-call service need to be more disseminated. On the other hand, there is a challenge to tackle
46 the unmet needs of patients with severe diseases which increased since the beginning of the pandemic.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 [17], a prior proposal before pandemic introduced a 7-day opening of GP practices for a better regulation
4
5 of health care utilisation [57].
6
7

8 **Limitations**

9
10 First, a response rate of about 44% can be considered as adequate, however, a potential selection bias due
11
12 to nonresponse cannot be ruled out. Nevertheless, the comparison of our weighted data with official
13
14 statistics regarding some sociodemographic variables supports the external validity. Second, despite various
15
16 strengths of a vignette design (comparability between symptoms and urgency, standardised stimulus), the
17
18 vignettes are an artificial stimulus that necessarily introduce symptoms in a brief form potentially neglecting
19
20 the complexity of some diseases. The extensive involvement of various experts in the development of the
21
22 case vignettes aimed to minimize these limits. Third, no observed or reported behaviour was analysed, but
23
24 exclusively intended utilisation. Fourth, our data is supposed to be representative for a metropolis in
25
26 Germany, the health care situation and behaviour could be different in more rural regions which are not
27
28 represented in this study.
29
30
31

32 **Conclusions**

33
34 To our knowledge, this is one of the first studies that analyse intended health care utilisation among the
35
36 German general population using case vignettes of severe symptoms. It could be shown that different
37
38 characteristics of vignettes and characteristics of the respondents lead to different health care utilisation,
39
40 although urgency is equal in the presented vignettes. These variations in intended health care use suggest
41
42 a potential need for interventions. Still, the communication of health care alternatives has to be improved
43
44 among vulnerable subgroups, and clear pathways for adequate health care utilisation has to be further
45
46 developed.
47
48
49

50 **Acknowledgement**

51
52 The authors would like to thank Martin Scherer, Sarah Porzelt, Robin Kobbe, Ulrich Thiem, Ulrich Mayer-
53
54 Runge and Michael Rieper for supporting the development of the case vignettes.
55
56
57

Author contributions

OK, JK, AS and IS designed the study including questionnaire and vignettes. JK drafted the manuscript, and analysed and interpreted the data. AS essentially developed the vignettes. OK led the project and made an essential contribution to drafting the manuscript and interpreting the data. SK, AS and IS critically revised and approved the final manuscript.

Ethical approval

Local Psychological Ethics Committee at the Center for Psychosocial Medicine, University Medical Center Hamburg (No. LPEK-0200).

Funding

The study is funded by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (grant number 01GY1912).

Competing interests

There are no competing interests.

Table 1 Sample characteristics (N=1,207)*: n (%)

Sex (<i>1</i>)		
female	621	(51.5)
male	585	(48.5)
Age (years) (<i>1</i>)		
18 – 40	455	(37.8)
41 – 60	419	(34.7)
≥ 60	332	(27.5)
Education (years) (<i>43</i>)		
≤ 9	316	(27.1)
10	275	(23.6)
≥ 12	574	(49.3)
Migration background (<i>22</i>)		
no	915	(77.3)
2 nd generation	129	(10.9)
1 st generation	141	(11.7)
Children (<i>18</i>)		
yes	546	(45.9)
no	643	(54.1)
Personally affected by such complaints (<i>4</i>)		
yes	238	(19.7)
no	965	(80.0)
Intended utilisation (<i>1</i>)		
General practitioner/paediatrician	646	(53.6)
Medical on-call service (“116117”)	182	(15.1)
Emergency medicine [†]	316	(26.2)
Other	62	(5.1)

*number of missing data in brackets in italics

[†]accident and emergency department/emergency practice/rescue service

Table 2 Intended utilisation of different care facilities according to characteristics of the vignettes and the respondents (N=1,207): Bivariate analysis (%)*

		General practitioner/ paediatrician (%)	Medical on-call service ("116117") (%)	Emergency medicine† (%)
Vignettes				
Sex	Male	49.4	19.0	25.8
	Female	57.6	11.1	26.4
	p‡	0.004	<0.001	0.804
Age	Child	48.8	16.5	31.8
	Adult middle aged	55.1	13.1	25.6
	Adult aged	56.7	16.1	20.8
	p	0.058	0.317	0.002
Time	Tuesday morning	65.7	7.4	22.2
	Tuesday evening	41.8	22.5	30.0
	p	<0.001	<0.001	0.002
Symptoms	Gastrointestinal	44.9	9.5	39.4
	COVID-19	62.3	20.7	12.7
	p	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Respondents				
Sex	Male	49.9	16.6	29.1
	Female	56.8	13.7	23.5
	p	0.016	0.161	0.029
Age (years)	18 - 40	57.9	17.4	18.7
	41 - 60	47.5	16.2	32.7
	> 60	55.1	10.6	28.3
	p	0.007	0.024	<0.001
Education (years)	≤ 9	57.5	8.9	26.7
	10	50.9	14.9	33.5
	≥ 12	54.5	17.9	22.0
	p	0.280	0.001	0.002
Migration background	No	52.0	16.8	28.5
	2 nd Generation	59.4	7.8	14.8
	1 st Generation	57.4	12.8	22.7
	p	0.172	0.020	0.003
Own children	No	53.5	14.3	26.6
	Yes	54.1	15.4	25.7
	p	0.825	0.592	0.712
Personally affected by such complaints	No	52.0	16.0	27.5
	Yes	60.1	11.8	20.5
	p	0.025	0.106	0.028

1
2
3 *the percentages do not sum to 100 due to missing data

4 †accident and emergency department/emergency practice/rescue service

5 ‡Pearson's Chi-square (statistically significant values ($p < 0.05$) in bold)

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Table 3 Intended utilisation of different care facilities (N= 1,170): Multivariate analysis (Odds Ratios and 95% confidence intervals)

	General practitioner/ paediatrician		Medical on-call service ("116117")		Emergency medicine*	
	OR (95% CI)**	p	OR (95% CI)	p	OR (95% CI)	p
Vignettes						
Sex (male)	1		1		1	
Sex (female)	1.34 (1.04-1.72)	0.024	0.48 (0.34-0.68)	<0.001	1.16 (0.86-1.56)	0.328
Age (child)	1		1		1	
Age (middle aged)	1.37 (1.01-1.86)	0.045	0.94 (0.62-1.44)	0.786	0.60 (0.42-0.85)	0.004
Age (older)	1.47 (1.08-2.02)	0.016	1.19 (0.78-1.83)	0.415	0.47 (0.33-0.69)	<0.001
Time (Tuesday morning)	1		1		1	
Time (Tuesday evening)	0.35 (0.27-0.44)	<0.001	3.65 (2.53-5.34)	<0.001	1.61 (1.20-2.16)	0.002
Symptoms (gastrointestinal)	1		1		1	
Symptoms (COVID-19)	2.15 (1.67-2.77)	<0.001	2.88 (2.01-4.18)	<0.001	0.20 (0.15-0.28)	<0.001
Respondents						
Sex (male)	1		1		1	
Sex (female)	1.46 (1.13-1.88)	0.003	0.83 (0.59-1.17)	0.279	0.70 (0.52-0.95)	0.022
Age (18-40)	1		1		1	
Age (41 – 60)	0.71 (0.52-0.96)	0.026	0.81 (0.53-1.21)	0.297	1.85 (1.29-2.65)	<0.001
Age (> 60)	0.87 (0.61-1.24)	0.446	0.73 (0.44-1.20)	0.220	1.34 (0.87-2.05)	0.178
Education (≤9)	1		1		1	
Education (10 Years)	0.70 (0.49-0.99)	0.047	1.75 (1.02-3.01)	0.043	1.54 (1.02-2.32)	0.040
Education (≥ 12 Years)	0.80 (0.58-1.10)	0.180	2.15 (1.34-3.52)	0.002	0.84 (0.58-1.21)	0.384
No migration background	1		1		1	
Migration background (2 nd generation)	1.29 (0.87-1.95)	0.212	0.49 (0.23-0.93)	0.042	0.38 (0.21-0.65)	<0.001
Migration background (1 st generation)	1.31 (0.89-1.93)	0.167	0.64 (0.36-1.09)	0.114	0.70 (0.43-1.12)	0.128
Own children (no)	1		1		1	
Own children (yes)	0.84 (0.64-1.11)	0.227	1.15 (0.78-1.69)	0.480	1.09 (0.78-1.51)	0.626
Personally affected by such complaints (no)	1		1		1	
Personally affected by such complaints (yes)	1.15 (0.83-1.58)	0.401	0.63 (0.39-1.00)	0.051	0.89 (0.60-1.32)	0.581
R ² (Nagelkerke)	0.155		0.182		0.222	

*accident and emergency department/emergency practice/rescue service

**OR=odds ratio; CI=confidence interval (statistically significant values (p<0.05) in bold

References

- 1 Pines JM, Hilton JA, Weber EJ, *et al.* International perspectives on emergency department crowding. *Acad Emerg Med* 2011;18:1358–70.
- 2 Pope C, McKenna G, Turnbull J, *et al.* Navigating and making sense of urgent and emergency care processes and provision. *Health Expect* 2019;22:435–43.
- 3 Uscher-Pines L, Pines J, Kellermann A, *et al.* Deciding to visit the emergency department for non-urgent conditions: a systematic review of the literature. *Am J Manag Care* 2013;19:47–59.
- 4 Coster JE, Turner JK, Bradbury D, *et al.* Why do people choose emergency and urgent care services? a rapid review utilizing a systematic literature search and narrative synthesis. *Acad Emerg Med* 2017;24:1137–49.
- 5 Penson R, Coleman P, Mason S, *et al.* Why do patients with minor or moderate conditions that could be managed in other settings attend the emergency department? *Emerg Med J* 2012;29:487–91.
- 6 Watson MC, Ferguson J, Barton GR, *et al.* A cohort study of influences, health outcomes and costs of patients' health-seeking behaviour for minor ailments from primary and emergency care settings. *BMJ Open* 2015;5:e006261.
- 7 Scherer M, Lühmann D, Kazek A, *et al.* Patients Attending Emergency Departments. *Dtsch Arztebl Int* 2017;114:645–52.
- 8 Schmiedhofer M, Möckel M, Slagman A, *et al.* Patient motives behind low-acuity visits to the emergency department in Germany: a qualitative study comparing urban and rural sites. *BMJ Open* 2016;6:e013323.
- 9 Oslislo S, Heintze C, Schmiedhofer M, *et al.* How to decide adequately? Qualitative study of GPs' view on decision-making in self-referred and physician-referred emergency department consultations in Berlin, Germany. *BMJ Open* 2019;9:e026786.
- 10 Shanmugavadivel D, Liu J-F, Gilhooley C, *et al.* Changing patterns of emergency paediatric presentations during the first wave of COVID-19: learning for the second wave from a UK tertiary emergency department. *BMJ Paediatr Open* 2021;5:e000967.
- 11 Moynihan R, Sanders S, Michaleff ZA, *et al.* Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on utilisation of healthcare services: a systematic review. *BMJ Open* 2021;11:e045343.
- 12 Seidu S, Kunutsor SK, Cos X, *et al.* Indirect impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on hospitalisations for cardiometabolic conditions and their management: A systematic review. *Prim Care Diabetes* 2021;15:653–81.
- 13 Damerow S, Rommel A, Prütz F, *et al.* Developments in the health situation in Germany during the initial stage of the COVID-19 pandemic for selected indicators of GEDA 2019/2020-EHIS. *Journal of Health Monitoring* 2020; 5:3–16.
- 14 Slagman A, Behringer W, Greiner F, *et al.* Medical emergencies during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Dtsch Arztebl Int* 2020;117:545–52.

- 1
2
3 15 Mangiapane S, Zhu L, Czihal T, *et al.* Veränderung der vertragsärztlichen Leistungsanspruchnahme
4 während der COVID-Krise. Berlin: Zentralinstitut für die kassenärztliche Versorgung in der
5 Bundesrepublik Deutschland 2021.
6
- 7 16 Schäfer I, Hansen H, Menzel A, *et al.* The effect of COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown on consultation
8 numbers, consultation reasons and performed services in primary care: results of a longitudinal
9 observational study. *BMC Fam Pract* 2021;22:125.
10
- 11 17 Wong LE, Hawkins JE, Langness S, *et al.* Where are all the patients? Addressing Covid-19 fear to
12 encourage sick patients to seek emergency care. *NEJM Catalyst Innovations in Care Delivery*
13 Published Online First: 14 May 2020. <https://catalyst.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/CAT.20.0193>
14 (accessed 22 Sep 2021).
15
- 16 18 Federal Ministry of Health. The German healthcare system. Strong. Reliable. Proven. Berlin: Federal
17 Ministry of Health 2020.
18
- 19 19 Germany's information platform on the coronavirus.
20 <https://www.zusammengegencorona.de/en/from-suspected-infection-to-isolation/> (accessed 22
21 Sep 2021).
22
- 23 20 Myer PA, Mannalithara A, Singh G, *et al.* Clinical and economic burden of emergency department
24 visits due to gastrointestinal diseases in the United States. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2013;108:1496–507.
25
- 26 21 Mangiapane S, Czihal T, von Stillfried D. Entwicklung der ambulanten Notfallversorgung in
27 Deutschland von 2009 bis 2020. Berlin: Zentralinstitut für die kassenärztliche Versorgung in der
28 Bundesrepublik Deutschland 2021.
29
- 30 22 Andersen RM, Davidson PL, Baumeister SE. Improving access to care. In: Kominski GE, ed. Changing
31 the U.S. health care system: key issues in health services, policy, and management. San Francisco:
32 Wiley & Sons 2014:33–69.
33
- 34 23 Andersen RM. National health surveys and the behavioral model of health services use. *Med Care*
35 2008;46:647–53.
36
- 37 24 Sørensen K, Van den Broucke S, Fullam J, *et al.* Health literacy and public health: a systematic review
38 and integration of definitions and models. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12:80.
39
- 40 25 Schaeffer, D., Hurrelmann, K., Bauer, U, Kolpatzik, K, eds.: National action plan health literacy.
41 Promoting health literacy in Germany. Berlin: KomPart 2018.
42
- 43 26 Friis K, Pedersen MH, Aaby A, *et al.* Impact of low health literacy on healthcare utilization in
44 individuals with cardiovascular disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, diabetes and mental
45 disorders. A Danish population-based 4-year follow-up study. *Eur J Public Health* 2020;30:866–72.
46
- 47 27 Berkman ND, Sheridan SL, Donahue KE, *et al.* Low health literacy and health outcomes: an updated
48 systematic review. *Ann Intern Med* 2011;155:97–107.
49
- 50 28 Sauzet O, David M, Naghavi B, *et al.* Adequate utilization of emergency services in Germany: is there
51 a differential by migration background? *Front Public Health* 2020;8:613250.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 29 Unwin M, Crisp E, Stankovich J, *et al.* Socioeconomic disadvantage as a driver of non-urgent
4 emergency department presentations: A retrospective data analysis. *PLOS ONE* 2020;15:e0231429.
5
6 30 Krieg C, Hudon C, Chouinard M-C, *et al.* Individual predictors of frequent emergency department
7 use: a scoping review. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2016;16:594.
8
9 31 David M, Richter R, Naghavi B, *et al.* [Use of emergency rooms by so-called multiple users: results of
10 a prospective study with special consideration of the migration status]. *Notfall Rettungsmed*
11 Published Online First: 24 February 2021. doi:10.1007/s10049-021-00851-7
12
13 32 Holzinger F, Oslislo S, Möckel M, *et al.* Self-referred walk-in patients in the emergency department –
14 who and why? Consultation determinants in a multicenter study of respiratory patients in Berlin,
15 Germany. *BMC Health Services Research* 2020;20:848.
16
17 33 Häder S, Gabler S. Ein neues Stichprobendesign für telefonische Umfragen in Deutschland. In: Gabler
18 S, Häder S, Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik JHP, eds. Telefonstichproben in Deutschland. Opladen/Wiesbaden: VS
19 Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften 1998: 69–88.
20
21 34 Kish L. A Procedure for Objective Respondent Selection within the Household. *Journal of the*
22 *American Statistical Association* 1949;44:380–7.
23
24 35 von dem Knesebeck O, Lehmann M, Löwe B, *et al.* Public stigma towards individuals with somatic
25 symptom disorders - Survey results from Germany. *J Psychosom Res* 2018;115:71–5.
26
27 36 Makowski AC, Kim TJ, Luck-Sikorski C, *et al.* Social deprivation, gender and obesity: multiple stigma?
28 Results of a population survey from Germany. *BMJ Open* 2019;9:e023389.
29
30 37 Schellein O, Ludwig-Pistor F, Bremerich DH. [Manchester triage system. Process optimization in the
31 interdisciplinary emergency department]. *Anaesthesist* 2009;58:163–70.
32
33 38 RKI - Coronavirus SARS-CoV-2.
34 https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges_Coronavirus/nCoV_node.html (accessed 22
35 Sep 2021).
36
37 39 Rommel A, Kroll LE. Individual and Regional Determinants for Physical Therapy Utilization in
38 Germany: Multilevel Analysis of National Survey Data. *Phys Ther* 2017;97:512–23.
39
40 40 Statistical Office for Hamburg and Schleswig-Holstein. Hamburg Statistical Yearbook 2019/2020.
41 Hamburg: Statistical Office for Hamburg and Schleswig-Holstein 2020.
42
43 41 Federal Statistical Office. Education level of the population - results of the microcensus 2019.
44 Wiesbaden: Federal Statistical Office 2020.
45
46 42 IBM Corp. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 26.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp. 2019.
47
48 43 R Core Team. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna: R foundation for
49 statistical computing 2021. <https://www.r-project.org/> (accessed 22 Sep 2021).
50
51 44 Okan O, Bollweg TM, Berens E-M, *et al.* Coronavirus-related health literacy: a cross-sectional study in
52 adults during the COVID-19 infodemic in Germany. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2020;17:5503.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 45 Metelmann B, Brinkrolf P, Kliche M, *et al.* [Emergency medical service, medical on-call service, or
4 emergency department]. *Med Klin Intensivmed Notfmed* Published Online First: 20 April 2021.
5
6 46 Luiz T, Dittrich S, Pollach G, *et al.* [Knowledge of the population about leading symptoms of
7 cardiovascular emergencies and the responsibility and accessibility of medical facilities in
8 emergencies]. *Anaesthetist* 2017;66:840–9.
9
10 47 Somasundaram R, Geissler A, Leidel BA, *et al.* [Reasons for emergency department visits: results of a
11 patient survey]. *Gesundheitswesen* 2018;80:621–7.
12
13 48 Smith V, Mustafa M, Grafstein E, *et al.* Factors influencing the decision to attend a pediatric
14 emergency department for nonemergent complaints. *Pediatr Emerg Care* 2015;31:640–4.
15
16 49 Kalidindi S, Mahajan P, Thomas R, *et al.* Parental perception of urgency of illness. *Pediatr Emerg Care*
17 2010;26:549–53.
18
19 50 Zhang L, Losin EAR, Ashar YK, *et al.* Gender biases in estimation of others' pain. *J Pain* 2021;22:1048–
20 59
21
22 51 Keil J, Brendler V, Sachse C, *et al.* [Gender-specific differences in the utilization of health care
23 services in an urban population sample]. *Gesundheitswesen* 2020;82:e17–23.
24
25 52 Tille F, Gibis B, Balke K, *et al.* [Sociodemographic and health-related determinants of health care
26 utilisation and access to primary and specialist care: Results of a nationwide population survey in
27 Germany (2006-2016)]. *Z Evid Fortbild Qual Gesundhwes* 2017;126:52–65.
28
29 53 Hansen H, Schäfer I, Porzelt S, *et al.* Regional and patient-related factors influencing the willingness
30 to use general practitioners as coordinators of the treatment in northern Germany - results of a
31 cross-sectional observational study. *BMC Fam Pract* 2020;21:110.
32
33 54 Sørensen K, Pelikan JM, Röthlin F, *et al.* Health literacy in Europe: comparative results of the
34 European health literacy survey (HLS-EU). *Eur J Public Health* 2015;25:1053–8.
35
36 55 Jordan S, Hoebel J. Health literacy of adults in Germany. Findings from the German Health Update
37 (GEDA) study. *Bundesgesundheitsbl* 2015;58:942–50.
38
39 56 Oliver A, Mossialos E. Equity of access to health care: outlining the foundations for action. *J*
40 *Epidemiol Community Health* 2004;58:655–8.
41
42 57 Dolton P, Pathania V. Can increased primary care access reduce demand for emergency care?
43 Evidence from England's 7-day GP opening. *Journal of Health Economics* 2016;49:193–208.
44 doi:10.1016/j.jhealeco.2016.05.002
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Supplement 1 Case vignettes

