

1 **Title:** Protocol for Project Recovery: Cardiac Surgery - Leveraging Digital
2 Platform for Efficient Collection of Longitudinal Patient-Reported Outcome Data
3 Towards Improving Postoperative Recovery

4

5 **Authors:** Makoto Mori MD^{1, 2}, Cornell Brooks II BA¹, Erica Spatz MD MHS^{2, 3},
6 Bobak J Mortazavi PhD⁴, Sanket S. Dhruva MD MHS^{5, 6}, George C. Linderman
7 PhD¹, Lawrence A. Grab MBA¹, Yawei Zhang PhD MD⁷, Arnar Geirsson MD¹,
8 Sarwat I. Chaudhry MD⁸, Harlan M. Krumholz MD SM⁹

9

10 **Affiliations:**

11 ¹Section of Cardiac Surgery, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut

12 ²Center for Outcomes Research and Evaluation, Yale-New Haven Hospital, New
13 Haven, Connecticut

14 ³Section of Cardiovascular Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, Yale
15 School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut

16 ⁴Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Texas A&M University,
17 College Station, Texas

18 ⁵Department of Medicine, University of California San Francisco School of
19 Medicine, San Francisco, California

20 ⁶San Francisco VA Medical Center, San Francisco, California

21 ⁷Department of Environmental Health Sciences, Yale School of Public Health,
22 Department of Surgery, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut

23 ⁸Section of General Internal Medicine, Department of Medicine, Yale School of
24 Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut

25 ⁹Section of Cardiovascular Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, Yale
26 School of Medicine and the Department of Health Policy and Management, Yale
27 School of Public Health, New Haven, Connecticut

28

29 **Corresponding author:**

30 Harlan M. Krumholz, MD SM

31 Center for Outcomes Research and Evaluation (CORE)

32 1 Church Street, Suite 200, New Haven, Connecticut 06510

33 Telephone: 203-764-5885; Fax: 203-764-5653

34 Email: harlan.krumholz@yale.edu

35

36

37

38 **Abstract** (287/300)

39 Introduction

40 Improving postoperative patient recovery after cardiac surgery is a priority,
41 but our current understanding of individual variations in recovery and factors
42 associated with poor recovery is limited. We are using a health-information
43 exchange platform to collect patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) and
44 wearable device data to phenotype recovery patterns in the 30-day period after
45 cardiac surgery hospital discharge, to identify factors associated with these
46 phenotypes and to investigate phenotype associations with clinical outcomes.

47

48 Methods and analysis

49 We designed a prospective cohort study to enroll 200 patients undergoing
50 valve, coronary artery bypass graft, or aortic surgery at a tertiary center in the
51 U.S. We are enrolling patients postoperatively after the intensive care unit (ICU)
52 discharge, and delivering electronic surveys directly to patients every 3 days for
53 30 days after hospital discharge. We will conduct medical record reviews to
54 collect patient demographics, comorbidity, operative details and hospital course
55 using the Society of Thoracic Surgeons (STS) data definitions. We will use phone
56 interview and medical record review data for adjudication of survival, readmission,
57 and complications. We will apply group-based trajectory modeling to the time-
58 series PROM and device data to classify patients into distinct categories of
59 recovery trajectories. We will evaluate whether certain recovery pattern predicts
60 death or hospital readmissions, as well as whether clinical factors predict a

61 patient having poor recovery trajectories. We will evaluate whether early recovery
62 patterns predict the overall trajectory at the patient-level.

63

64 Ethics and dissemination

65 The Yale Institutional Review Board approved this study. Following the
66 description of the study procedure, we obtain written informed consent from all
67 study participants. The consent form states that all personal information, survey
68 response, and any medical records are confidential, will not be shared, and are
69 stored in an encrypted database.

70

71 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 72 • This study will assess the patient perspective on recovery after cardiac
73 surgery at a high frequency within the 30-day postoperative period with
74 surveys and activity monitoring via a health information platform and
75 wearable devices.
- 76 • Using longitudinal patient-reported outcomes measure (PROM) data, this
77 study will define recovery patterns and factors associated with different
78 recovery trajectories and guide the development interventions to improve
79 recovery and support expansion of the study to additional sites.
- 80 • The study is single center and the sample size is limited.

81 Text (4081 words)

82 **Background**

83 Improving postoperative patient recovery is a priority. Readmission rates
84 in the post-operative period are high. Moreover, in the United States, the
85 expansion of episode-based payments and performance measures is increasing
86 interest in the post-acute experience of patients^{1,2}. However, we generally lack
87 systematically-collected information on the experience of patients in the post-
88 acute period, as few studies rigorously collecting information using established
89 patient-reported outcomes measures (PROMs). We have, for example, little
90 information about the variation of the trajectories of recovery and the factors most
91 strongly associated with better outcomes³.

92 The assessment of the patient experience can provide important insights
93 into the process of recovery that is not evident through clinical outcomes or
94 intermittent clinical office visits. PROMs and wearable devices can provide
95 complementary information by providing measurements of how the patient's
96 experience and functional status change over time⁴. Current digital platforms
97 allow us to efficiently collect PROMs and wearable-generated data at high
98 frequencies and with little cost and burden. These automated data collection
99 approaches may minimize the bias introduced by clinician-directed patient
100 interviews⁵. Such a platform is highly suited to obtain repeated measures to
101 characterize a time-dependent process such as recovery⁶.

102 Cardiac surgery is an ideal area for the study of recovery. Many patients
103 have good outcomes, but the limited existing evidence suggests a wide variation

104 in the post-operative experience of these patients⁷. However, these patients'
105 experience has been poorly studied, as most studies of recovery simply assess
106 deaths and complications.

107 Characterizing the recovery from the patient perspective is important for
108 many reasons. First, shared decision-making and informed consent should be
109 guided not only by the risk of mortality and complications but also by the recovery
110 experience. Understanding variations in recovery could enable the early
111 identification of people who are struggling and require additional attention.
112 Recovery data from the patient perspective may enable remote monitoring after
113 the procedure to selectively and preemptively intervene on those at high risk of
114 poor recovery to improve outcomes. Characterization of recovery can also be
115 used to identify patient, surgeon, procedural, and institutional factors that are
116 associated with different patterns. With this information we can identify modifiable
117 risk factors for poor recovery.

118 Thus, at this juncture, there are several notable gaps in knowledge. First,
119 although recovery occurs over time, most studies of recovery included a small
120 number of timepoints, and the recovery trajectory phenotypes remains poorly
121 defined³. Cohort-level average of recovery trajectories is a common way of
122 reporting³ and can indicate how patients recover on average⁷, but it obscures
123 individual variation such as rapid early recovery, gradual recovery, or initial
124 recovery followed by a decline. Second, we have limited understanding of how
125 recovery trajectories vary by patient factors, operation types, center or surgeon

126 characteristics, procedural processes, and complications, which limit
127 opportunities to identify high risk patients preemptively and intervene.

128 Accordingly, our overall objective is to characterize short-term trajectories
129 of patient recovery after cardiac surgery using PROMs and wearable data. We
130 are conducting a prospective study to characterize trajectories of postoperative
131 recovery in multiple domains after cardiac surgery. The specific aims of this study
132 are to: 1) leverage a digital data platform to collect PROM and wearable device
133 data to bring forth the variable individual recovery trajectories, 2) describe distinct
134 classes of recovery trajectories and clinical factors associated with the classes,
135 and 3) to evaluate whether early postoperative recovery trajectory predicts later
136 recovery trajectory. In addition, we will investigate optimal ways to manage
137 missing data specific to these time-series data This study is a step toward using
138 this approach to prospectively monitor and preemptively identify patients at risk of
139 poor recovery and facilitate intervention to reduce the risk of adverse events.

140

141 **Methods**

142 *Design Overview*

143 This is a prospective cohort study of patients who are undergoing valve,
144 CABG, or aortic surgery at a tertiary center in the U.S. We chose the operations
145 because they are the most common cardiac operations performed⁸. We are
146 enrolling patients postoperatively after ICU discharge in order to ensure clinical
147 stability, and we electronically delivering surveys directly to patients every 3 days
148 for 30 days after hospital discharge to study patient trajectories in multiple

149 domains characterizing recovery. The closing phone interview after 30 days,
150 electronic medical record review, and linkage to the Society of Thoracic
151 Surgeons database are used to confirm survival, readmission, and complications.
152 The closing interview asks about details of readmissions if they occurred,
153 patients' overall satisfaction with the study, and whether their experience was
154 well captured by the summary of their PROM data. We will apply group-based
155 trajectory modeling to the longitudinal PROM data to identify distinct categories of
156 recovery trajectories in a data-driven fashion. We also identify predictors of
157 protracted recovery trajectory and evaluate whether early recovery patterns (<10
158 days) predict the overall trajectory (30 days) at the patient-level. The Yale
159 Institutional Review Board approved this study.