Symptoms: COVID-19**Age group: children**

It is Tuesday morning, 8 a.m./It is Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., Paula S./Lukas P., 12 years old, schoolgirl/schoolboy,

...has had a headache for three days. She has developed a dry cough since yesterday. She feels tired and lacks the drive to do something which is unusual for the girl). She did not go to school today. Her mother took her temperature, it is 38.7 °C. Additionally, since today, Paula has trouble breathing when climbing stairs. Her parents are very worried because this has never happened before.

Age group: adults, middle-aged

It is Tuesday morning, 8 a.m./It is Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., Melanie P./Stefan D., 49 years, administration officer,

...has had a headache for three days. She has developed a dry cough since yesterday. She feels tired and lacks the drive to do something which is unusual for her. She did not go to work today. Mrs. P.'s temperature is at 38.7 °C today. Additionally, since today, she has trouble breathing when climbing stairs. She is very worried because this has never happened before.

Age group: adults, older

It is Tuesday morning, 8 a.m./It is Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., Hildegard S./Helmut K., 72 years, retired,

...has had a headache for three days. She has developed a dry cough since yesterday. She feels tired and lacks the drive to do something which is unusual for her. Mrs. S.'s temperature is at 38.7 °C today. Additionally, since today, she has trouble breathing when climbing stairs. Seeing that her heart and lungs are actually in good condition, this worries her very much.

Symptoms: Inflammatory gastrointestinal diseases**Age group: children (appendicitis)**

It is Tuesday morning, 8 a.m./It is Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., Paula S./Lukas P., 12 years old, schoolgirl/schoolboy,

...complains about a bad tummy ache. The trouble started the evening before with sickness and pain at the center of the stomach. In the morning she had to vomit. Since the evening before the pain has become worse and has moved to the right lower side of the stomach. The otherwise so active girl feels weak, has no appetite and would rather not move at all. Her temperature was 37.4 °C. When Paula's parents tried to palpate her tummy, she screamed of pain. This worries her parents very much.

Age group: adults, middle-aged (cholecystitis)

It is Tuesday morning, 8 a.m./It is Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., Melanie P./Stefan D., 49 years, administration officer,

...has sudden, severe pain in his right upper abdomen which radiates right up to his back and the right shoulder. Besides, she feels sick but so far did not have to vomit. Because of her bad condition she took her temperature: 38.6 °C. Her pain started about two hours ago. Mrs. P. does not know (has not experienced) pain like this. This worries her very much.

Age group: adults, elder (diverticulitis)

It is Tuesday morning, 8 a.m./It is Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., Hildegard S./Helmut K., 72 years, retired,

...has had pain in the lower left abdomen for three days. For a few weeks she has occasionally suffered from diarrhea, constipation also occurs. She feels less productive than usual and is often tired. Because of her bad condition she took her temperature: 38.5 °C. She noticed a streak of fresh blood on her stool since yesterday. Today the pain has reached a strength she had not experienced before. This very much worries her.

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	3-4
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5-6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6-7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6-7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6-7
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	7-9
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	6-9
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	8
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6-7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7-8
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	8-9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	8-9
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	Table 1-3
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	NA
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	NA
Results			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	6-7; Tables 1-3
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	NA
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	Table 1
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Table 1
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	Table 2-3
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	Table 3; 5, 7-9
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	8
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	NA
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	NA
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	10
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	13
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	10-12
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	13
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	14

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Intended health care utilisation in cases of severe COVID-19 and inflammatory gastrointestinal disease – results of a population survey with vignettes

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2021-057644.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	21-Jan-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Klein, Jens; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf Center for Psychosocial Medicine, Institute of Medical Sociology Strauß, Annette; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf Center for Psychosocial Medicine, Department of General Practice and Primary Care Koens, Sarah; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Institute of Medical Sociology Schäfer, Ingmar; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf Center for Psychosocial Medicine, Department of General Practice and Primary Care von dem Knesebeck, Olaf; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf Center for Psychosocial Medicine, Institute of Medical Sociology
Primary Subject Heading:	Health services research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Communication, Emergency medicine, General practice / Family practice, Sociology
Keywords:	HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, ACCIDENT & EMERGENCY MEDICINE, COVID-19, PRIMARY CARE, PUBLIC HEALTH, SOCIAL MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

Title:

Intended health care utilisation in cases of severe COVID-19 and inflammatory gastrointestinal disease – results of a population survey with vignettes

Authors:

Klein, J.¹, Strauß, A.², Koens, S.¹, Schäfer, I.², von dem Knesebeck O.¹

Institutions:

¹Institute of Medical Sociology, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

²Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

Corresponding author:

Jens Klein, PhD

University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf

Institute of Medical Sociology

Martinstraße 52

20247 Hamburg

Germany

+49 040 7410 51617

j.klein@uke.de

Abstract

Objectives: To examine variations in intended health care utilisation in severe cases of COVID-19 and inflammatory gastrointestinal disease (IGD).

Design: Representative cross-sectional telephone survey.

Setting and participants: 1,207 randomly drawn adults of the city of Hamburg, Germany, between November 2020 and January 2021.

Outcome measures: Different vignettes with severe symptoms were presented varying in sex, age (child, middle-aged person, older person), daytime (Tuesday morning or Tuesday evening) and disease (COVID-19 or IGD), while the degree of urgency was equivalent for all cases. The respondents were asked for the intended health care utilisation resulting in three different alternatives: general practitioner (GP)/paediatrician, medical on-call service ("116117"), and emergency care (accident & emergency department, emergency practice, rescue service). In multivariate analyses, associations of characteristics of the vignettes and participants (sex, age, education, migration background) with intended health care utilisation were tested. In a further step, analyses were conducted separately for IGD and COVID-19.

Results: Regarding the vignettes' characteristics, intended utilisation of GP/paediatrician is associated with female sex, higher age, daytime (morning) and COVID-19 symptoms, the medical on-call service with male sex, daytime (evening) and COVID-19 symptoms, and the emergency medicine with younger age, daytime (evening) and IGD. Women chose more often the GP/paediatrician, men preferred emergency medicine. Only in case of IGD, higher educated persons more often chose the medical on-call service while people with a migration background decided less often for medical on-call service and emergency medicine.

Conclusions: Despite comparable urgency the findings suggest variations of intended health care utilisation depending on various characteristics of the vignettes and respondents. Depending on the type of disease inequalities vary. Overall, information about health care alternatives in severe cases has to be improved and clear pathways to facilitate health care utilisation has to be further developed.

Strengths and Limitations of this study

- This is one of the first studies that analyse intended health care utilisation among the German general population using case vignettes of severe symptoms (COVID-19 and inflammatory gastrointestinal diseases).
- The vignette design provides a standardised stimulus and comparability between symptoms and urgency.
- The survey was conducted during the second peak of the COVID-19 pandemic and provides information about health care utilisation under extraordinary conditions.
- No observed or reported behaviour was analysed, but intended utilisation.

Introduction

In the past decade, utilization of urgent and emergency care services became an important topic in various countries [1–4]. The reasons to visit emergency departments (ED) are multi-layered and, next to lower access barriers, convenience and the belief in higher care quality, the subjective perception of urgency is one of the main causes for the utilization of emergency care [3–9]. However, the vast majority of the studies analysed characteristics and behaviour of patients which already entered emergency care facilities. Studies among the general population that surveyed the knowledge, beliefs, and intended utilization when severe symptoms occur are very rare. Moreover, various studies have shown a tremendous impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on health care utilisation among all age groups [10,11]. A systematic review of 81 studies across 20 countries found out that health care utilisation decreased by about a third during the pandemic in the first six months of 2020 [11]. A further systematic overview reported reductions of hospitalisations for cardiovascular diseases and their management ranging from 20% to 73% until February 2021 in numerous countries [12]. This decline of health care utilization was also prevalent in Germany in various outpatient, inpatient and emergency care facilities indicating a changed behaviour even when severe symptoms occur [11–16]. Hence, the increasing morbidity and mortality leads to an ongoing debate about changed utilisation pattern and the avoiding of ED due to fear of contracting COVID-19 although acute treatment is mandatory [17].

Generally, in the German health care system, three options are provided when severe symptoms occur [18]: (1) to contact the general practitioner (GP)/paediatrician (or in some cases a specialist), (2) to contact the medical on-call service, or (3) to utilize emergency medicine (accident and emergency departments, emergency practices, rescue service). In 2012, a nationwide telephone number (116117) was introduced to provide a medical on-call service for treatment outside normal appointment times. Even in acute cases and within normal appointment times, patients can receive medical treatment here. They can use this service to ask for advice and to make medical appointments, and alternatively, a home visit by the doctor can be

1
2
3 arranged. The present study is focused on two types of diseases: inflammatory gastrointestinal diseases
4 (IGD) and COVID-19. While COVID-19 symptoms are currently a major reason for help-seeking in case of
5
6 acute health problems, symptoms of gastrointestinal diseases are generally a prevalent driver of ED visits in
7
8 various countries including Germany [19,20].
9
10

11
12 The well-established Behavioral Model of Health Services Use by Ronald Andersen distinguishes between
13
14 predisposing, enabling and need factors of health care use on individual and contextual level [21,22]. It aims
15
16 to explain disparities in ambulatory and hospital services use by including various factors in the conceptual
17
18 model. Major individual predisposing factors are sex, age, education and ethnicity. Enabling is characterised
19
20 by income, health insurance status and the organisation of health services for the individual. Need factors
21
22 comprise the self-perception and the objective measurement of health and functional status. Over the
23
24 years, the health care system was included into the model to give recognition to the importance of national
25
26 health policy, the resources and their organisation [22]. Against the background of the current organisation
27
28 of urgent and emergency care services in Germany, the present study introduces the individual predisposing
29
30 factors sex, age, education, migration background and having children into the analyses of utilisation.
31
32 Predisposing factors as lower education and a migration background are often associated with more
33
34 frequent or inadequate pre-hospital and hospital emergency care utilization in Germany and further
35
36 European countries [7,23–26], although some current findings for Germany did not confirm these
37
38 inequalities [27–29]. Moreover, higher age predicts increased ED use while sex does not seem to play a
39
40 significant role [7,24,27,28]. Furthermore, the navigation within the health care system and the decision
41
42 making concerning health care in everyday life is a major domain in the conceptual models of health literacy
43
44 [30]. Thus, a major recommendation of The German National Action Plan Health Literacy is to facilitate
45
46 navigation within the health care system including emergency medicine [31]. Studies have shown
47
48 associations between low health literacy and more frequent as well as inadequate health care use, including
49
50 emergency care [32–34].
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Against this background, three research questions are addressed: (1) How does the intended health care
4 utilisation in severe cases vary depending on predisposing factors (sex and age of the afflicted person), on
5 symptoms (COVID-19 vs. inflammatory gastrointestinal disease (IGD)) and daytime (Tuesday, 8 a.m.;
6 Tuesday, 8 p.m.) of the vignettes? (2) How does the intended health care utilisation in severe cases vary
7 depending on predisposing factors of the respondents (sex, age, education, migration background, having
8 children)? (3) What differences occur when analysing the intended utilisation separately for symptoms of
9 IGD and COVID-19?
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **Methods**

21 *Study design and sample*

22
23 Cross-sectional data was assessed via computer assisted telephone interviews (CATI) between November
24 2020 and January 2021 in Hamburg, Germany. The sample was randomly drawn using all possible telephone
25 numbers in Hamburg, including non-registered numbers via random digital dialling [35]. Only landline
26 numbers could be included as mobile telephone numbers are not provided on regional level. Participants
27 were eligible when their age was ≥ 18 years, they were German-speaking and the place of residence was
28 Hamburg. On different weekdays, repeated calls were made by trained interviewers. The Kish selection grid
29 was used to randomly choose the target person in the respected household [36]. In this method, the
30 interviewer collected the age and gender of every household member that was eligible for the survey and
31 then randomly selected one person from that list. To analyse decisions for utilization, 24 different vignettes
32 (case stories) were used. Based on former research projects [37,38], a number of about $n=50$ participants
33 per vignette (i.e. total $N=1,200$) was considered sufficient to identify medium sized differences. The net
34 sample included 2,756 randomly selected persons. Of these, 961 (34.9 %) could not be reached and 588
35 (21.3 %) refused to participate leading to a total number of 1,207 participants (response rate: 43.8 %). The
36 study was approved by the Local Psychological Ethics Committee at the Center for Psychosocial Medicine,
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 University Medical Center Hamburg (No. LPEK-0200). Respondents gave their informed consent for the
4 participation and the use of their data. Consents and refusals were documented by the interviewers.
5
6

7 8 *Vignettes* 9

10 Vignettes were used as a stimulus at the beginning of the survey (please see Supplement 1). They were
11 designed in cooperation with primary care physicians, emergency physicians, geriatricians, paediatricians
12 and nursing staff. Two groups of prevalent diseases were selected for the vignettes: COVID-19 and
13 inflammatory gastrointestinal diseases (IGD). Additionally, vignettes were varied according to sex (female,
14 male), age (12 years (child), 49 years (middle-aged person), 72 years (older person)), and daytime (Tuesday,
15 8 a.m.; Tuesday, 8 p.m.) resulting in N=24 vignettes randomly assigned to the respondents. Presented
16 symptoms of both diseases were severe and comparable regarding urgency of treatment. However, it does
17 not imply that the recommended utilisation is the same for both types of diseases. In terms of inflammatory
18 gastrointestinal symptoms, typical and frequent diseases for the different age groups were selected:
19 appendicitis (child), cholecystitis (middle-aged person), and diverticulitis (older person). According to our
20 clinical cooperation partners, this was more realistic than to choose the same disease for all age groups.
21 Inspired by the Manchester-Triage-Score [39], urgency of treatment was indicated by fever or elevated
22 temperature and severe pain in all three gastrointestinal vignettes. A hospitalisation (own initiative or
23 referral by a physician) for further diagnostics or treatment is required in all three cases. Symptoms of the
24 COVID-19 vignette were based on guidelines and information provided by the Robert Koch Institute [40].
25 The recommended proceeding when COVID-19 symptoms occur is given by the Federal Ministry of Health
26 [41]: Affected people should stay at home, reduce contacts to a bare minimum and get in touch with a
27 doctor by phone. Outside of surgery opening hours, one can also call the medical on-call service by dialling
28 the nationwide number 116117 and wait for further instructions. In case of an emergency, it is
29 recommended to dial "112" for rescue service. All vignettes were audio-recorded by a clearly speaking
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 trained person. The audio files were directly played to the respondents followed by a standardized
4
5 questionnaire (total interview time: about 15 min.).
6
7

8 *Measures*

9

10
11 In the beginning of the interview, one of the vignettes was presented to the respondents. To assess intended
12
13 utilization behaviour in the presented case, the respondents were requested to answer following open
14
15 ended question: “Who would you turn to first for help in the place of Mrs. X. / Mr. X / in the place of the
16
17 parents of...?” The interviewers were provided with a list of possibilities to facilitate the documentation.
18
19 Three major options of intended utilization could be categorised after data collection: general practitioner
20
21 (GP/paediatrician), medical-on call service (“116117”), and emergency medicine facilities (accident and
22
23 emergency department, emergency practice, rescue service). These three categories were recoded as
24
25 dummy variables (yes/no). A residual category (“Other”) sums up further responses (e.g. friends or family
26
27 members, watchful waiting, alternative medicine, or pharmacy). Furthermore, the following characteristics
28
29 of the respondents were introduced: age (age groups: 18-40, 41-60, ≥ 60 years), sex, education (years of
30
31 schooling: ≤ 9 , 10, ≥ 12), having children (yes/no), and migration background (no/2nd generation/1st
32
33 generation). A person has a migration background, if he/she or one of his/her parents was born abroad.
34
35 Respondents with a migration background who were born abroad and migrated to Germany were classified
36
37 as 1st generation migrants, while German-born descendants of 1st generation migrants were considered as
38
39 2nd generation migrants [42]. Finally, respondents were asked whether they ever had been affected by such
40
41 complaints (yes/no). The sample was weighted for sex, age and educational level on the basis of official
42
43 statistics of the population in Hamburg in 2020 [43,44]. Chi²-tests have shown an effective weighting
44
45 indicating no significant differences between the study sample and the population in Hamburg in terms of
46
47 sex, age and education.
48
49
50
51
52

53 *Analyses*

54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Bivariate analyses of intended utilisation of the different care facilities were calculated using crosstabs
4 including Pearson's Chi²-test. For multivariate analyses, binary logistic regressions were conducted.
5
6 Dependent variables were the three options of utilization: (1) GP/paediatrician, (2) medical on-call service,
7
8 (3) emergency medicine (accident & emergency department, emergency practice, rescue service). As
9
10 predictor variables, characteristics of the vignettes (disease, sex, age, and daytime) and of the respondents
11
12 (sex, age, education, migration status, children, and personal affliction) were entered simultaneously into
13
14 the models, so that all variables are adjusted for each other. In a further step, the multivariate analyses
15
16 were conducted separately for the case scenarios of IGD and COVID-19. Analyses were carried out using the
17
18 Statistical Package for the Social Sciences SPSS 26 [45] and the R statistical package [46].
19
20
21
22
23

24 *Patient and Public Involvement*

25
26 Patients and public were not involved.
27
28
29

30 **Results**

31
32 Sample characteristics are shown in Table 1. The sample consisted of 52% female respondents whilst nearly
33
34 half of the participants had a higher educational level (≥ 12 years of schooling) and 23% a migration
35
36 background (1st and 2nd generation). In terms of the intended utilisation, more than half of the respondents
37
38 (54%) would choose the general practitioner or paediatrician as first contact after vignette presentation.
39
40 The medical on-call service ("116117") was preferred by 18% and emergency care (accident and emergency
41
42 department/emergency practice/rescue service) mentioned 26% (other options like friends and family,
43
44 pharmacy or alternative medicine: 5%).
45
46
47
48

49 *(Table 1 here)*

50
51
52 Bivariate analyses are shown in Table 2. In terms of characteristics of the vignettes, there were significant
53
54 differences ($p < 0.05$) in intended utilization according to sex and symptoms. Respondents to whom a COVID-
55
56 19 vignette was presented more frequently have chosen the GP/paediatrician or medical on-call service
57
58
59

1
2
3 than emergency medicine as first option for medical support. Regarding characteristics of the respondents,
4
5 significant differences emerged for sex, age, education, migration background, and personal affection.
6
7

8 *(Table 2 here)*
9

10
11 Results of the multivariate regression analysis show that the GP/paediatrician was chosen significantly more
12
13 often when the afflicted person in the vignette was female, middle aged or older, and had been affected by
14
15 COVID-19 symptoms (Table 3). There was a more than 2-fold likelihood of choosing the GP/paediatrician
16
17 when COVID-19 was presented in the vignette (OR: 2.15, CI: 1.67-2.77). Moreover, this option was less
18
19 favoured when symptoms occurred in the evening. In contrast, the option of medical on-call service was
20
21 more prevalent in male case vignettes and when the symptoms occurred in the evening. Similar to
22
23 GP/paediatrician, the medical on-call service was chosen more often when the COVID-19 vignette was
24
25 presented (OR: 2.88, CI: 2.01-4.18). Emergency medicine (accident and emergency department/emergency
26
27 practice/rescue service) was mentioned more often when children were affected, when symptoms were
28
29 gastrointestinal, and occurred in the evening. Regarding respondents' characteristics, women favoured the
30
31 GP/paediatrician while men rather preferred emergency medicine. Furthermore, higher educated persons
32
33 favoured the medical on-call service compared to the lowest status group (OR: 2.15, CI: 1.34-3.52). People
34
35 with migration background (especially 2nd generation) less often chose medical on-call service and
36
37 emergency medicine than non-migrants.
38
39
40
41
42

43 *(Table 3 here)*
44

45
46 When examining intended utilisation separately for IGD and COVID-19 cases, further important differences
47
48 emerged (Table 4 and Table 5). In terms of vignettes' characteristics, even in the evening, emergency
49
50 medicine was not chosen more often than in the morning when the COVID-19 vignette was presented (OR:
51
52 1.00, CI: 0.59-1.68). Regarding the respondents' characteristics, predisposing factors showed considerable
53
54 differences in some cases. Particularly, there was a significant social gradient in the association between the
55
56
57

1
2
3 on-call service use and educational level in case of IGD. Elevated Odds Ratios were found for higher educated
4 groups (OR: 3.85, CI: 1.39-11.10 to OR: 4.65, CI: 1.68-12.85). This social gradient does not exist regarding
5 COVID-19. Moreover, higher age groups much more often preferred emergency medicine when COVID-19
6 symptoms occur, while age does not matter for IGD. Finally, only in case of IGD, the migration background
7 (2nd generation) indicated significant differences favouring the GP/paediatrician and less on-call service and
8 emergency care.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 *(Table 4 and Table 5 here)*
18

19 20 **Discussion**

21
22 In this study, the intended utilisation of different care facilities in a German metropolis was examined using
23 varied case vignettes of severe COVID-19 and inflammatory gastrointestinal diseases (IGD). Following
24 Andersen's Behavioral Model of Health Services Use, the study analysed different predisposing factors (sex,
25 age, education, migration background) for the utilisation of GP/paediatrician, medical on-call service
26 ("116117"), and emergency care (accident and emergency department, emergency practice, rescue service).
27 Moreover, daytime and symptoms were additionally included as predictors into the model. First of all, the
28 majority of the respondents chose the GP/paediatrician as first option to get help. Furthermore, multivariate
29 results show that both, the characteristics of the vignettes and the characteristics of the respondents are
30 associated with the intended utilisation. In terms of the vignettes' characteristics, the intended utilisation
31 of GP/paediatrician is associated with female sex, higher age, daytime (morning) and COVID-19 symptoms,
32 the medical on-call service with male sex, daytime (evening) and COVID-19 symptoms, and the emergency
33 medicine with young age, daytime (evening) and gastrointestinal symptoms. Regarding the respondents'
34 characteristics, women chose more often the GP/paediatrician, men preferred emergency medicine. Higher
35 educated persons more often chose the medical on-call service while people with a migration background
36 decided less often for medical on-call service and emergency medicine. Thus, although case stories were
37 similar regarding urgency of treatment, results suggest variations of intended health care utilisation
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 according to various characteristics of the case vignettes and the respondents. Separate analyses for IGD
4 and COVID-19 cases show that the utilisation behaviour differs between the types of diseases. The
5
6 associations between daytime and emergency medicine, and education and medical on-call service as well
7
8 as associations between respondents' age and emergency medicine were solely significant in case of IGD.
9

10
11
12 Only a few studies analysed intended utilization among the general population using case vignettes. A
13
14 German study with a similar vignette design focused on intended behaviour and judgement of urgency, but
15
16 did not analyse any predisposing factors [47]. Another study with case scenarios conducted in the
17
18 Netherlands, Switzerland and Denmark examined the intended help-seeking behaviour exclusively in terms
19
20 of acute out-of-hours health care [48]. Parents or adults who were lower educated, older, or had a migration
21
22 background were more inclined to contact out-of-hours care, whereas women were less inclined [48]. A
23
24 survey among the German general population about its utilisation of pre-hospital emergency care revealed
25
26 a higher use among lower educated persons and migrants [25]. Two more overviews – mostly including
27
28 patient samples – indicated similar findings [24,26]. However, a significantly higher use of emergency
29
30 medicine among people with lower education and migrant background is not shown in the present study
31
32 which is supported by some current findings from Germany [27–29]. As in previous studies, a higher age of
33
34 the respondents (particularly in case of IGD) is associated with increased ED use [24]. The results also show
35
36 that female sex predicts lower ED use and a preference for GP/paediatrician. Although women still show a
37
38 different health care utilisation than men and utilise health care more frequently in general [49], there is no
39
40 clear evidence that female patients more often visit the GP in Germany [50–52]. The more frequent choice
41
42 of the comparatively new nationwide medical on-call service (“116117”) among higher educated people (in
43
44 case of IGD) reflects the evidence about social inequalities in health care use [53,54], and could be due to a
45
46 generally better health literacy among higher socioeconomic status groups [55,56]. Overall, the knowledge
47
48 about this service increased in the past years [57], and other data from the present study project confirm
49
50 the increasing popularity of the medical on-call service [58]. Interestingly, further analyses solely among the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 respondents which were presented a COVID-19 case showed no more inequalities between utilisation and
4 educational level as well as migration history, while inequalities increased in case of IGD.
5
6
7

8 Regarding the case vignettes' characteristics, sex plays another significant role. In this case, it is not about
9 different answers from females or males, but the reaction when a woman or a man is affected in the case
10 story. In the present study, a female vignette leads to significantly more GP/paediatrician consultations and
11 less on-call service. This suggests a less urgent perception when a female is affected, and is supported by
12 findings that symptoms of female patients were more often underestimated compared with males [59]. The
13 result that emergency care is more often preferred when a child was affected is supported by findings that
14 the perception of urgency is increased in case of ill children, and parents prefer to visit ED before contacting
15 the primary care provider [60,61]. The significant preference of medical on-call service and emergency care
16 in the evening is obvious due to restricted opening hours of practices. Concerning the disease-related
17 intended utilisation, significant difference are shown. While the GP/paediatrician and the medical on-call
18 service was significantly more chosen in case of a COVID-19 vignette, emergency facilities were more
19 preferred when an IGD vignette was presented. The respondents' preference of GP/paediatrician and
20 medical on-call service ("116117") in acute cases of COVID-19 indicates an adequate navigation within the
21 health care system as it is in line with the official national recommendations when symptoms of COVID-19
22 occur [41]. This suggests an improved information due to widespread campaigns about COVID-19 symptoms
23 and health care use. A German study about coronavirus-related health literacy showed that, despite some
24 confusion about coronavirus information, the vast majority felt well informed [62]. To differ between
25 adequate or inadequate utilisation in terms of the IGD vignettes is hardly possible as all three health care
26 options would be adequate. In this case, hospitalisation could be organised through self-referral, referral by
27 a physician, or after consultation with the medical on-call service. Additionally, the daytime plays an
28 important role for symptoms like that. Overall, measurement of adequate utilisation is very diverse and
29 remains difficult [7,23,47,63]. Thus, interpretations should be done carefully.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 Generally, it is still a challenge to work out the reasons behind differences in health care utilisation. Different
4 utilisation behaviour could be due to differences in need, to differences in expectations and preferences
5 (e.g. individual/cultural preferences or health beliefs), to differences in information (e.g. about service
6 availability, navigation in the health care system, or wrong assumption of costs), or to formal access barriers
7 (e.g. charges, waiting times, travel distances, or lost wages when using health care during work hours) [64].
8
9

10 To figure out the reasons behind the patient's behaviour is highly relevant for implications in terms of
11 possible interventions. The results suggest differences in information (e.g. about the medical-on-call-service
12 or further options), preferences (e.g. directly visiting ED on own initiative or expecting higher expertise in
13 ED), and perceived need due to sociodemographic characteristics. It is likely that the campaigns regarding
14 health care seeking during the COVID-19 pandemic had an impact on utilisation behaviour in our study. The
15 use of the medical on-call service and primary care provider in case of symptoms of a COVID-19 infection
16 conforms to the official recommendations. However, among people with lower education and with a
17 migration background, information about health care options needs to be more disseminated. In Germany,
18 the ongoing establishment of out-of-hours primary care centers ("Portalpraxen") located at hospitals aims
19 at improving coordination between emergency and urgent care, and at improving availability of urgent
20 primary care [65]. In further European countries, similar approaches of out-of-hours services, walk-in and
21 primary care centers are established [65]. Moreover, there is a challenge to tackle the unmet needs of
22 patients with severe diseases which increased since the beginning of the pandemic. Suggestions include a
23 division of the ED into respiratory and non-respiratory section and targeted messaging [17].
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Limitations**

47 First, a response rate of about 44% can be considered as adequate, however, a potential selection bias due
48 to nonresponse and due to only using landline numbers cannot be ruled out. Nevertheless, the comparison
49 of our weighted data with official statistics of the population in Hamburg regarding some sociodemographic
50 variables (sex, age, education) supports the external validity as significant differences between our data and
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 official statistics did not exist. Second, despite various strengths of a vignette design (comparability between
4 symptoms and urgency, standardised stimulus), the vignettes are an artificial stimulus that necessarily
5 introduce symptoms in a brief form potentially neglecting the complexity of some diseases. The extensive
6 involvement of various experts in the development of the case vignettes aimed to minimize these limits.
7
8 The development of the COVID-19 vignette was based on the state of research in summer 2020. The
9
10 evidence about COVID-19 morbidity among different age groups is subject to change over time. Additionally,
11
12 the comparability between the age groups of IGD was limited as three different diseases were introduced.
13
14 Third, no observed or reported behaviour was analysed, but exclusively intended utilisation. Fourth, our
15
16 data is supposed to be representative for a metropolis in Germany, the health care situation and behaviour
17
18 could be different in more rural regions which are not represented in this study.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Conclusions**

27
28 To our knowledge, this is one of the first studies that analyse intended health care utilisation among the
29
30 German general population using case vignettes of severe symptoms. It could be shown that different
31
32 characteristics of vignettes and characteristics of the respondents lead to different health care utilisation,
33
34 although urgency is equal in the presented vignettes. These variations in intended health care use suggest
35
36 a potential need for interventions. Even though the respondents mostly followed the official
37
38 recommendations in case of COVID-19, the communication of health care alternatives has to be improved,
39
40 and clear pathways to facilitate health care utilisation should be further developed.
41
42
43
44

45 **Acknowledgement**

46
47 The authors would like to thank Martin Scherer, Sarah Porzelt, Robin Kobbe, Ulrich Thiem, Ulrich Mayer-
48
49 Runge and Michael Rieper for supporting the development of the case vignettes.
50

51 **Author contributions**

52
53 OK, JK, AS and IS designed the study including questionnaire and vignettes. JK drafted the manuscript, and
54
55 analysed and interpreted the data. AS essentially developed the vignettes. OK led the project and made an
56
57

1
2
3 essential contribution to drafting the manuscript and interpreting the data. SK, AS and IS critically revised
4
5 and approved the final manuscript.
6
7

8 **Ethical approval**

9
10 Local Psychological Ethics Committee at the Center for Psychosocial Medicine, University Medical Center
11
12 Hamburg (No. LPEK-0200).
13
14

15 **Funding**

16
17 The study is funded by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (grant number 01GY1912).
18

19 **Competing interests**

20
21 There are no competing interests.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 Sample characteristics (N=1,207)*: n (%)