160

161 *Patient Population*

162 This study began in January 2019 and is ongoing. The study is taking
163 place at Yale-New Haven Hospital, a tertiary center in the United States, where
164 over 1,100 cardiac surgeries are performed annually. Inclusion criteria are
165 patients of age 18 and older who are undergoing coronary artery bypass grafting
166 (CABG), valve replacement or repair, or aortic operations. Exclusion criteria are
167 those who undergo heart transplant, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation
168 (ECMO), adult congenital operations, or ventricular assist device implantation, as
169 these patient populations tend to have a longer course of intensive care unit stay⁹,
170 precluding the timely enrollment necessary to capture immediate postoperative
171 recovery. We also excluded those who do not own a smartphone or a tablet or

172 those who do not speak or read English, because the digital platform for PROM
173 data collection relies on patients responding to surveys displayed on web
174 browser via email or text, and the surveys were written in English language. We
175 do not allow proxy for survey response and consequently excluded patients who
176 were not able to respond by themselves as determined by the research assistant.

177

178 *Recruitment*

179 Recruitment takes place postoperatively after the patient has left the
180 intensive care unit (ICU) for the step-down or floor unit (Figure 1). We chose to
181 enroll patients postoperatively, as opposed to preoperatively, because
182 postoperative enrollment allows for enrollment of patients who undergo surgery
183 under non-elective settings. Recruitment after transfer from the ICU setting
184 ensures clinical stability. A research assistant (RA) visits the patient and after
185 confirming the patient is eligible to participate and following the description of the
186 study procedure, obtains written informed consent (Supplementary Material S1)
187 from all study participants. The informed consent form states that all personal
188 information, survey response, and any medical records are confidential, will not
189 be shared, and will be stored in an encrypted database.

190 We iteratively refined the enrollment process to minimize the onboarding
191 time, which includes obtaining informed consent and signup process directed by
192 the RA on a tablet device to enter patient name and email address or phone
193 number and takes approximately 10-15 minutes.

194

195 *PROM instrument and administration*

196 We use 24-item quality of recovery (QoR-24) to characterize patients'
197 postoperative recovery in various domains. The questionnaire consists of 24
198 items that were developed and validated in inpatient and outpatient surgical
199 populations¹⁰⁻¹³. The instrument was previously adapted into a mobile format and
200 was successfully used to administer the survey daily for 14 days^{11, 12}. We added
201 3 items to QoR-24 to capture the self-reported time patients went to sleep, the
202 time they awakened, and their global perception of how much they have
203 'recovered' in a 0-100% scale. The resulting 27-item questionnaire takes 2-4
204 minutes to complete, making its frequent administration feasible (Supplementary
205 Material S2). Among the published studies in cardiac surgery, this study will have
206 the highest number of PROM data points collected in the first postoperative
207 month³.

208

209 *Digital data platform*

210 We are delivering surveys on the day of enrollment and every 3 days for
211 30 days. This method provides detailed longitudinal data across multiple domains
212 of recovery (Figure 2). To facilitate data organization and scheduled survey
213 delivery, we use Hugo (Me2Health, LLC, Guilford CT, USA) a patient-centered
214 health data sharing platform, which has a customizable survey delivery function
215 and reminder feature to facilitate data collection. Hugo platform allows for
216 automated delivery of surveys without researchers having to directly contact
217 patients, which facilitates high-frequency data collection. Additionally, it imports

218 data from connected wearable devices to facilitate centralization of patient health
219 data. The patients retain access to their own data in a cloud-based account.

220

221 *Identifying common reasons for low response rate*

222 Recognizing that the survey response will be incomplete for some
223 participants, we have conducted a phone interview with the first 22 patients to
224 learn reasons for low responses and identify strategies to minimize the barriers
225 toward survey response for subsequent participants. In the first 22 patients, we
226 identified 5 with response rate of <50% and conducted recorded phone
227 interviews. Our interview guide (Supplementary Material S3) contained questions
228 to elucidate technical barriers, differential preferences for engagement, and or
229 any other issues precluding survey completion. We also asked whether the
230 length of the questionnaire or types of questions asked made it difficult to
231 complete the survey. Two members of the research team (CB and MM)
232 evaluated the interview recordings to identify common reasons for low response
233 rate. This suggested the potential importance of reminder to maintain patient
234 engagement. We modified the protocol to contact all participants approximately
235 10 days after enrollment.

236

237

238 *Additional clinical data and adjudication of hospitalization and survival*

239 Additionally, we are using the Society of Thoracic Surgeons (STS) Adult
240 Cardiac Surgery Database data specifications to retrospectively collect clinically

241 relevant data in this patient population. Pre-specified candidate predictors in this
242 database will be used to identify clinical predictors of recovery trajectories (Table
243 1). The STS database contains patient demographics, comorbidities, presenting
244 clinical status, operative details, and postoperative mortality and morbidity up to
245 30 days after the time of operation¹⁴. These data are routinely collected at Yale
246 New Haven Hospital.

247 We will determine mortality and hospital readmissions by several
248 approaches: review of hospital records, review of cardiac surgery clinic notes,
249 and conducting closing phone interviews with the patient or contact person
250 previously identified.

251

252 *Patient Involvement*

253 Prior to launching the study, we interviewed 5 patients both in pre and
254 postoperative settings to evaluate whether the frequency of survey delivery and
255 PROM instrument were likely to adequately capture their experience of recovery.
256 All patients agreed that the frequency of questionnaire administration and the
257 length of the PROM instrument were reasonable and provided face validity that
258 the questionnaire captured aspects of recovery that were important to the
259 patients. Additionally, this article is authored with a patient (LG) who participated
260 in the study to reflect his perspective on the study design and experience in
261 responding to the surveys.

262

263 *Sample size*

264 The study sample target is 200 patients. Adequate sample size for studies
265 using group-based trajectory modeling depends on the dataset's
266 representativeness of the population of interest¹⁵. Therefore, the concept of
267 statistical power traditionally used for sample size calculation does not apply to
268 latent class analyses. We may generate a larger simulation dataset from the
269 measured patient trajectory data to perform a split-sample testing, evaluating
270 whether trajectories generated from the derivation sample would allow for
271 satisfactory categorization of the testing dataset. Additionally, the study setting is
272 scalable to increase the sample size by increasing the enrollment period, should
273 a larger sample size become necessary.

274

275 *Analytical approach – group-based trajectory modeling*

276 The resulting dataset is a complex time-series data, with each patient
277 having 10 data points (one every three days) at different postoperative times for
278 each item. A practical approach to dimension reduction is group-based trajectory
279 modeling, which is a type of latent class analysis that groups similar patient
280 trajectories according to a number of features derived from the time-series data¹⁶,
281 ¹⁷. This approach allows for dimension reduction of the complex time-series data
282 into several distinct classes of recovery trajectories. These trajectories can be
283 labeled according to the observed clinical phenotype of trajectories, for example
284 'fast recovery,' 'average recovery,' or 'protracted recovery,'. This data-driven
285 categorization enables additional regression modeling to identify predictors of
286 patients belonging to a certain class of recovery path.

287 The dataset will be classified into distinct categories of trajectories at
288 domain level, using group-based trajectory modeling^{16, 17}. Traj package on R¹⁸ or
289 Proc Traj package on SAS¹⁵, performs trajectory modeling by first extracting 24
290 features of patient-level trajectory, selecting a subset of features that describes
291 the overall trajectory, and identifying optimal number of classes to group the
292 trajectories based on the longitudinal k-means method. The 24 features include
293 range, mean change per unit time, and slope of the linear model (Table 2), which
294 have been demonstrated to discriminate between stable-unstable, increasing-
295 decreasing, linear-nonlinear, and monotonic-nonmonotonic patterns of
296 trajectories¹⁸. K-means method partitions the time-series data into k groups such
297 that the mean squared error distance of each data point from the assigned
298 cluster is minimized¹⁹. The optimal number of clusters is determined by the
299 minimization of Bayesian information criterion, which signifies the balance
300 between model's complexity and the ability to describe the dataset. This process
301 yields distinct classes of patient trajectories in a data-driven fashion. Trajectories
302 will be identified separately for the 5 domains and 1 global recovery measure.

303

304 *Analytical approach – missing data*

305 Because missing data are inevitable in longitudinal PROMs, there is a
306 need employ an appropriate handling of missing data. Multiple imputation prior to
307 latent class analysis may yield a less biased estimate of the resulting trajectories.
308 An alternative approach used in group-based trajectory models assumes the data
309 are missing at random (MAR) and generates the maximum likelihood of the

310 model parameters²⁰. MAR is valid when the response attrition is independent of
311 the group membership. However, patient attrition is oftentimes dependent on
312 clinical characteristics and likely related to the class of trajectory itself. An
313 extension of the model allows for modeling of attrition across trajectory groups²¹,
314 permitting dropout probability to vary as a function of covariates or observed
315 outcomes prior to dropout and yields a more robust estimate of the probability of
316 group membership. As such, we will perform sensitivity analysis to compare the
317 trajectories generated via raw data vs. data preprocessed with multiple
318 imputation vs. trajectories generated via trajectory model accounting for response
319 attrition.