Sex (<i>1</i>)		
female	621	(51.5)
male	585	(48.5)
Age (years) (<i>1</i>)		
18 – 40	455	(37.8)
41 – 60	419	(34.7)
≥ 60	332	(27.5)
Education (years) (<i>43</i>)		
≤ 9	316	(27.1)
10	275	(23.6)
≥ 12	574	(49.3)
Migration background (<i>22</i>)		
no	915	(77.3)
2 nd generation	129	(10.9)
1 st generation	141	(11.7)
Children (<i>18</i>)		
yes	546	(45.9)
no	643	(54.1)
Personally affected by such complaints (<i>4</i>)		
yes	238	(19.8)
no	965	(80.2)
Intended utilisation (<i>1</i>)		
General practitioner/paediatrician	646	(53.6)
Medical on-call service (“116117”)	182	(15.1)
Emergency medicine [†]	316	(26.2)
Other	62	(5.1)

*number of missing data in brackets in italics

[†]accident and emergency department/emergency practice/rescue service

Table 2 Intended utilisation of different care facilities according to characteristics of the vignettes and the respondents (N=1,207): Bivariate analysis (%)*

		General practitioner/ paediatrician (%)	Medical on-call service ("116117") (%)	Emergency medicine† (%)
Vignettes				
Sex	Male	49.4	19.0	25.8
	Female	57.6	11.1	26.4
	p‡	0.004	<0.001	0.804
Age	Child	48.8	16.5	31.8
	Adult middle aged	55.1	13.1	25.6
	Adult aged	56.7	16.1	20.8
	p	0.058	0.317	0.002
Time	Tuesday morning	65.7	7.4	22.2
	Tuesday evening	41.8	22.5	30.0
	p	<0.001	<0.001	0.002
Symptoms	Gastrointestinal	44.9	9.5	39.4
	COVID-19	62.3	20.7	12.7
	p	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Respondents				
Sex	Male	49.9	16.6	29.1
	Female	56.8	13.7	23.5
	p	0.016	0.161	0.029
Age (years)	18 - 40	57.9	17.4	18.7
	41 - 60	47.5	16.2	32.7
	> 60	55.1	10.6	28.3
	p	0.007	0.024	<0.001
Education (years)	≤ 9	57.5	8.9	26.7
	10	50.9	14.9	33.5
	≥ 12	54.5	17.9	22.0
	p	0.280	0.001	0.002
Migration background	No	52.0	16.8	28.5
	2 nd Generation	59.4	7.8	14.8
	1 st Generation	57.4	12.8	22.7
	p	0.172	0.020	0.003
Own children	No	53.5	14.3	26.6
	Yes	54.1	15.4	25.7
	p	0.825	0.592	0.712
Personally affected by such complaints	No	52.0	16.0	27.5
	Yes	60.1	11.8	20.5
	p	0.025	0.106	0.028

1
2
3 *the percentages do not sum to 100 due to missing data

4 †accident and emergency department/emergency practice/rescue service

5 ‡Pearson's Chi-square (statistically significant values ($p < 0.05$) in bold)

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Table 3 Intended utilisation of different care facilities (N=1,170): Multivariate analysis (Odds Ratios and 95% confidence intervals)

	General practitioner/ paediatrician		Medical on-call service ("116117")		Emergency medicine*	
	OR (95% CI)**	p	OR (95% CI)	p	OR (95% CI)	p
Vignettes						
Sex (male)	1		1		1	
Sex (female)	1.34 (1.04-1.72)	0.024	0.48 (0.34-0.68)	<0.001	1.16 (0.86-1.56)	0.328
Age (child)	1		1		1	
Age (middle aged)	1.37 (1.01-1.86)	0.045	0.94 (0.62-1.44)	0.786	0.60 (0.42-0.85)	0.004
Age (older)	1.47 (1.08-2.02)	0.016	1.19 (0.78-1.83)	0.415	0.47 (0.33-0.69)	<0.001
Time (Tuesday morning)	1		1		1	
Time (Tuesday evening)	0.35 (0.27-0.44)	<0.001	3.65 (2.53-5.34)	<0.001	1.61 (1.20-2.16)	0.002
Symptoms (gastrointestinal)	1		1		1	
Symptoms (COVID-19)	2.15 (1.67-2.77)	<0.001	2.88 (2.01-4.18)	<0.001	0.20 (0.15-0.28)	<0.001
Respondents						
Sex (male)	1		1		1	
Sex (female)	1.46 (1.13-1.88)	0.003	0.83 (0.59-1.17)	0.279	0.70 (0.52-0.95)	0.022
Age (18-40)	1		1		1	
Age (41 – 60)	0.71 (0.52-0.96)	0.026	0.81 (0.53-1.21)	0.297	1.85 (1.29-2.65)	<0.001
Age (> 60)	0.87 (0.61-1.24)	0.446	0.73 (0.44-1.20)	0.220	1.34 (0.87-2.05)	0.178
Education (≤9)	1		1		1	
Education (10 Years)	0.70 (0.49-0.99)	0.047	1.75 (1.02-3.01)	0.043	1.54 (1.02-2.32)	0.040
Education (≥ 12 Years)	0.80 (0.58-1.10)	0.180	2.15 (1.34-3.52)	0.002	0.84 (0.58-1.21)	0.384
No migration background	1		1		1	
Migration background (2 nd generation)	1.29 (0.87-1.95)	0.212	0.49 (0.23-0.93)	0.042	0.38 (0.21-0.65)	<0.001
Migration background (1 st generation)	1.31 (0.89-1.93)	0.167	0.64 (0.36-1.09)	0.114	0.70 (0.43-1.12)	0.128
Own children (no)	1		1		1	
Own children (yes)	0.84 (0.64-1.11)	0.227	1.15 (0.78-1.69)	0.480	1.09 (0.78-1.51)	0.626
Personally affected by such complaints (no)	1		1		1	
Personally affected by such complaints (yes)	1.15 (0.83-1.58)	0.401	0.63 (0.39-1.00)	0.051	0.89 (0.60-1.30)	0.581
R ² (Nagelkerke)	0.155		0.182		0.222	

*accident and emergency department/emergency practice/rescue service

**OR=odds ratio; CI=confidence interval (statistically significant values (p<0.05) in bold)

Table 4 Intended utilisation of different care facilities in case of inflammatory gastrointestinal diseases (N=603): Multivariate analysis (Odds Ratios and 95% confidence intervals)

	General practitioner/ paediatrician		Medical on-call service ("116117")		Emergency medicine*	
	OR (95% CI)**	p	OR (95% CI)	p	OR (95% CI)	p
Vignettes						
Sex (male)	1		1		1	
Sex (female)	1.24 (0.87-1.77)	0.243	0.45 (0.24-0.85)	0.013	1.35 (0.93-1.95)	0.110
Age (child)	1		1		1	
Age (middle aged)	1.29 (0.83-2.01)	0.255	1.31 (0.59-2.90)	0.511	0.63 (0.41-0.97)	0.036
Age (older)	1.81 (1.15-2.83)	0.010	1.85 (0.85-4.03)	0.121	0.36 (0.23-0.57)	<0.001
Time (Tuesday morning)	1		1		1	
Time (Tuesday evening)	0.31 (0.22-0.44)	<0.001	3.20 (1.64-6.27)	0.001	2.02 (1.41-2.90)	<0.001
Respondents						
Sex (male)	1		1		1	
Sex (female)	1.32 (0.93-1.90)	0.127	1.10 (0.60-2.03)	0.751	0.75 (0.52-1.07)	0.123
Age (18-40)	1		1		1	
Age (41 – 60)	0.67 (0.43-1.04)	0.071	1.11 (0.54-2.33)	0.765	1.35 (0.87-2.10)	0.183
Age (61 and older)	0.89 (0.53-1.49)	0.658	1.46 (0.59-3.60)	0.409	0.95 (0.56-1.61)	0.840
Education (≤9)	1		1		1	
Education (10 Years)	0.56 (0.33-0.93)	0.024	3.85 (1.39-11.10)	0.012	1.84 (1.10-3.07)	0.020
Education (≥ 12 Years)	0.68 (0.43-1.07)	0.096	4.65 (1.68-12.85)	0.003	1.04 (0.65-1.66)	0.869
No migrant background	1		1		1	
Migrant background (2 nd generation)	2.01 (1.17-3.46)	0.012	0.16 (0.29-0.87)	0.034	0.35 (0.19-0.65)	0.001
Migrant background (1 st generation)	1.19 (0.69-2.07)	0.534	0.33 (0.87-1.29)	0.111	0.68 (0.39-1.20)	0.182
Own children (no)	1		1		1	
Own children (yes)	0.90 (0.60-1.34)	0.605	0.77 (0.38-1.55)	0.459	1.24 (0.82-1.88)	0.310
Personally affected by such complaints (no)	1		1		1	
Personally affected by such complaints (yes)	0.83 (0.49-1.39)	0.470	2.58 (1.17-5.67)	0.019	0.73 (0.42-1.28)	0.261

*accident and emergency department/emergency practice/rescue service

**OR=odds ratio; CI=confidence interval (statistically significant values (p<0.05) in bold)

Table 5 Intended utilisation of different care facilities in case of COVID-19 (N=604): Multivariate analysis (Odds Ratios and 95% confidence intervals)

	General practitioner/ paediatrician		Medical on-call service ("116117")		Emergency medicine*	
	OR (95% CI)	p	OR (95% CI)	p	OR (95% CI)	p
Vignettes						
Sex (male)	1		1		1	
Sex (female)	1.44 (0.99-2.07)	0.052	0.52 (0.33-0.82)	0.005	0.84 (0.50-1.43)	0.525
Age (child)	1		1		1	
Age (middle aged)	1.43 (0.92-2.23)	0.111	0.89 (0.52-1.52)	0.672	0.49 (0.25-0.95)	0.033
Age (older)	1.14 (0.73-1.78)	0.564	1.07 (0.62-1.84)	0.814	0.73 (0.39-1.35)	0.318
Time (Tuesday morning)	1		1		1	
Time (Tuesday evening)	0.38 (0.27-0.55)	<0.001	3.92 (2.46-6.25)	<0.001	1.00 (0.59-1.68)	0.993
Respondents						
Sex (male)	1		1		1	
Sex (female)	1.68 (1.17-2.41)	0.005	0.70 (0.45-1.08)	0.106	0.56 (0.33-0.95)	0.033
Age (18-40)	1		1		1	
Age (41 – 60)	0.74 (0.48-1.14)	0.174	0.70 (0.42-1.17)	0.176	3.93 (1.93-8.00)	<0.001
Age (61 and older)	0.87 (0.52-1.46)	0.600	0.50 (0.26-0.96)	0.039	3.22 (1.46-7.0)	0.004
Education (≤9)	1		1		1	
Education (10 Years)	0.88 (0.53-1.49)	0.642	1.22 (0.62-2.41)	0.563	1.14 (0.59-2.23)	0.698
Education (≥ 12 Years)	0.89 (0.56-1.40)	0.607	1.65 (0.92-2.97)	0.093	0.58 (0.30-1.10)	0.099
No migrant background	1		1		1	
Migrant background (2 nd generation)	0.70 (0.38-1.29)	0.254	0.76 (0.34-1.73)	0.514	0.35 (0.19-0.60)	0.116
Migrant background (1 st generation)	1.44 (0.83-2.51)	0.198	0.76 (0.39-1.46)	0.405	0.73 (0.32-1.65)	0.444
Own children (no)	1		1		1	
Own children (yes)	0.79 (0.53-1.12)	0.242	1.42 (0.88-2.33)	0.160	0.91 (0.52-1.59)	0.728
Personally affected by such complaints (no)	1		1		1	
Personally affected by such complaints (yes)	1.42 (0.93-2.17)	0.110	0.36 (0.20-0.65)	0.001	1.08 (0.60-1.96)	0.801

*accident and emergency department/emergency practice/rescue service

**OR=odds ratio; CI=confidence interval (statistically significant values (p<0.05) in bold)

References

- 1 Pines JM, Hilton JA, Weber EJ, *et al.* International perspectives on emergency department crowding. *Acad Emerg Med* 2011;18:1358–70.
- 2 Pope C, McKenna G, Turnbull J, *et al.* Navigating and making sense of urgent and emergency care processes and provision. *Health Expect* 2019;22:435–43.
- 3 Uscher-Pines L, Pines J, Kellermann A, *et al.* Deciding to visit the emergency department for non-urgent conditions: a systematic review of the literature. *Am J Manag Care* 2013;19:47–59.
- 4 Coster JE, Turner JK, Bradbury D, *et al.* Why do people choose emergency and urgent care services? a rapid review utilizing a systematic literature search and narrative synthesis. *Acad Emerg Med* 2017;24:1137–49.
- 5 Penson R, Coleman P, Mason S, *et al.* Why do patients with minor or moderate conditions that could be managed in other settings attend the emergency department? *Emerg Med J* 2012;29:487–91.
- 6 Watson MC, Ferguson J, Barton GR, *et al.* A cohort study of influences, health outcomes and costs of patients' health-seeking behaviour for minor ailments from primary and emergency care settings. *BMJ Open* 2015;5:e006261.
- 7 Scherer M, Lühmann D, Kazek A, *et al.* Patients Attending Emergency Departments. *Dtsch Arztebl Int* 2017;114:645–52.
- 8 Schmiedhofer M, Möckel M, Slagman A, *et al.* Patient motives behind low-acuity visits to the emergency department in Germany: a qualitative study comparing urban and rural sites. *BMJ Open* 2016;6:e013323.
- 9 Oslislo S, Heintze C, Schmiedhofer M, *et al.* How to decide adequately? Qualitative study of GPs' view on decision-making in self-referred and physician-referred emergency department consultations in Berlin, Germany. *BMJ Open* 2019;9:e026786.
- 10 Shanmugavadivel D, Liu J-F, Gilhooley C, *et al.* Changing patterns of emergency paediatric presentations during the first wave of COVID-19: learning for the second wave from a UK tertiary emergency department. *BMJ Paediatr Open* 2021;5:e000967.
- 11 Moynihan R, Sanders S, Michaleff ZA, *et al.* Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on utilisation of healthcare services: a systematic review. *BMJ Open* 2021;11:e045343.
- 12 Seidu S, Kunutsor SK, Cos X, *et al.* Indirect impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on hospitalisations for cardiometabolic conditions and their management: A systematic review. *Prim Care Diabetes* 2021;15:653–81.
- 13 Damerow S, Rommel A, Prütz F, *et al.* Developments in the health situation in Germany during the initial stage of the COVID-19 pandemic for selected indicators of GEDA 2019/2020-EHIS. *Journal of Health Monitoring* 2020; 5:3–16.
- 14 Slagman A, Behringer W, Greiner F, *et al.* Medical emergencies during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Dtsch Arztebl Int* 2020;117:545–52.