320

321 **Results**

322 Between January and May 2019, we have enrolled 22 patients who
323 completed the 30-day follow-up. In this cohort, median age was 58.5 years
324 (interquartile range 53.5-67.0) and 7 (32%) were women. There were 9 (41%)
325 mitral valve repair cases and 6 isolated or concomitant CABG (27%).

326

327 *Barriers to completing surveys*

328 Of the 22 patients enrolled, 3 (14%) did not complete any surveys, 19
329 (86%) completed at least 3 surveys, and 17 patients (77%) completed at least 6
330 of 11 delivered surveys (>50% of delivered surveys). Of the 5 patients who
331 completed less than half of the surveys, we successfully contacted 4, and 1 could
332 not be reached after 5 attempts. All 4 reported that the major barriers precluding

333 survey completion were their clinical conditions: 2 described readmissions as an
334 overwhelming event that made them feel continuing survey participation
335 challenging, and 2 described not feeling well in general, which precluded
336 participation. All 4 patients noted that text or email reminders might have been
337 helpful to sustain participation. Based on these responses, we modified the
338 protocol to contact all participants approximately 10 days after enrollment to
339 improve engagement and resolve any patient-specific issues in completing the
340 surveys.

341

342 *Clinical outcomes*

343 There were no deaths during follow-up. Two (9%) patients experienced at
344 least 1 hospital readmission. Figure 2 depicts the breadth in recovery trajectories
345 in pain, sleep, ability to take care of own hygiene, and perception of overall
346 recovery in five patients with complete response.

347

348 *Patient perspective*

349 An author (LG) participated in this study as he underwent cardiac surgery.
350 He noted that the length and frequency of the questionnaire was reasonable and
351 helped him to be more aware of the recovery process because responding to the
352 questions facilitated introspection on his progress across different domains. He
353 recommended that the study platform feedback the data to study participants,
354 such as a visual summary of the trajectory or response for patients to better
355 gauge their progress. Additionally, he noted that responses may differ across the

356 time of the day, as he was able to better function physically in the afternoon
357 compared with in the morning. Finally, he suggested the potential value of
358 reviewing the questionnaire during preoperative counseling to highlight important
359 aspects of recovery to provide better patient and family expectations.
360 Investigators plan on providing a brochure to the clinic that contains this
361 information.

362

363 **Discussion**

364 This study will provide time-series data on short-term recovery after
365 cardiac surgery using PROM instruments complemented by clinical records
366 obtained via the STS database and electronic health records. This study will
367 provide one of the highest density of postoperative PROM data in existing
368 cardiac surgery literature³, and it will characterize the variability in individual
369 recovery processes with a high temporal resolution. This study will be important
370 in closing knowledge gaps around patient-level variations in trajectories because
371 prior studies have mostly focused on changes in PROM scores at a limited
372 number of time points³ or reporting group-level aggregate of longitudinal recovery
373 data^{7, 22}. Because recovery is an individual, variable, and time-dependent
374 process, we designed our data collection and analytical approach to capture such
375 features important to recovery.

376 This study has the potential to make a variety of contributions toward
377 improving post-acute phase of care. First, we will be able to develop a
378 preliminary nomogram of postoperative recovery for each domain and overall

379 perception of recovery, which would be instrumental for patients and clinicians to
380 gauge the breadth of possible recovery trajectories to facilitate informed shared
381 decision-making. Second, identifying predictors of accelerated or protracted
382 recovery, as classified by group-based trajectory model, may allow for
383 individualized prediction of the postoperative recovery course to better inform the
384 patients and family members. Third, early detection of recovery signals related to
385 adverse events, such as mortality and readmission, may eventually facilitate
386 preemptive intervention and focused monitoring of patients at an elevated risk for
387 such events. Our design of the longitudinal PROM data collection allows for
388 incremental update of such prediction as patients progress through the phase of
389 recovery.

390 There are many challenges to the successful acquisition of patient
391 measurements during recovery: efficient administration of PROMs in a way that
392 does not require prohibitive amount of resources, minimizing selection bias
393 originating from barriers to survey completion, handling of missing data that
394 inevitably occurs in PROMs, and summarizing the complex data in a way that is
395 interpretable to surgeons and patients²³. Additionally, the use of wearables and
396 device data require active patient participation in periodically charging the device,
397 wearing them correctly, and reliably syncing the device to the server for data
398 uploads. Moreover, there is a need to provide value to the patients for providing
399 their recovery profile, such as giving them access to their health data in a
400 meaningful way.

401 The resulting data collection, analytical, and output platforms have the
402 potential of being implemented in the clinical setting where an integration of
403 incrementally increasing PROM and clinical data provides the near-real time
404 estimate of individual patient risk of adverse post-operative events. Such a model
405 may allow for triggering of preemptive clinical intervention. An output may
406 assimilate a form of clinical dashboard within the electronic health record system,
407 which may be monitored at a centralized location where a trained clinician
408 reviews high-risk cases filtered by the algorithm to further evaluate whether the
409 patient condition warrants an intervention. Together, this workflow has a
410 tremendous potential to improve post-acute phase of care following surgery.

411

412 *Lessons Learned from the initial experience*

413 Through this first group of enrolled patients, we learned that most of the
414 patients approached were willing to participate and consented to the study. By
415 streamlining the enrollment process, the enrollment time shortened from over 1
416 hour on the first patient to approximately 10-15 minutes for the current enrollment.
417 The overall response rate is acceptable, with 77% of the participants completing
418 more than half of the delivered surveys independently without any intervention by
419 researchers. Challenging recovery course, including readmissions may have
420 interfered with patient engagement. While this would have resulted in an
421 underrepresentation of those with protracted recovery or with complications, our
422 preliminary data show we were able to capture variations in the trajectories of
423 recovery.

424 To sustain patient engagement through challenging recovery course, we
425 implemented a protocol for a research assistant to call the patient around 10
426 days after enrollment to troubleshoot any issues and reemphasize the
427 importance of their participation. We believe that once the survey becomes part
428 of clinical workflow with clinicians monitoring and responding to the PROM
429 response, patient response rate would improve further.

430 We modified the enrollment protocol to reduce the enrollment time,
431 because to some patients, the complexity and prolonged time spent for
432 enrollment discouraged signups. Initial protocol for enrollment required patients
433 to download an app and register. This resulted in a wide range of time spent for
434 enrollment between 15 minutes and 90 minutes, with longer enrollment owing to
435 technical challenges. These challenges include patients forgetting the password
436 for app download, having to reset the password, and not having immediate email
437 access to check account confirmation emails. Because our cardiac surgery
438 patient population tended to be older, these technical challenges may have been
439 pronounced. By not including the app download and allowing for the research
440 assistant to enroll the patient via an online form with their permission, the
441 enrollment time shortened significantly to 10-15 minutes.

442 Examining the initial individual data on recovery, there were wide
443 variations in the trajectories of recovery even among only 5 patients. The
444 variation suggests that the instrument we used was sensitive to capturing such
445 differences. We also noted variations in improvement over time across different
446 domains of recovery, where overall perception of recovery seemed to have a

447 steady improvement pattern, while pain varied between consecutive
448 measurements in some patients.

449

450 *Limitations*

451 There are several limitations to this study. First, the single-center tertiary
452 care setting limits the sample size and applicability of the findings to patients
453 cared for in different settings. A multi-center study following the current study
454 would address this limitation and evaluate whether the findings at our center are
455 comparable to findings in other centers. Additionally, group-based trajectory
456 modeling will classify patients into distinct trajectories based on similar recovery
457 patterns, and this analytical approach may allow for generalization of the
458 variations in the trajectories as long as our sample represents the breadth of the
459 possible variation in recovery.

460 Another limitation is the exclusion of patients who cannot participate for
461 various reasons. The use of digital platform is advantageous in reducing the
462 resource intensity for data collection, but leads to exclusion of patients who do
463 not own mobile devices, which likely affects older patients disproportionately. As
464 the number of adults using mobile devices is increasing²⁴, we believe this will
465 become less of a limitation over time. Initiating this study now despite this
466 limitation is important to establish a platform that may become the standard of
467 postoperative care when the vast majority of patient population own digital
468 devices in a predictably near future. Those who cannot participate due to lack of
469 interest represent an important population that may be distinct in characteristics

470 and risk profiles. We plan on minimizing the non-participation for the lack of
471 interest by intermittent phone check-ins to sustain interests and identify barriers
472 to inform strategies to increase engagement. In following studies, we may
473 consider other forms of incentives to participate, if this population is indeed
474 distinct and large in proportion. Additionally, when the PROM data are integrated
475 into routine clinical care, patient engagement will likely increase substantially
476 because they will be more inspired to share these data if they are used by their
477 clinicians.