- 1
2
3 15 Mangiapane S, Zhu L, Czihal T, *et al.* Veränderung der vertragsärztlichen Leistungsanspruchnahme
4 während der COVID-Krise. Berlin: Zentralinstitut für die kassenärztliche Versorgung in der
5 Bundesrepublik Deutschland 2021.
6
7 16 Schäfer I, Hansen H, Menzel A, *et al.* The effect of COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown on consultation
8 numbers, consultation reasons and performed services in primary care: results of a longitudinal
9 observational study. *BMC Fam Pract* 2021;22:125.
10
11 17 Wong LE, Hawkins JE, Langness S, *et al.* Where are all the patients? Addressing Covid-19 fear to
12 encourage sick patients to seek emergency care. *NEJM Catalyst Innovations in Care Delivery*
13 Published Online First: 14 May 2020. <https://catalyst.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/CAT.20.0193>
14 (accessed 22 Sep 2021).
15
16 18 Federal Ministry of Health. The German healthcare system. Strong. Reliable. Proven. Berlin: Federal
17 Ministry of Health 2020.
18
19 19 Myer PA, Mannalithara A, Singh G, *et al.* Clinical and economic burden of emergency department
20 visits due to gastrointestinal diseases in the United States. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2013;108:1496–507.
21
22 20 Mangiapane S, Czihal T, von Stillfried D. Entwicklung der ambulanten Notfallversorgung in
23 Deutschland von 2009 bis 2020. Berlin: Zentralinstitut für die kassenärztliche Versorgung in der
24 Bundesrepublik Deutschland 2021.
25
26 21 Andersen RM, Davidson PL, Baumeister SE. Improving access to care. In: Kominski GE, ed. Changing
27 the U.S. health care system: key issues in health services, policy, and management. San Francisco:
28 Wiley & Sons 2014:33–69.
29
30 22 Andersen RM. National health surveys and the behavioral model of health services use. *Med Care*
31 2008;46:647–53.
32
33 23 Sauzet O, David M, Naghavi B, *et al.* Adequate utilization of emergency services in Germany: is there
34 a differential by migration background? *Front Public Health* 2020;8:613250.
35
36 24 Krieg C, Hudon C, Chouinard M-C, *et al.* Individual predictors of frequent emergency department
37 use: a scoping review. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2016;16:594.
38
39 25 Kietzmann D, Knuth D, Schmidt S. (Non-)utilization of pre-hospital emergency care by migrants and
40 non-migrants in Germany. *Int J Public Health* 2017;62:95–102.
41
42 26 Credé SH, Such E, Mason S. International migrants' use of emergency departments in Europe
43 compared with non-migrants' use: a systematic review. *Eur J Public Health* 2018;28:61–73.
44
45 27 David M, Richter R, Naghavi B, *et al.* [Use of emergency rooms by so-called multiple users: results of
46 a prospective study with special consideration of the migration status]. *Notfall Rettungsmed*
47 Published Online First: 24 February 2021. doi:10.1007/s10049-021-00851-7
48
49 28 Holzinger F, Oslislo S, Möckel M, *et al.* Self-referred walk-in patients in the emergency department –
50 who and why? Consultation determinants in a multicenter study of respiratory patients in Berlin,
51 Germany. *BMC Health Services Research* 2020;20:848.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 29 Wenner J, Razum O, Schenk L, *et al.* [The health of children and adolescents from families with
4 insecure residence status compared to children with permanent residence permits: analysis of KiGGS
5 data 2003-2006]. *Bundesgesundheitsblatt Gesundheitsforschung Gesundheitsschutz* 2016;59:627–
6 35.
7
8
9 30 Sørensen K, Van den Broucke S, Fullam J, *et al.* Health literacy and public health: a systematic review
10 and integration of definitions and models. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12:80.
11
12 31 Schaeffer, D., Hurrelmann, K., Bauer, U, Kolpatzik, K, eds.: National action plan health literacy.
13 Promoting health literacy in Germany. Berlin: KomPart 2018.
14
15 32 Friis K, Pedersen MH, Aaby A, *et al.* Impact of low health literacy on healthcare utilization in
16 individuals with cardiovascular disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, diabetes and mental
17 disorders. A Danish population-based 4-year follow-up study. *Eur J Public Health* 2020;30:866–72.
18
19 33 Berkman ND, Sheridan SL, Donahue KE, *et al.* Low health literacy and health outcomes: an updated
20 systematic review. *Ann Intern Med* 2011;155:97–107.
21
22 34 Schumacher JR, Hall AG, Davis TC, *et al.* Potentially preventable use of emergency services: the role
23 of low health literacy. *Med Care* 2013;51:654–8.
24
25 35 Häder S, Gabler S. Ein neues Stichprobendesign für telefonische Umfragen in Deutschland. In: Gabler
26 S, Häder S, Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik JHP, eds. Telefonstichproben in Deutschland. Opladen/Wiesbaden: VS
27 Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften 1998: 69–88.
28
29 36 Kish L. A Procedure for Objective Respondent Selection within the Household. *Journal of the*
30 *American Statistical Association* 1949;44:380–7.
31
32 37 von dem Knesebeck O, Lehmann M, Löwe B, *et al.* Public stigma towards individuals with somatic
33 symptom disorders - Survey results from Germany. *J Psychosom Res* 2018;115:71–5.
34
35 38 Makowski AC, Kim TJ, Luck-Sikorski C, *et al.* Social deprivation, gender and obesity: multiple stigma?
36 Results of a population survey from Germany. *BMJ Open* 2019;9:e023389.
37
38 39 Schellein O, Ludwig-Pistor F, Bremerich DH. [Manchester triage system. Process optimization in the
39 interdisciplinary emergency department]. *Anaesthetist* 2009;58:163–70.
40
41 40 RKI - Coronavirus SARS-CoV-2.
42 https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges_Coronavirus/nCoV_node.html (accessed 22
43 Sep 2021).
44
45 41 Germany's information platform on the coronavirus.
46 <https://www.zusammengengencorona.de/en/from-suspected-infection-to-isolation/> (accessed 22
47 Sep 2021).
48
49 42 Rommel A, Kroll LE. Individual and Regional Determinants for Physical Therapy Utilization in
50 Germany: Multilevel Analysis of National Survey Data. *Phys Ther* 2017;97:512–23.
51
52 43 Statistical Office for Hamburg and Schleswig-Holstein. Hamburg Statistical Yearbook 2019/2020.
53 Hamburg: Statistical Office for Hamburg and Schleswig-Holstein 2020.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 44 Federal Statistical Office. Education level of the population - results of the microcensus 2019.
4 Wiesbaden: Federal Statistical Office 2020.
5
6 45 IBM Corp. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 26.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp. 2019.
7
8 46 R Core Team. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna: R foundation for
9 statistical computing 2021. <https://www.r-project.org/> (accessed 22 Sep 2021).
10
11 47 Metelmann B, Brinkrolf P, Kliche M, *et al.* [Emergency medical service, medical on-call service, or
12 emergency department]. *Med Klin Intensivmed Notfmed* Published Online First: 20 April 2021.
13
14 48 Keizer E, Christensen MB, Carlsen AH, *et al.* Factors related to out-of-hours help-seeking for acute
15 health problems: a survey study using case scenarios. *BMC Public Health* 2019;19:33.
16
17 49 Prütz F, Rommel A, Thom J, *et al.* Utilisation of outpatient medical services in Germany – results
18 from GEDA 2019/2020-EHIS. *Journal of Health Monitoring* 2021;6:45–65.
19
20 50 Keil J, Brendler V, Sachse C, *et al.* [Gender-specific differences in the utilization of health care
21 services in an urban population sample]. *Gesundheitswesen* 2020;82:e17–23.
22
23 51 Tille F, Gibis B, Balke K, *et al.* [Sociodemographic and health-related determinants of health care
24 utilisation and access to primary and specialist care: Results of a nationwide population survey in
25 Germany (2006-2016)]. *Z Evid Fortbild Qual Gesundheitswes* 2017;126:52–65.
26
27 52 Hansen H, Schäfer I, Porzelt S, *et al.* Regional and patient-related factors influencing the willingness
28 to use general practitioners as coordinators of the treatment in northern Germany - results of a
29 cross-sectional observational study. *BMC Fam Pract* 2020;21:110.
30
31 53 Klein J, Hofreuter-Gätgens K, von dem Knesebeck O. Socioeconomic status and the utilization of
32 health services in Germany: a systematic review. In: Janssen C, Swart E, Lengerke T von, eds. *Health
33 Care Utilization in Germany*. New York: Springer 2014:117–43.
34
35 54 Lueckmann SL, Hoebel J, Roick J, *et al.* Socioeconomic inequalities in primary-care and specialist
36 physician visits: a systematic review. *Int J Equity Health* 2021;20:58.
37
38 55 Sørensen K, Pelikan JM, Röthlin F, *et al.* Health literacy in Europe: comparative results of the
39 European health literacy survey (HLS-EU). *Eur J Public Health* 2015;25:1053–8.
40
41 56 Jordan S, Hoebel J. Health literacy of adults in Germany. Findings from the German Health Update
42 (GEDA) study. *Bundesgesundheitsbl* 2015;58:942–50.
43
44 57 Kassenärztlichen Bundesvereinigung (KBV). Versichertenbefragung der Kassenärztlichen
45 Bundesvereinigung 2021. Mannheim: Forschungsgruppe Wahlen 2021:15-16.
46
47 58 von dem Knesebeck O, Koens S, Schäfer I, *et al.* Public knowledge about emergency care—results of
48 a population survey from Germany. *Front Public Health* 2022;9:2204.
49
50 59 Zhang L, Losin EAR, Ashar YK, *et al.* Gender biases in estimation of others' pain. *J Pain* 2021;22:1048–
51 59.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 60 Smith V, Mustafa M, Grafstein E, *et al.* Factors influencing the decision to attend a pediatric
4 emergency department for nonemergent complaints. *Pediatr Emerg Care* 2015;31:640–4.
5
6 61 Kalidindi S, Mahajan P, Thomas R, *et al.* Parental perception of urgency of illness. *Pediatr Emerg Care*
7 2010;26:549–53.
8
9 62 Okan O, Bollweg TM, Berens E-M, *et al.* Coronavirus-related health literacy: a cross-sectional study in
10 adults during the COVID-19 infodemic in Germany. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2020;17:5503.
11
12 63 Unwin M, Crisp E, Stankovich J, *et al.* Socioeconomic disadvantage as a driver of non-urgent
13 emergency department presentations: A retrospective data analysis. *PLOS ONE* 2020;15:e0231429.
14
15 64 Oliver A, Mossialos E. Equity of access to health care: outlining the foundations for action. *J*
16 *Epidemiol Community Health* 2004;58:655–8.
17
18 65 Baier N, Geissler A, Bech M, *et al.* Emergency and urgent care systems in Australia, Denmark,
19 England, France, Germany and the Netherlands – analyzing organization, payment and reforms.
20 *Health Policy* 2019;123:1–10.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Supplement 1 Case vignettes

Symptoms: COVID-19**Age group: children**

It is Tuesday morning, 8 a.m./It is Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., Paula S./Lukas P., 12 years old, schoolgirl/schoolboy,

...has had a headache for three days. She has developed a dry cough since yesterday. She feels tired and lacks the drive to do something which is unusual for the girl). She did not go to school today. Her mother took her temperature, it is 38.7 °C. Additionally, since today, Paula has trouble breathing when climbing stairs. Her parents are very worried because this has never happened before.

Age group: adults, middle-aged

It is Tuesday morning, 8 a.m./It is Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., Melanie P./Stefan D., 49 years, administration officer,

...has had a headache for three days. She has developed a dry cough since yesterday. She feels tired and lacks the drive to do something which is unusual for her. She did not go to work today. Mrs. P.'s temperature is at 38.7 °C today. Additionally, since today, she has trouble breathing when climbing stairs. She is very worried because this has never happened before.

Age group: adults, older

It is Tuesday morning, 8 a.m./It is Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., Hildegard S./ Helmut K., 72 years, retired,

...has had a headache for three days. She has developed a dry cough since yesterday. She feels tired and lacks the drive to do something which is unusual for her. Mrs. S.'s temperature is at 38.7 °C today. Additionally, since today, she has trouble breathing when climbing stairs. Seeing that her heart and lungs are actually in good condition, this worries her very much.

Symptoms: Inflammatory gastrointestinal diseases**Age group: children (appendicitis)**

It is Tuesday morning, 8 a.m./It is Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., Paula S./Lukas P., 12 years old, schoolgirl/schoolboy,

...complains about a bad tummy ache. The trouble started the evening before with sickness and pain at the center of the stomach. In the morning she had to vomit. Since the evening before the pain has become worse and has moved to the right lower side of the stomach. The otherwise so active girl feels weak, has no appetite and would rather not move at all. Her temperature was 37.4 °C. When Paula's parents tried to palpate her tummy, she screamed of pain. This worries her parents very much.

Age group: adults, middle-aged (cholecystitis)

It is Tuesday morning, 8 a.m./It is Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., Melanie P./Stefan D., 49 years, administration officer,

...has sudden, severe pain in his right upper abdomen which radiates right up to his back and the right shoulder. Besides, she feels sick but so far did not have to vomit. Because of her bad condition she took her temperature: 38.6 °C. Her pain started about two hours ago. Mrs. P. does not know (has not experienced) pain like this. This worries her very much.

Age group: adults, elder (diverticulitis)

It is Tuesday morning, 8 a.m./It is Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., Hildegard S./ Helmut K., 72 years, retired,

...has had pain in the lower left abdomen for three days. For a few weeks she has occasionally suffered from diarrhea, constipation also occurs. She feels less productive than usual and is often tired. Because of her bad condition she took her temperature: 38.5 °C. She noticed a streak of fresh blood on her stool since yesterday. Today the pain has reached a strength she had not experienced before. This very much worries her.

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies* (refer to clean version of the manuscript)

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1-2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	4-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5-6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6-7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6-7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	8-9
Data sources/measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	7-9
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	8
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7-9
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	9
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	Tables 1-5
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	NA
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	NA
Results			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	6; Tables 1-5
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	NA
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	Table 1
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Table 1
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	9-10; Tables 1-2
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	Tables 3-5; 9-11
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	8
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	NA
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	10-11; Tables 4-5
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	11-12
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	14-15
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	12-14
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	14-15
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	16

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Intended health care utilisation in cases of severe COVID-19 and inflammatory gastrointestinal disease – results of a population survey with vignettes

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2021-057644.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	04-Mar-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Klein, Jens; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf Center for Psychosocial Medicine, Institute of Medical Sociology Strauß, Annette; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf Center for Psychosocial Medicine, Department of General Practice and Primary Care Koens, Sarah; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Institute of Medical Sociology Schäfer, Ingmar; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf Center for Psychosocial Medicine, Department of General Practice and Primary Care von dem Knesebeck, Olaf; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf Center for Psychosocial Medicine, Institute of Medical Sociology
Primary Subject Heading:	Health services research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Communication, Emergency medicine, General practice / Family practice, Sociology
Keywords:	HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, ACCIDENT & EMERGENCY MEDICINE, COVID-19, PRIMARY CARE, PUBLIC HEALTH, SOCIAL MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

Title:

Intended health care utilisation in cases of severe COVID-19 and inflammatory gastrointestinal disease – results of a population survey with vignettes

Authors:

Klein, J.¹, Strauß, A.², Koens, S.¹, Schäfer, I.², von dem Knesebeck O.¹

Institutions:

¹Institute of Medical Sociology, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

²Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

Corresponding author:

Jens Klein, PhD

University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf

Institute of Medical Sociology

Martinstraße 52

20247 Hamburg

Germany

+49 040 7410 51617

j.klein@uke.de

Abstract

Objectives: To examine variations in intended health care utilisation in severe cases of COVID-19 and inflammatory gastrointestinal disease (IGD).

Design: Representative cross-sectional telephone survey.

Setting and participants: 1,207 randomly drawn adults of the city of Hamburg, Germany, between November 2020 and January 2021.

Outcome measures: Different vignettes with severe symptoms were presented varying in sex, age (child, middle-aged person, older person), daytime (Tuesday morning or Tuesday evening) and disease (COVID-19 or IGD), while the degree of urgency was equivalent for all cases. The respondents were asked for the intended health care utilisation resulting in three different alternatives: general practitioner (GP)/paediatrician, medical on-call service ("116117"), and emergency care (accident & emergency department, emergency practice, rescue service). In multivariate analyses, associations of characteristics of the vignettes and participants (sex, age, education, migration background) with intended health care utilisation were tested. In a further step, analyses were conducted separately for IGD and COVID-19.

Results: Regarding the vignettes' characteristics, intended utilisation of GP/paediatrician is associated with female sex, higher age, daytime (morning) and COVID-19 symptoms, the medical on-call service with male sex, daytime (evening) and COVID-19 symptoms, and the emergency medicine with younger age, daytime (evening) and IGD. Women chose more often the GP/paediatrician, men preferred emergency medicine. Only in case of IGD, higher educated persons more often chose the medical on-call service while people with a migration background decided less often for medical on-call service and emergency medicine.

Conclusions: Despite comparable urgency the findings suggest variations of intended health care utilisation depending on various characteristics of the vignettes and respondents. Depending on the type of disease inequalities vary. Overall, information about health care alternatives in severe cases has to be improved and clear pathways to facilitate health care utilisation has to be further developed.

Strengths and Limitations of this study

- The vignette design provides a standardised stimulus and comparability between symptoms and urgency.
- Data is weighted based on official statistics and can be seen as representative in terms of sociodemographic characteristics.
- No observed or reported behaviour was measured, but exclusively intended utilisation.
- The vignettes introduce symptoms in a brief form potentially neglecting the complexity of the diseases.

For peer review only

Introduction

In the past decade, utilization of urgent and emergency care services became an important topic in various countries [1–4]. The reasons to visit emergency departments (ED) are multi-layered and, next to lower access barriers, convenience and the belief in higher care quality, the subjective perception of urgency is one of the main causes for the utilization of emergency care [3–9]. However, the vast majority of the studies analysed characteristics and behaviour of patients which already entered emergency care facilities. Studies among the general population that surveyed the knowledge, beliefs, and intended utilization when severe symptoms occur are very rare. Moreover, various studies have shown a tremendous impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on health care utilisation among all age groups [10,11]. A systematic review of 81 studies across 20 countries found out that health care utilisation decreased by about a third during the pandemic in the first six months of 2020 [11]. A further systematic overview reported reductions of hospitalisations for cardiovascular diseases and their management ranging from 20% to 73% until February 2021 in numerous countries [12]. This decline of health care utilization was also prevalent in Germany in various outpatient, inpatient and emergency care facilities indicating a changed behaviour even when severe symptoms occur [11–16]. Hence, the increasing morbidity and mortality leads to an ongoing debate about changed utilisation pattern and the avoiding of ED due to fear of contracting COVID-19 although acute treatment is mandatory [17].