478 Finally, postoperative enrollment and retrospective assessment of
479 preoperative health status, as opposed to preoperative enrollment, may introduce
480 recall bias. We decided on postoperative enrollment, because preoperative
481 enrollment precluded standardized enrollment of patients operated on under non-
482 elective settings. Given the retrospective assessment of baseline health status
483 takes place on the first postoperative survey, we believe the recall bias is
484 minimized owing to the temporal proximity.

485

486 **Conclusion**

487 This study will generate highly granular, longitudinal PROM data to
488 characterize individual trajectories of patient recovery after cardiac surgery.
489 Digital data sharing platforms promise to minimize the patient and researcher
490 burden in administering and completing PROMs, allowing for characterization of
491 granular progression of patients' state of health over time in the postoperative
492 period. Implementation of such study is complex but feasible, and it will serve as

493 an important platform to facilitate clinical use of PROM data to improve the
494 overall patient recovery.

495

496 **Authors' contributions**

497 MM, HMK, SD, and AG developed the study and research question. MM and
498 HMK developed analytical strategy with inputs from BJM, GCL, and YZ. SIC and
499 ES guided refining the enrollment strategy and interpretation of the phone
500 interview responses. LAG provided patient perspective on the study protocol and
501 interpretation of the preliminary results. All authors developed and approved the
502 final manuscript before submission.
503

504 **Funding statement**

505 This publication was made possible by K12HL138046 by the National Institutes
506 of Health (NIH) and the Yale Clinical and Translational Science Award, grant
507 UL1TR001863, from the National Center for Advancing Translational Science, a
508 component of the NIH.
509

510 **Competing interest statement**

511 Dr. Chaudhry is a paid reviewer for the CVS Caremark State of CT Clinical
512 Pharmacy Program.
513 Dr. Mortazavi is supported in part by the Center for Remote Health Technologies
514 and Systems and Texas A&M University, as well as awards 1R01EB028106-01
515 and 1R21EB028486-01 from the National Institute for Biomedical Imaging and
516 Bioengineering (NIBIB) for work employing machine learning on health data. Dr.
517 Mortazavi reported having a patent US10201746B1 approved for "Near-realistic
518 sports motion analysis and activity monitoring" and a patent to
519 US20180315507A1 is pending.
520 Dr. Krumholz works under contract with the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid
521 Services to support quality measurement programs; was a recipient of a research
522 grant, through Yale, from Medtronic and the U.S. Food and Drug Administration to
523 develop methods for post-market surveillance of medical devices; was a recipient of
524 a research grant with Medtronic and is the recipient of a research grant from Johnson
525 & Johnson, through Yale University, to support clinical trial data sharing; was a
526 recipient of a research agreement, through Yale University, from the Shenzhen
527 Center for Health Information for work to advance intelligent disease prevention and
528 health promotion; collaborates with the National Center for Cardiovascular Diseases
529 in Beijing; receives payment from the Arnold & Porter Law Firm for work related to
530 the Sanofi clopidogrel litigation, from the Ben C. Martin Law Firm for work related to
531 the Cook Celect IVC filter litigation, and from the Siegfried and Jensen Law Firm for

532 work related to Vioxx litigation; chairs a Cardiac Scientific Advisory Board for
533 UnitedHealth; was a participant/participant representative of the IBM Watson Health
534 Life Sciences Board; is a member of the Advisory Board for Element Science, the
535 Advisory Board for Facebook, and the Physician Advisory Board for Aetna; and is the
536 co-founder of HugoHealth, a personal health information platform, and co-founder of
537 Refactor Health, an enterprise healthcare AI-augmented data management company.
538
539