Generally, in the German health care system, three options are provided when severe symptoms occur [18]: (1) to contact the general practitioner (GP)/paediatrician (or in some cases a specialist), (2) to contact the medical on-call service, or (3) to utilize emergency medicine (accident and emergency departments, emergency practices, rescue service). In 2012, a nationwide telephone number (116117) was introduced to provide a medical on-call service for treatment outside normal appointment times. Even in acute cases and within normal appointment times, patients can receive medical treatment here. They can use this service to ask for advice and to make medical appointments, and alternatively, a home visit by the doctor can be

1
2
3 arranged. The present study is focused on two types of diseases: inflammatory gastrointestinal diseases
4 (IGD) and COVID-19. While COVID-19 symptoms are currently a major reason for help-seeking in case of
5
6 acute health problems, symptoms of gastrointestinal diseases are generally a prevalent driver of ED visits in
7
8 various countries including Germany [19,20].
9

10
11
12 The well-established Behavioral Model of Health Services Use by Ronald Andersen distinguishes between
13
14 predisposing, enabling and need factors of health care use on individual and contextual level [21,22]. It aims
15
16 to explain disparities in ambulatory and hospital services use by including various factors in the conceptual
17
18 model. Major individual predisposing factors are sex, age, education and ethnicity. Enabling is characterised
19
20 by income, health insurance status and the organisation of health services for the individual. Need factors
21
22 comprise the self-perception and the objective measurement of health and functional status. Over the
23
24 years, the health care system was included into the model to give recognition to the importance of national
25
26 health policy, the resources and their organisation [22]. Against the background of the current organisation
27
28 of urgent and emergency care services in Germany, the present study introduces the individual predisposing
29
30 factors sex, age, education, migration background and having children into the analyses of utilisation.
31
32 Predisposing factors as lower education and a migration background are often associated with more
33
34 frequent or inadequate pre-hospital and hospital emergency care utilization in Germany and further
35
36 European countries [7,23–26], although some current findings for Germany did not confirm these
37
38 inequalities [27–29]. Moreover, higher age predicts increased ED use while sex does not seem to play a
39
40 significant role [7,24,27,28]. Furthermore, the navigation within the health care system and the decision
41
42 making concerning health care in everyday life is a major domain in the conceptual models of health literacy
43
44 [30]. Thus, a major recommendation of The German National Action Plan Health Literacy is to facilitate
45
46 navigation within the health care system including emergency medicine [31]. Studies have shown
47
48 associations between low health literacy and more frequent as well as inadequate health care use, including
49
50 emergency care [32–34].
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Against this background, three research questions are addressed: (1) How does the intended health care
4 utilisation in severe cases vary depending on predisposing factors (sex and age of the afflicted person), on
5 symptoms (COVID-19 vs. inflammatory gastrointestinal disease (IGD)) and daytime (Tuesday, 8 a.m.;
6 Tuesday, 8 p.m.) of the vignettes? (2) How does the intended health care utilisation in severe cases vary
7 depending on predisposing factors of the respondents (sex, age, education, migration background, having
8 children)? (3) What differences occur when analysing the intended utilisation separately for symptoms of
9 IGD and COVID-19?
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **Methods**

21 *Study design and sample*

22
23
24 Cross-sectional data was assessed via computer assisted telephone interviews (CATI) between November
25 2020 and January 2021 in Hamburg, Germany. The sample was randomly drawn using all possible telephone
26 numbers in Hamburg, including non-registered numbers via random digital dialling [35]. Only landline
27 numbers could be included as mobile telephone numbers are not provided on regional level. Participants
28 were eligible when their age was ≥ 18 years, they were German-speaking and the place of residence was
29 Hamburg. On different weekdays, repeated calls were made by trained interviewers. The Kish selection grid
30 was used to randomly choose the target person in the respected household [36]. In this method, the
31 interviewer collected the age and gender of every household member that was eligible for the survey and
32 then randomly selected one person from that list. To analyse decisions for utilization, 24 different vignettes
33 (case stories) were used. Based on former research projects [37,38], a number of about $n=50$ participants
34 per vignette (i.e. total $N=1,200$) was considered sufficient to identify medium sized differences. The net
35 sample included 2,756 randomly selected persons. Of these, 961 (34.9 %) could not be reached and 588
36 (21.3 %) refused to participate leading to a total number of 1,207 participants (response rate: 43.8 %). The
37 study was approved by the Local Psychological Ethics Committee at the Center for Psychosocial Medicine,
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 University Medical Center Hamburg (No. LPEK-0200). Respondents gave their informed consent for the
4 participation and the use of their data. Consents and refusals were documented by the interviewers.
5
6

7 8 *Vignettes* 9

10 Vignettes were used as a stimulus at the beginning of the survey (please see Supplement 1). They were
11 designed in cooperation with primary care physicians, emergency physicians, geriatricians, paediatricians
12 and nursing staff. Two groups of prevalent diseases were selected for the vignettes: COVID-19 and
13 inflammatory gastrointestinal diseases (IGD). Additionally, vignettes were varied according to sex (female,
14 male), age (12 years (child), 49 years (middle-aged person), 72 years (older person)), and daytime (Tuesday,
15 8 a.m.; Tuesday, 8 p.m.) resulting in N=24 vignettes randomly assigned to the respondents. Presented
16 symptoms of both diseases were severe and comparable regarding a higher urgency of treatment. However,
17 it does not imply that the recommended utilisation is the same for both types of diseases. In terms of
18 inflammatory gastrointestinal symptoms, typical and frequent diseases for the different age groups were
19 selected: appendicitis (child), cholecystitis (middle-aged person), and diverticulitis (older person). According
20 to our clinical cooperation partners, this was more realistic than to choose the same disease for all age
21 groups. Inspired by the Manchester-Triage-Score [39], a higher urgency of treatment was indicated by fever
22 or elevated temperature and severe pain in all three gastrointestinal vignettes. A hospitalisation (own
23 initiative or referral by a physician) for further diagnostics or treatment is required in all three cases.
24 Symptoms of the COVID-19 vignette were based on guidelines and information provided by the Robert Koch
25 Institute [40]. The recommended proceeding when COVID-19 symptoms occur is given by the Federal
26 Ministry of Health [41]: Affected people should stay at home, reduce contacts to a bare minimum and get
27 in touch with a doctor by phone. Outside of surgery opening hours, one can also call the medical on-call
28 service by dialling the nationwide number 116117 and wait for further instructions. In case of an emergency,
29 it is recommended to dial "112" for rescue service. In terms of the COVID-19 case scenarios of higher
30 urgency in the study, the correct procedure is to contact the GP/paediatrician (ideally via telephone) or to
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 dial the permanently available medical on-call service (116117), and to wait for further instructions. All
4
5 vignettes were audio-recorded by a clearly speaking trained person. The audio files were directly played to
6
7 the respondents followed by a standardized questionnaire (total interview time: about 15 min.).
8
9

10 *Measures*

11
12 In the beginning of the interview, one of the vignettes was presented to the respondents. To assess intended
13
14 utilization behaviour in the presented case, the respondents were requested to answer following open
15
16 ended question: "Who would you turn to first for help in the place of Mrs. X. / Mr. X / in the place of the
17
18 parents of...?" The interviewers were provided with a list of possibilities to facilitate the documentation.
19
20 Three major options of intended utilization could be categorised after data collection: general practitioner
21
22 (GP/paediatrician), medical-on call service ("116117"), and emergency medicine facilities (accident and
23
24 emergency department, emergency practice, rescue service). These three categories were recoded as
25
26 dummy variables (yes/no). A residual category ("Other") sums up further responses (e.g. friends or family
27
28 members, watchful waiting, alternative medicine, or pharmacy). Furthermore, the following characteristics
29
30 of the respondents were introduced: age (age groups: 18-40, 41-60, ≥ 60 years), sex, education (years of
31
32 schooling: ≤ 9 , 10, ≥ 12), having children (yes/no), and migration background (no/2nd generation/1st
33
34 generation). A person has a migration background, if he/she or one of his/her parents was born abroad.
35
36 Respondents with a migration background who were born abroad and migrated to Germany were classified
37
38 as 1st generation migrants, while German-born descendants of 1st generation migrants were considered as
39
40 2nd generation migrants [42]. Finally, respondents were asked whether they ever had been affected by such
41
42 complaints (yes/no). The sample was weighted for sex, age and educational level on the basis of official
43
44 statistics of the population in Hamburg in 2020 [43,44]. Chi²-tests have shown an effective weighting
45
46 indicating no significant differences between the study sample and the population in Hamburg in terms of
47
48 sex, age and education.
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 *Analyses*

1
2
3 Bivariate analyses of intended utilisation of the different care facilities were calculated using crosstabs
4 including Pearson's Chi²-test. For multivariate analyses, binary logistic regressions were conducted.
5
6 Dependent variables were the three options of utilization: (1) GP/paediatrician, (2) medical on-call service,
7
8 (3) emergency medicine (accident & emergency department, emergency practice, rescue service). As
9
10 predictor variables, characteristics of the vignettes (disease, sex, age, and daytime) and of the respondents
11
12 (sex, age, education, migration status, children, and personal affliction) were entered simultaneously into
13
14 the models, so that all variables are adjusted for each other. In a further step, the multivariate analyses
15
16 were conducted separately for the case scenarios of IGD and COVID-19. Analyses were carried out using the
17
18 Statistical Package for the Social Sciences SPSS 26 [45] and the R statistical package [46].
19
20
21
22
23

24 *Patient and Public Involvement*

25
26 Patients and public were not involved.
27
28
29

30 **Results**

31
32 Sample characteristics are shown in Table 1. The sample consisted of 52% female respondents whilst nearly
33
34 half of the participants had a higher educational level (≥ 12 years of schooling) and 23% a migration
35
36 background (1st and 2nd generation). In terms of the intended utilisation, more than half of the respondents
37
38 (54%) would choose the general practitioner or paediatrician as first contact after vignette presentation.
39
40 The medical on-call service ("116117") was preferred by 18% and emergency care (accident and emergency
41
42 department/emergency practice/rescue service) mentioned 26% (other options like friends and family,
43
44 pharmacy or alternative medicine: 5%).
45
46
47
48

49 *(Table 1 here)*

50
51
52 Bivariate analyses are shown in Table 2. In terms of characteristics of the vignettes, there were significant
53
54 differences ($p < 0.05$) in intended utilization according to sex and symptoms. Respondents to whom a COVID-
55
56 19 vignette was presented more frequently have chosen the GP/paediatrician or medical on-call service
57
58
59

1
2
3 than emergency medicine as first option for medical support. Regarding characteristics of the respondents,
4
5 significant differences emerged for sex, age, education, migration background, and personal affection.
6
7

8 *(Table 2 here)*
9

10
11 Results of the multivariate regression analysis show that the GP/paediatrician was chosen significantly more
12
13 often when the afflicted person in the vignette was female, middle aged or older, and had been affected by
14
15 COVID-19 symptoms (Table 3). There was a more than 2-fold likelihood of choosing the GP/paediatrician
16
17 when COVID-19 was presented in the vignette (OR: 2.15, CI: 1.67-2.77). Moreover, this option was less
18
19 favoured when symptoms occurred in the evening. In contrast, the option of medical on-call service was
20
21 more prevalent in male case vignettes and when the symptoms occurred in the evening. Similar to
22
23 GP/paediatrician, the medical on-call service was chosen more often when the COVID-19 vignette was
24
25 presented (OR: 2.88, CI: 2.01-4.18). Emergency medicine (accident and emergency department/emergency
26
27 practice/rescue service) was mentioned more often when children were affected, when symptoms were
28
29 gastrointestinal, and occurred in the evening. Regarding respondents' characteristics, women favoured the
30
31 GP/paediatrician while men rather preferred emergency medicine. Furthermore, higher educated persons
32
33 favoured the medical on-call service compared to the lowest status group (OR: 2.15, CI: 1.34-3.52). People
34
35 with migration background (especially 2nd generation) less often chose medical on-call service and
36
37 emergency medicine than non-migrants.
38
39
40
41
42

43 *(Table 3 here)*
44
45

46 When examining intended utilisation separately for IGD and COVID-19 cases, further important differences
47
48 emerged (Table 4 and Table 5). In terms of vignettes' characteristics, even in the evening, emergency
49
50 medicine was not chosen more often than in the morning when the COVID-19 vignette was presented (OR:
51
52 1.00, CI: 0.59-1.68). Regarding the respondents' characteristics, predisposing factors showed considerable
53
54 differences in some cases. Particularly, there was a significant social gradient in the association between the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 on-call service use and educational level in case of IGD. Elevated Odds Ratios were found for higher educated
4 groups (OR: 3.85, CI: 1.39-11.10 to OR: 4.65, CI: 1.68-12.85). This social gradient does not exist regarding
5 COVID-19. Moreover, higher age groups much more often preferred emergency medicine when COVID-19
6 symptoms occur, while age does not matter for IGD. Finally, only in case of IGD, the migration background
7 (2nd generation) indicated significant differences favouring the GP/paediatrician and less on-call service and
8 emergency care.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16
17 *(Table 4 and Table 5 here)*
18
19

20 **Discussion**

21
22 In this study, the intended utilisation of different care facilities in a German metropolis was examined using
23 varied case vignettes of severe COVID-19 and inflammatory gastrointestinal diseases (IGD). Following
24 Andersen's Behavioral Model of Health Services Use, the study analysed different predisposing factors (sex,
25 age, education, migration background) for the utilisation of GP/paediatrician, medical on-call service
26 ("116117"), and emergency care (accident and emergency department, emergency practice, rescue service).
27 Moreover, daytime and symptoms were additionally included as predictors into the model. First of all, the
28 majority of the respondents chose the GP/paediatrician as first option to get help. Furthermore, multivariate
29 results show that both, the characteristics of the vignettes and the characteristics of the respondents are
30 associated with the intended utilisation. In terms of the vignettes' characteristics, the intended utilisation
31 of GP/paediatrician is associated with female sex, higher age, daytime (morning) and COVID-19 symptoms,
32 the medical on-call service with male sex, daytime (evening) and COVID-19 symptoms, and the emergency
33 medicine with young age, daytime (evening) and gastrointestinal symptoms. Regarding the respondents'
34 characteristics, women chose more often the GP/paediatrician, men preferred emergency medicine. Higher
35 educated persons more often chose the medical on-call service while people with a migration background
36 decided less often for medical on-call service and emergency medicine. Thus, although case stories were
37 similar regarding urgency of treatment, results suggest variations of intended health care utilisation
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 according to various characteristics of the case vignettes and the respondents. Separate analyses for IGD
4 and COVID-19 cases show that the utilisation behaviour differs between the types of diseases. The
5
6 associations between daytime and emergency medicine, and education and medical on-call service as well
7
8 as associations between respondents' age and emergency medicine were solely significant in case of IGD.
9

10
11
12 Only a few studies analysed intended utilization among the general population using case vignettes. A
13
14 German study with a similar vignette design focused on intended behaviour and judgement of urgency, but
15
16 did not analyse any predisposing factors [47]. Another study with case scenarios conducted in the
17
18 Netherlands, Switzerland and Denmark examined the intended help-seeking behaviour exclusively in terms
19
20 of acute out-of-hours health care [48]. Parents or adults who were lower educated, older, or had a migration
21
22 background were more inclined to contact out-of-hours care, whereas women were less inclined [48]. A
23
24 survey among the German general population about its utilisation of pre-hospital emergency care revealed
25
26 a higher use among lower educated persons and migrants [25]. Two more overviews – mostly including
27
28 patient samples – indicated similar findings [24,26]. However, a significantly higher use of emergency
29
30 medicine among people with lower education and migrant background is not shown in the present study
31
32 which is supported by some current findings from Germany [27–29]. As in previous studies, a higher age of
33
34 the respondents (particularly in case of IGD) is associated with increased ED use [24]. The results also show
35
36 that female sex predicts lower ED use and a preference for GP/paediatrician. Although women still show a
37
38 different health care utilisation than men and utilise health care more frequently in general [49], there is no
39
40 clear evidence that female patients more often visit the GP in Germany [50–52]. The more frequent choice
41
42 of the comparatively new nationwide medical on-call service (“116117”) among higher educated people (in
43
44 case of IGD) reflects the evidence about social inequalities in health care use [53,54], and could be due to a
45
46 generally better health literacy among higher socioeconomic status groups [55,56]. Overall, the knowledge
47
48 about this service increased in the past years [57], and other data from the present study project confirm
49
50 the increasing popularity of the medical on-call service [58]. Interestingly, further analyses solely among the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 respondents which were presented a COVID-19 case showed no more inequalities between utilisation and
4 educational level as well as migration history, while inequalities increased in case of IGD.
5
6
7

8 Regarding the case vignettes' characteristics, sex plays another significant role. In this case, it is not about
9 different answers from females or males, but the reaction when a woman or a man is affected in the case
10 story. In the present study, a female vignette leads to significantly more GP/paediatrician consultations and
11 less on-call service. This suggests a less urgent perception when a female is affected, and is supported by
12 findings that symptoms of female patients were more often underestimated compared with males [59]. The
13 result that emergency care is more often preferred when a child was affected is supported by findings that
14 the perception of urgency is increased in case of ill children, and parents prefer to visit ED before contacting
15 the primary care provider [60,61]. The significant preference of medical on-call service and emergency care
16 in the evening is obvious due to restricted opening hours of practices. Concerning the disease-related
17 intended utilisation, significant difference are shown. While the GP/paediatrician and the medical on-call
18 service was significantly more chosen in case of a COVID-19 vignette, emergency facilities were more
19 preferred when an IGD vignette was presented. The respondents' preference of GP/paediatrician and
20 medical on-call service ("116117") in acute cases of COVID-19 indicates an adequate navigation within the
21 health care system as it is in line with the official national recommendations when symptoms of COVID-19
22 occur [41]. This pathway of utilisation is correct in terms of the presented case scenarios of a COVID-19
23 infection and suggests an improved information due to widespread campaigns about COVID-19 symptoms
24 and health care use. A German study about coronavirus-related health literacy showed that, despite some
25 confusion about coronavirus information, the vast majority felt well informed [62]. To differ between
26 adequate or inadequate utilisation in terms of the IGD vignettes is hardly possible as all three health care
27 options would be adequate. In this case, hospitalisation could be organised through self-referral, referral by
28 a physician, or after consultation with the medical on-call service. Additionally, the daytime plays an
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 important role for symptoms like that. Overall, measurement of adequate utilisation is very diverse and
4
5 remains difficult [7,23,47,63]. Thus, interpretations should be done carefully.
6
7

8 Generally, it is still a challenge to work out the reasons behind differences in health care utilisation. Different
9
10 utilisation behaviour could be due to differences in need, to differences in expectations and preferences
11
12 (e.g. individual/cultural preferences or health beliefs), to differences in information (e.g. about service
13
14 availability, navigation in the health care system, or wrong assumption of costs), or to formal access barriers
15
16 (e.g. charges, waiting times, travel distances, or lost wages when using health care during work hours) [64].
17
18 To figure out the reasons behind the patient's behaviour is highly relevant for implications in terms of
19
20 possible interventions. The results suggest differences in information (e.g. about the medical-on-call-service
21
22 or further options), preferences (e.g. directly visiting ED on own initiative or expecting higher expertise in
23
24 ED), and perceived need due to sociodemographic characteristics. It is likely that the campaigns regarding
25
26 health care seeking during the COVID-19 pandemic had an impact on utilisation behaviour in our study. The
27
28 use of the medical on-call service and primary care provider in case of symptoms of a COVID-19 infection
29
30 conforms to the official recommendations. However, among people with lower education and with a
31
32 migration background, information about health care options needs to be more disseminated. In Germany,
33
34 the ongoing establishment of out-of-hours primary care centers ("Portalpraxen") located at hospitals aims
35
36 at improving coordination between emergency and urgent care, and at improving availability of urgent
37
38 primary care [65]. In further European countries, similar approaches of out-of-hours services, walk-in and
39
40 primary care centers are established [65]. Moreover, there is a challenge to tackle the unmet needs of
41
42 patients with severe diseases which increased since the beginning of the pandemic. Suggestions include a
43
44 division of the ED into respiratory and non-respiratory section and targeted messaging [17].
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **Limitations**

53
54 First, a response rate of about 44% can be considered as adequate, however, a potential selection bias due
55
56 to nonresponse and due to only using landline numbers cannot be ruled out. Nevertheless, the comparison
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of our weighted data with official statistics of the population in Hamburg regarding some sociodemographic
4 variables (sex, age, education) supports the external validity as significant differences between our data and
5 official statistics did not exist. Second, despite various strengths of a vignette design (comparability between
6 symptoms and urgency, standardised stimulus), the vignettes are an artificial stimulus that necessarily
7 introduce symptoms in a brief form potentially neglecting the complexity of some diseases. The extensive
8 involvement of various experts in the development of the case vignettes aimed to minimize these limits.
9
10 The development of the COVID-19 vignette was based on the state of research in summer 2020. The
11 evidence about COVID-19 morbidity among different age groups is subject to change over time. Additionally,
12 the comparability between the age groups of IGD was limited as three different diseases were introduced.
13
14 Third, no observed or reported behaviour was analysed, but exclusively intended utilisation. Fourth, our
15 data is supposed to be representative for a metropolis in Germany, the health care situation and behaviour
16 could be different in more rural regions which are not represented in this study.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Conclusions**

31 To our knowledge, this is one of the first studies that analyse intended health care utilisation among the
32 German general population using case vignettes of severe symptoms. It could be shown that different
33 characteristics of vignettes and characteristics of the respondents lead to different health care utilisation,
34 although urgency is equal in the presented vignettes. These variations in intended health care use suggest
35 a potential need for interventions. Even though the respondents mostly followed the official
36 recommendations in case of COVID-19, the communication of health care alternatives has to be improved,
37 and clear pathways to facilitate health care utilisation should be further developed.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Acknowledgement**

50 The authors would like to thank Martin Scherer, Sarah Porzelt, Robin Kobbe, Ulrich Thiem, Ulrich Mayer-
51 Runge and Michael Rieper for supporting the development of the case vignettes.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Ethical approval

Local Psychological Ethics Committee at the Center for Psychosocial Medicine, University Medical Center Hamburg (No. LPEK-0200).

Contributorship statement

OK, JK, AS and IS designed the study including questionnaire and vignettes. JK drafted the manuscript, and analysed and interpreted the data. AS essentially developed the vignettes. OK led the project and made an essential contribution to drafting the manuscript and interpreting the data. SK, AS and IS critically revised and approved the final manuscript.

Competing interests

There are no competing interests.

Funding

The study is funded by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (grant number 01GY1912).

Data sharing statement

Data are available upon reasonable request.

Table 1 Sample characteristics (N=1,207)*: n (%)

Sex (<i>1</i>)		
female	621	(51.5)
male	585	(48.5)
Age (years) (<i>1</i>)		
18 – 40	455	(37.8)
41 – 60	419	(34.7)
≥ 60	332	(27.5)
Education (years) (<i>43</i>)		
≤ 9	316	(27.1)
10	275	(23.6)
≥ 12	574	(49.3)
Migration background (<i>22</i>)		
no	915	(77.3)
2 nd generation	129	(10.9)
1 st generation	141	(11.7)
Children (<i>18</i>)		
yes	546	(45.9)
no	643	(54.1)
Personally affected by such complaints (<i>4</i>)		
yes	238	(19.8)
no	965	(80.2)
Intended utilisation (<i>1</i>)		
General practitioner/paediatrician	646	(53.6)
Medical on-call service (“116117”)	182	(15.1)
Emergency medicine [†]	316	(26.2)
Other	62	(5.1)

*number of missing data in brackets in italics

[†]accident and emergency department/emergency practice/rescue service

Table 2 Intended utilisation of different care facilities according to characteristics of the vignettes and the respondents (N=1,207): Bivariate analysis (%)*

		General practitioner/ paediatrician (%)	Medical on-call service ("116117") (%)	Emergency medicine† (%)
Vignettes				
Sex	Male	49.4	19.0	25.8
	Female	57.6	11.1	26.4
	p‡	0.004	<0.001	0.804
Age	Child	48.8	16.5	31.8
	Adult middle aged	55.1	13.1	25.6
	Adult aged	56.7	16.1	20.8
	p	0.058	0.317	0.002
Time	Tuesday morning	65.7	7.4	22.2
	Tuesday evening	41.8	22.5	30.0
	p	<0.001	<0.001	0.002
Symptoms	Gastrointestinal	44.9	9.5	39.4
	COVID-19	62.3	20.7	12.7
	p	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Respondents				
Sex	Male	49.9	16.6	29.1
	Female	56.8	13.7	23.5
	p	0.016	0.161	0.029
Age (years)	18 - 40	57.9	17.4	18.7
	41 - 60	47.5	16.2	32.7
	> 60	55.1	10.6	28.3
	p	0.007	0.024	<0.001
Education (years)	≤ 9	57.5	8.9	26.7
	10	50.9	14.9	33.5
	≥ 12	54.5	17.9	22.0
	p	0.280	0.001	0.002
Migration background	No	52.0	16.8	28.5
	2 nd Generation	59.4	7.8	14.8
	1 st Generation	57.4	12.8	22.7
	p	0.172	0.020	0.003
Own children	No	53.5	14.3	26.6
	Yes	54.1	15.4	25.7
	p	0.825	0.592	0.712
Personally affected by such complaints	No	52.0	16.0	27.5
	Yes	60.1	11.8	20.5
	p	0.025	0.106	0.028

1
2
3 *the percentages do not sum to 100 due to missing data

4 †accident and emergency department/emergency practice/rescue service

5 ‡Pearson's Chi-square (statistically significant values ($p < 0.05$) in bold)

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Table 3 Intended utilisation of different care facilities (N=1,170): Multivariate analysis (Odds Ratios and 95% confidence intervals)

	General practitioner/ paediatrician		Medical on-call service ("116117")		Emergency medicine*	
	OR (95% CI)**	p	OR (95% CI)	p	OR (95% CI)	p
Vignettes						
Sex (male)	1		1		1	
Sex (female)	1.34 (1.04-1.72)	0.024	0.48 (0.34-0.68)	<0.001	1.16 (0.86-1.56)	0.328
Age (child)	1		1		1	
Age (middle aged)	1.37 (1.01-1.86)	0.045	0.94 (0.62-1.44)	0.786	0.60 (0.42-0.85)	0.004
Age (older)	1.47 (1.08-2.02)	0.016	1.19 (0.78-1.83)	0.415	0.47 (0.33-0.69)	<0.001
Time (Tuesday morning)	1		1		1	
Time (Tuesday evening)	0.35 (0.27-0.44)	<0.001	3.65 (2.53-5.34)	<0.001	1.61 (1.20-2.16)	0.002
Symptoms (gastrointestinal)	1		1		1	
Symptoms (COVID-19)	2.15 (1.67-2.77)	<0.001	2.88 (2.01-4.18)	<0.001	0.20 (0.15-0.28)	<0.001
Respondents						
Sex (male)	1		1		1	
Sex (female)	1.46 (1.13-1.88)	0.003	0.83 (0.59-1.17)	0.279	0.70 (0.52-0.95)	0.022
Age (18-40)	1		1		1	
Age (41 – 60)	0.71 (0.52-0.96)	0.026	0.81 (0.53-1.21)	0.297	1.85 (1.29-2.65)	<0.001
Age (> 60)	0.87 (0.61-1.24)	0.446	0.73 (0.44-1.20)	0.220	1.34 (0.87-2.05)	0.178
Education (≤9)	1		1		1	
Education (10 Years)	0.70 (0.49-0.99)	0.047	1.75 (1.02-3.01)	0.043	1.54 (1.02-2.32)	0.040
Education (≥ 12 Years)	0.80 (0.58-1.10)	0.180	2.15 (1.34-3.52)	0.002	0.84 (0.58-1.21)	0.384
No migration background	1		1		1	
Migration background (2 nd generation)	1.29 (0.87-1.95)	0.212	0.49 (0.23-0.93)	0.042	0.38 (0.21-0.65)	<0.001
Migration background (1 st generation)	1.31 (0.89-1.93)	0.167	0.64 (0.36-1.09)	0.114	0.70 (0.43-1.12)	0.128
Own children (no)	1		1		1	
Own children (yes)	0.84 (0.64-1.11)	0.227	1.15 (0.78-1.69)	0.480	1.09 (0.78-1.51)	0.626
Personally affected by such complaints (no)	1		1		1	
Personally affected by such complaints (yes)	1.15 (0.83-1.58)	0.401	0.63 (0.39-1.00)	0.051	0.89 (0.60-1.30)	0.581
R ² (Nagelkerke)	0.155		0.182		0.222	

*accident and emergency department/emergency practice/rescue service

**OR=odds ratio; CI=confidence interval (statistically significant values (p<0.05) in bold)

Table 4 Intended utilisation of different care facilities in case of inflammatory gastrointestinal diseases (N=603): Multivariate analysis (Odds Ratios and 95% confidence intervals)

	General practitioner/ paediatrician		Medical on-call service ("116117")		Emergency medicine*	
	OR (95% CI)**	p	OR (95% CI)	p	OR (95% CI)	p
Vignettes						
Sex (male)	1		1		1	
Sex (female)	1.24 (0.87-1.77)	0.243	0.45 (0.24-0.85)	0.013	1.35 (0.93-1.93)	0.110
Age (child)	1		1		1	
Age (middle aged)	1.29 (0.83-2.01)	0.255	1.31 (0.59-2.90)	0.511	0.63 (0.41-0.97)	0.036
Age (older)	1.81 (1.15-2.83)	0.010	1.85 (0.85-4.03)	0.121	0.36 (0.23-0.57)	<0.001
Time (Tuesday morning)	1		1		1	
Time (Tuesday evening)	0.31 (0.22-0.44)	<0.001	3.20 (1.64-6.27)	0.001	2.02 (1.41-2.90)	<0.001
Respondents						
Sex (male)	1		1		1	
Sex (female)	1.32 (0.93-1.90)	0.127	1.10 (0.60-2.03)	0.751	0.75 (0.52-1.07)	0.123
Age (18-40)	1		1		1	
Age (41 – 60)	0.67 (0.43-1.04)	0.071	1.11 (0.54-2.33)	0.765	1.35 (0.87-2.10)	0.183
Age (61 and older)	0.89 (0.53-1.49)	0.658	1.46 (0.59-3.60)	0.409	0.95 (0.56-1.61)	0.840
Education (≤9)	1		1		1	
Education (10 Years)	0.56 (0.33-0.93)	0.024	3.85 (1.39-11.10)	0.012	1.84 (1.10-3.07)	0.020
Education (≥ 12 Years)	0.68 (0.43-1.07)	0.096	4.65 (1.68-12.85)	0.003	1.04 (0.65-1.66)	0.869
No migrant background	1		1		1	
Migrant background (2 nd generation)	2.01 (1.17-3.46)	0.012	0.16 (0.29-0.87)	0.034	0.35 (0.19-0.65)	0.001
Migrant background (1 st generation)	1.19 (0.69-2.07)	0.534	0.33 (0.87-1.29)	0.111	0.68 (0.39-1.20)	0.182
Own children (no)	1		1		1	
Own children (yes)	0.90 (0.60-1.34)	0.605	0.77 (0.38-1.55)	0.459	1.24 (0.82-1.88)	0.310
Personally affected by such complaints (no)	1		1		1	
Personally affected by such complaints (yes)	0.83 (0.49-1.39)	0.470	2.58 (1.17-5.67)	0.019	0.73 (0.42-1.28)	0.261

*accident and emergency department/emergency practice/rescue service

**OR=odds ratio; CI=confidence interval (statistically significant values (p<0.05) in bold)

Table 5 Intended utilisation of different care facilities in case of COVID-19 (N=604): Multivariate analysis (Odds Ratios and 95% confidence intervals)

	General practitioner/ paediatrician		Medical on-call service ("116117")		Emergency medicine*	
	OR (95% CI)	p	OR (95% CI)	p	OR (95% CI)	p
Vignettes						
Sex (male)	1		1		1	
Sex (female)	1.44 (0.99-2.07)	0.052	0.52 (0.33-0.82)	0.005	0.84 (0.50-1.43)	0.525
Age (child)	1		1		1	
Age (middle aged)	1.43 (0.92-2.23)	0.111	0.89 (0.52-1.52)	0.672	0.49 (0.25-0.95)	0.033
Age (older)	1.14 (0.73-1.78)	0.564	1.07 (0.62-1.84)	0.814	0.73 (0.39-1.35)	0.318
Time (Tuesday morning)	1		1		1	
Time (Tuesday evening)	0.38 (0.27-0.55)	<0.001	3.92 (2.46-6.25)	<0.001	1.00 (0.59-1.68)	0.993
Respondents						
Sex (male)	1		1		1	
Sex (female)	1.68 (1.17-2.41)	0.005	0.70 (0.45-1.08)	0.106	0.56 (0.33-0.95)	0.033
Age (18-40)	1		1		1	
Age (41 – 60)	0.74 (0.48-1.14)	0.174	0.70 (0.42-1.17)	0.176	3.93 (1.93-8.00)	<0.001
Age (61 and older)	0.87 (0.52-1.46)	0.600	0.50 (0.26-0.96)	0.039	3.22 (1.46-7.0)	0.004
Education (≤9)	1		1		1	
Education (10 Years)	0.88 (0.53-1.49)	0.642	1.22 (0.62-2.41)	0.563	1.14 (0.59-2.23)	0.698
Education (≥ 12 Years)	0.89 (0.56-1.40)	0.607	1.65 (0.92-2.97)	0.093	0.58 (0.30-1.10)	0.099
No migrant background	1		1		1	
Migrant background (2 nd generation)	0.70 (0.38-1.29)	0.254	0.76 (0.34-1.73)	0.514	0.35 (0.19-0.60)	0.116
Migrant background (1 st generation)	1.44 (0.83-2.51)	0.198	0.76 (0.39-1.46)	0.405	0.73 (0.32-1.65)	0.444
Own children (no)	1		1		1	
Own children (yes)	0.79 (0.53-1.12)	0.242	1.42 (0.88-2.33)	0.160	0.91 (0.52-1.59)	0.728
Personally affected by such complaints (no)	1		1		1	
Personally affected by such complaints (yes)	1.42 (0.93-2.17)	0.110	0.36 (0.20-0.65)	0.001	1.08 (0.60-1.96)	0.801

*accident and emergency department/emergency practice/rescue service

**OR=odds ratio; CI=confidence interval (statistically significant values (p<0.05) in bold)

References

- 1 Pines JM, Hilton JA, Weber EJ, *et al.* International perspectives on emergency department crowding. *Acad Emerg Med* 2011;18:1358–70.
- 2 Pope C, McKenna G, Turnbull J, *et al.* Navigating and making sense of urgent and emergency care processes and provision. *Health Expect* 2019;22:435–43.
- 3 Uscher-Pines L, Pines J, Kellermann A, *et al.* Deciding to visit the emergency department for non-urgent conditions: a systematic review of the literature. *Am J Manag Care* 2013;19:47–59.
- 4 Coster JE, Turner JK, Bradbury D, *et al.* Why do people choose emergency and urgent care services? a rapid review utilizing a systematic literature search and narrative synthesis. *Acad Emerg Med* 2017;24:1137–49.
- 5 Penson R, Coleman P, Mason S, *et al.* Why do patients with minor or moderate conditions that could be managed in other settings attend the emergency department? *Emerg Med J* 2012;29:487–91.
- 6 Watson MC, Ferguson J, Barton GR, *et al.* A cohort study of influences, health outcomes and costs of patients' health-seeking behaviour for minor ailments from primary and emergency care settings. *BMJ Open* 2015;5:e006261.
- 7 Scherer M, Lühmann D, Kazek A, *et al.* Patients Attending Emergency Departments. *Dtsch Arztebl Int* 2017;114:645–52.
- 8 Schmiedhofer M, Möckel M, Slagman A, *et al.* Patient motives behind low-acuity visits to the emergency department in Germany: a qualitative study comparing urban and rural sites. *BMJ Open* 2016;6:e013323.
- 9 Oslislo S, Heintze C, Schmiedhofer M, *et al.* How to decide adequately? Qualitative study of GPs' view on decision-making in self-referred and physician-referred emergency department consultations in Berlin, Germany. *BMJ Open* 2019;9:e026786.
- 10 Shanmugavadivel D, Liu J-F, Gilhooley C, *et al.* Changing patterns of emergency paediatric presentations during the first wave of COVID-19: learning for the second wave from a UK tertiary emergency department. *BMJ Paediatr Open* 2021;5:e000967.
- 11 Moynihan R, Sanders S, Michaleff ZA, *et al.* Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on utilisation of healthcare services: a systematic review. *BMJ Open* 2021;11:e045343.
- 12 Seidu S, Kunutsor SK, Cos X, *et al.* Indirect impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on hospitalisations for cardiometabolic conditions and their management: A systematic review. *Prim Care Diabetes* 2021;15:653–81.
- 13 Damerow S, Rommel A, Prütz F, *et al.* Developments in the health situation in Germany during the initial stage of the COVID-19 pandemic for selected indicators of GEDA 2019/2020-EHIS. *Journal of Health Monitoring* 2020; 5:3–16.
- 14 Slagman A, Behringer W, Greiner F, *et al.* Medical emergencies during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Dtsch Arztebl Int* 2020;117:545–52.

- 1
2
3 15 Mangiapane S, Zhu L, Czihal T, *et al.* Veränderung der vertragsärztlichen Leistungsanspruchnahme
4 während der COVID-Krise. Berlin: Zentralinstitut für die kassenärztliche Versorgung in der
5 Bundesrepublik Deutschland 2021.
6
- 7 16 Schäfer I, Hansen H, Menzel A, *et al.* The effect of COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown on consultation
8 numbers, consultation reasons and performed services in primary care: results of a longitudinal
9 observational study. *BMC Fam Pract* 2021;22:125.
10
- 11 17 Wong LE, Hawkins JE, Langness S, *et al.* Where are all the patients? Addressing Covid-19 fear to
12 encourage sick patients to seek emergency care. *NEJM Catalyst Innovations in Care Delivery*
13 Published Online First: 14 May 2020. <https://catalyst.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/CAT.20.0193>
14 (accessed 22 Sep 2021).
15
- 16 18 Federal Ministry of Health. The German healthcare system. Strong. Reliable. Proven. Berlin: Federal
17 Ministry of Health 2020.
18
- 19 19 Myer PA, Mannalithara A, Singh G, *et al.* Clinical and economic burden of emergency department
20 visits due to gastrointestinal diseases in the United States. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2013;108:1496–507.
21
- 22 20 Mangiapane S, Czihal T, von Stillfried D. Entwicklung der ambulanten Notfallversorgung in
23 Deutschland von 2009 bis 2020. Berlin: Zentralinstitut für die kassenärztliche Versorgung in der
24 Bundesrepublik Deutschland 2021.
25
- 26 21 Andersen RM, Davidson PL, Baumeister SE. Improving access to care. In: Kominski GE, ed. Changing
27 the U.S. health care system: key issues in health services, policy, and management. San Francisco:
28 Wiley & Sons 2014:33–69.
29
- 30 22 Andersen RM. National health surveys and the behavioral model of health services use. *Med Care*
31 2008;46:647–53.
32
- 33 23 Sauzet O, David M, Naghavi B, *et al.* Adequate utilization of emergency services in Germany: is there
34 a differential by migration background? *Front Public Health* 2020;8:613250.
35
- 36 24 Krieg C, Hudon C, Chouinard M-C, *et al.* Individual predictors of frequent emergency department
37 use: a scoping review. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2016;16:594.
38
- 39 25 Kietzmann D, Knuth D, Schmidt S. (Non-)utilization of pre-hospital emergency care by migrants and
40 non-migrants in Germany. *Int J Public Health* 2017;62:95–102.
41
- 42 26 Credé SH, Such E, Mason S. International migrants' use of emergency departments in Europe
43 compared with non-migrants' use: a systematic review. *Eur J Public Health* 2018;28:61–73.
44
- 45 27 David M, Richter R, Naghavi B, *et al.* [Use of emergency rooms by so-called multiple users: results of
46 a prospective study with special consideration of the migration status]. *Notfall Rettungsmed*
47 Published Online First: 24 February 2021. doi:10.1007/s10049-021-00851-7
48
- 49 28 Holzinger F, Oslislo S, Möckel M, *et al.* Self-referred walk-in patients in the emergency department –
50 who and why? Consultation determinants in a multicenter study of respiratory patients in Berlin,
51 Germany. *BMC Health Services Research* 2020;20:848.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 29 Wenner J, Razum O, Schenk L, *et al.* [The health of children and adolescents from families with
4 insecure residence status compared to children with permanent residence permits: analysis of KiGGS
5 data 2003-2006]. *Bundesgesundheitsblatt Gesundheitsforschung Gesundheitsschutz* 2016;59:627–
6 35.
7
8
9 30 Sørensen K, Van den Broucke S, Fullam J, *et al.* Health literacy and public health: a systematic review
10 and integration of definitions and models. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12:80.
11
12 31 Schaeffer, D., Hurrelmann, K., Bauer, U, Kolpatzik, K, eds.: National action plan health literacy.
13 Promoting health literacy in Germany. Berlin: KomPart 2018.
14
15 32 Friis K, Pedersen MH, Aaby A, *et al.* Impact of low health literacy on healthcare utilization in
16 individuals with cardiovascular disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, diabetes and mental
17 disorders. A Danish population-based 4-year follow-up study. *Eur J Public Health* 2020;30:866–72.
18
19 33 Berkman ND, Sheridan SL, Donahue KE, *et al.* Low health literacy and health outcomes: an updated
20 systematic review. *Ann Intern Med* 2011;155:97–107.
21
22 34 Schumacher JR, Hall AG, Davis TC, *et al.* Potentially preventable use of emergency services: the role
23 of low health literacy. *Med Care* 2013;51:654–8.
24
25 35 Häder S, Gabler S. Ein neues Stichprobendesign für telefonische Umfragen in Deutschland. In: Gabler
26 S, Häder S, Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik JHP, eds. Telefonstichproben in Deutschland. Opladen/Wiesbaden: VS
27 Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften 1998: 69–88.
28
29 36 Kish L. A Procedure for Objective Respondent Selection within the Household. *Journal of the*
30 *American Statistical Association* 1949;44:380–7.
31
32 37 von dem Knesebeck O, Lehmann M, Löwe B, *et al.* Public stigma towards individuals with somatic
33 symptom disorders - Survey results from Germany. *J Psychosom Res* 2018;115:71–5.
34
35 38 Makowski AC, Kim TJ, Luck-Sikorski C, *et al.* Social deprivation, gender and obesity: multiple stigma?
36 Results of a population survey from Germany. *BMJ Open* 2019;9:e023389.
37
38 39 Schellein O, Ludwig-Pistor F, Bremerich DH. [Manchester triage system. Process optimization in the
39 interdisciplinary emergency department]. *Anaesthesist* 2009;58:163–70.
40
41 40 RKI - Coronavirus SARS-CoV-2.
42 https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges_Coronavirus/nCoV_node.html (accessed 22
43 Sep 2021).
44
45 41 Germany's information platform on the coronavirus.
46 <https://www.zusammengengencorona.de/en/from-suspected-infection-to-isolation/> (accessed 22
47 Sep 2021).
48
49 42 Rommel A, Kroll LE. Individual and Regional Determinants for Physical Therapy Utilization in
50 Germany: Multilevel Analysis of National Survey Data. *Phys Ther* 2017;97:512–23.
51
52 43 Statistical Office for Hamburg and Schleswig-Holstein. Hamburg Statistical Yearbook 2019/2020.
53 Hamburg: Statistical Office for Hamburg and Schleswig-Holstein 2020.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 44 Federal Statistical Office. Education level of the population - results of the microcensus 2019.
4 Wiesbaden: Federal Statistical Office 2020.
5
6 45 IBM Corp. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 26.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp. 2019.
7
8 46 R Core Team. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna: R foundation for
9 statistical computing 2021. <https://www.r-project.org/> (accessed 22 Sep 2021).
10
11 47 Metelmann B, Brinkrolf P, Kliche M, *et al.* [Emergency medical service, medical on-call service, or
12 emergency department]. *Med Klin Intensivmed Notfmed* Published Online First: 20 April 2021.
13
14 48 Keizer E, Christensen MB, Carlsen AH, *et al.* Factors related to out-of-hours help-seeking for acute
15 health problems: a survey study using case scenarios. *BMC Public Health* 2019;19:33.
16
17 49 Prütz F, Rommel A, Thom J, *et al.* Utilisation of outpatient medical services in Germany – results
18 from GEDA 2019/2020-EHIS. *Journal of Health Monitoring* 2021;6:45–65.
19
20 50 Keil J, Brendler V, Sachse C, *et al.* [Gender-specific differences in the utilization of health care
21 services in an urban population sample]. *Gesundheitswesen* 2020;82:e17–23.
22
23 51 Tille F, Gibis B, Balke K, *et al.* [Sociodemographic and health-related determinants of health care
24 utilisation and access to primary and specialist care: Results of a nationwide population survey in
25 Germany (2006-2016)]. *Z Evid Fortbild Qual Gesundheitswes* 2017;126:52–65.
26
27 52 Hansen H, Schäfer I, Porzelt S, *et al.* Regional and patient-related factors influencing the willingness
28 to use general practitioners as coordinators of the treatment in northern Germany - results of a
29 cross-sectional observational study. *BMC Fam Pract* 2020;21:110.
30
31 53 Klein J, Hofreuter-Gätgens K, von dem Knesebeck O. Socioeconomic status and the utilization of
32 health services in Germany: a systematic review. In: Janssen C, Swart E, Lengerke T von, eds. *Health
33 Care Utilization in Germany*. New York: Springer 2014:117–43.
34
35 54 Lueckmann SL, Hoebel J, Roick J, *et al.* Socioeconomic inequalities in primary-care and specialist
36 physician visits: a systematic review. *Int J Equity Health* 2021;20:58.
37
38 55 Sørensen K, Pelikan JM, Röthlin F, *et al.* Health literacy in Europe: comparative results of the
39 European health literacy survey (HLS-EU). *Eur J Public Health* 2015;25:1053–8.
40
41 56 Jordan S, Hoebel J. Health literacy of adults in Germany. Findings from the German Health Update
42 (GEDA) study. *Bundesgesundheitsbl* 2015;58:942–50.
43
44 57 Kassenärztlichen Bundesvereinigung (KBV). Versichertenbefragung der Kassenärztlichen
45 Bundesvereinigung 2021. Mannheim: Forschungsgruppe Wahlen 2021:15-16.
46
47 58 von dem Knesebeck O, Koens S, Schäfer I, *et al.* Public knowledge about emergency care—results of
48 a population survey from Germany. *Front Public Health* 2022;9:2204.
49
50 59 Zhang L, Losin EAR, Ashar YK, *et al.* Gender biases in estimation of others' pain. *J Pain* 2021;22:1048–
51 59.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 60 Smith V, Mustafa M, Grafstein E, *et al.* Factors influencing the decision to attend a pediatric
4 emergency department for nonemergent complaints. *Pediatr Emerg Care* 2015;31:640–4.
5
6 61 Kalidindi S, Mahajan P, Thomas R, *et al.* Parental perception of urgency of illness. *Pediatr Emerg Care*
7 2010;26:549–53.
8
9 62 Okan O, Bollweg TM, Berens E-M, *et al.* Coronavirus-related health literacy: a cross-sectional study in
10 adults during the COVID-19 infodemic in Germany. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2020;17:5503.
11
12 63 Unwin M, Crisp E, Stankovich J, *et al.* Socioeconomic disadvantage as a driver of non-urgent
13 emergency department presentations: A retrospective data analysis. *PLOS ONE* 2020;15:e0231429.
14
15 64 Oliver A, Mossialos E. Equity of access to health care: outlining the foundations for action. *J*
16 *Epidemiol Community Health* 2004;58:655–8.
17
18 65 Baier N, Geissler A, Bech M, *et al.* Emergency and urgent care systems in Australia, Denmark,
19 England, France, Germany and the Netherlands – analyzing organization, payment and reforms.
20 *Health Policy* 2019;123:1–10.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Supplement 1 Case vignettes

Symptoms: COVID-19**Age group: children**

It is Tuesday morning, 8 a.m./It is Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., Paula S./Lukas P., 12 years old, schoolgirl/schoolboy,

...has had a headache for three days. She has developed a dry cough since yesterday. She feels tired and lacks the drive to do something which is unusual for the girl). She did not go to school today. Her mother took her temperature, it is 38.7 °C. Additionally, since today, Paula has trouble breathing when climbing stairs. Her parents are very worried because this has never happened before.

Age group: adults, middle-aged

It is Tuesday morning, 8 a.m./It is Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., Melanie P./Stefan D., 49 years, administration officer,

...has had a headache for three days. She has developed a dry cough since yesterday. She feels tired and lacks the drive to do something which is unusual for her. She did not go to work today. Mrs. P.'s temperature is at 38.7 °C today. Additionally, since today, she has trouble breathing when climbing stairs. She is very worried because this has never happened before.

Age group: adults, older

It is Tuesday morning, 8 a.m./It is Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., Hildegard S./Helmut K., 72 years, retired,

...has had a headache for three days. She has developed a dry cough since yesterday. She feels tired and lacks the drive to do something which is unusual for her. Mrs. S.'s temperature is at 38.7 °C today. Additionally, since today, she has trouble breathing when climbing stairs. Seeing that her heart and lungs are actually in good condition, this worries her very much.

Symptoms: Inflammatory gastrointestinal diseases**Age group: children (appendicitis)**

It is Tuesday morning, 8 a.m./It is Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., Paula S./Lukas P., 12 years old, schoolgirl/schoolboy,

...complains about a bad tummy ache. The trouble started the evening before with sickness and pain at the center of the stomach. In the morning she had to vomit. Since the evening before the pain has become worse and has moved to the right lower side of the stomach. The otherwise so active girl feels weak, has no appetite and would rather not move at all. Her temperature was 37.4 °C. When Paula's parents tried to palpate her tummy, she screamed of pain. This worries her parents very much.

Age group: adults, middle-aged (cholecystitis)

It is Tuesday morning, 8 a.m./It is Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., Melanie P./Stefan D., 49 years, administration officer,

...has sudden, severe pain in his right upper abdomen which radiates right up to his back and the right shoulder. Besides, she feels sick but so far did not have to vomit. Because of her bad condition she took her temperature: 38.6 °C. Her pain started about two hours ago. Mrs. P. does not know (has not experienced) pain like this. This worries her very much.

Age group: adults, elder (diverticulitis)

It is Tuesday morning, 8 a.m./It is Tuesday evening, 8 p.m., Hildegard S./Helmut K., 72 years, retired,

...has had pain in the lower left abdomen for three days. For a few weeks she has occasionally suffered from diarrhea, constipation also occurs. She feels less productive than usual and is often tired. Because of her bad condition she took her temperature: 38.5 °C. She noticed a streak of fresh blood on her stool since yesterday. Today the pain has reached a strength she had not experienced before. This very much worries her.

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies* (refer to clean version of the manuscript)

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1-2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	4-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5-6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6-7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6-7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	8-9
Data sources/measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	7-9
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	8
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7-9
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	9
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	Tables 1-5
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	NA
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	NA
Results			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	6; Tables 1-5
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	NA
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	Table 1
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Table 1
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	9-10; Tables 1-2
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	Tables 3-5; 9-11
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	8
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	NA
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	10-11; Tables 4-5
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	11-12
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	14-15
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	12-14
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	14-15
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	16

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.