540 **References**

- 541 1. Wadhera RK, Yeh RW and Joynt Maddox KE. The Rise and Fall of
542 Mandatory Cardiac Bundled Payments. *JAMA*. 2018;319:335-336.
- 543 2. Khera R, Dharmarajan K, Wang Y, Lin Z, Bernheim SM, Normand ST and
544 Krumholz HM. Association of the Hospital Readmissions Reduction Program
545 With Mortality During and After Hospitalization for Acute Myocardial Infarction,
546 Heart Failure, and Pneumonia. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2018;1:e182777.
- 547 3. Mori M, Angraal S, Chaudhry SI, Suter LG, Geirsson A, Wallach JD and
548 Krumholz HM. Characterizing Patient-Centered Postoperative Recovery After
549 Adult Cardiac Surgery: A Systematic Review. *J Am Heart Assoc*.
550 2019;8:e013546.
- 551 4. Gill TM, Gahbauer EA, Han L and Allore HG. Trajectories of disability in
552 the last year of life. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;362:1173-80.
- 553 5. Pakhomov SV, Jacobsen SJ, Chute CG and Roger VL. Agreement
554 between patient-reported symptoms and their documentation in the medical
555 record. *Am J Manag Care*. 2008;14:530-9.
- 556 6. Moore FD. Getting well: the biology of surgical convalescence. *Ann N Y*
557 *Acad Sci*. 1958;73:387-400.
- 558 7. Diab MS, Bilkhu R, Soppa G, Edsell M, Fletcher N, Heiberg J, Royse C
559 and Jahangiri M. The influence of prolonged intensive care stay on quality of life,
560 recovery, and clinical outcomes following cardiac surgery: A prospective cohort
561 study. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2018;156:1906-1915.e3.
- 562 8. Thourani VH, Badhwar V, Shahian DM, O'Brien S, Kitahara H, Vemulapalli
563 S, Brennan JM, Habib RH, Fernandez F, D'Agostino RS, Lobdell K, Rankin JS,
564 Gammie JS, Higgins R, Sabik J, Schwann TA and Jacobs JP. The Society of
565 Thoracic Surgeons Adult Cardiac Surgery Database: 2019 Update on Research.
566 *Ann Thorac Surg*. 2019;108:334-342.
- 567 9. Blanche C, Blanche DA, Kearney B, Sandhu M, Czer LS, Kamlot A,
568 Hickey A and Trento A. Heart transplantation in patients seventy years of age
569 and older: A comparative analysis of outcome. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*.
570 2001;121:532-41.
- 571 10. Dahlberg K, Jaensson M, Eriksson M and Nilsson U. Evaluation of the
572 Swedish Web-Version of Quality of Recovery (SwQoR): Secondary Step in the
573 Development of a Mobile Phone App to Measure Postoperative Recovery. *JMIR*
574 *research protocols*. 2016;5:e192.

- 575 11. Jaensson M, Dahlberg K, Eriksson M and Nilsson U. Evaluation of
576 postoperative recovery in day surgery patients using a mobile phone application:
577 a multicentre randomized trial. *Br J Anaesth*. 2017;119:1030-1038.
- 578 12. Halleberg Nyman M, Nilsson U, Dahlberg K and Jaensson M. Association
579 Between Functional Health Literacy and Postoperative Recovery, Health Care
580 Contacts, and Health-Related Quality of Life Among Patients Undergoing Day
581 Surgery: Secondary Analysis of a Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Surg*.
582 2018;153:738-745.
- 583 13. Myles PS, Weitkamp B, Jones K, Melick J and Hensen S. Validity and
584 reliability of a postoperative quality of recovery score: the QoR-40. *Br J Anaesth*.
585 2000;84:11-5.
- 586 14. O'Brien SM, Feng L, He X, Xian Y, Jacobs JP, Badhwar V, Kurlansky PA,
587 Furnary AP, Cleveland JC, Lobdell KW, Vassileva C, Wyler von Ballmoos MC,
588 Thourani VH, Rankin JS, Edgerton JR, D'Agostino RS, Desai ND, Edwards FH
589 and Shahian DM. The Society of Thoracic Surgeons 2018 Adult Cardiac Surgery
590 Risk Models: Part 2-Statistical Methods and Results. *Ann Thorac Surg*.
591 2018;105:1419-1428.
- 592 15. Loughran T and Nagin DS. Finite Sample Effects in Group-Based
593 Trajectory Models. *Sociological Methods & Research*. 2006;35:250-278.
- 594 16. Nagin DS and Odgers CL. Group-based trajectory modeling in clinical
595 research. *Annu Rev Clin Psychol*. 2010;6:109-38.
- 596 17. Savage SA, Sumislawski JJ, Bell TM and Zarzaur BL. Utilizing Group-
597 based Trajectory Modeling to Understand Patterns of Hemorrhage and
598 Resuscitation. *Ann Surg*. 2016;264:1135-1141.
- 599 18. Leffondré K, Abrahamowicz M, Regeasse A, Hawker GA, Badley EM,
600 McCusker J and Belzile E. Statistical measures were proposed for identifying
601 longitudinal patterns of change in quantitative health indicators. *J Clin Epidemiol*.
602 2004;57:1049-62.
- 603 19. Hartigan JA and Wong MA. Algorithm AS 136: A K-Means Clustering
604 Algorithm. *Applied Statistics*. 1979;28:100--108.
- 605 20. Jones BL, Nagin DS and Roeder K. A SAS Procedure Based on Mixture
606 Models for Estimating Developmental Trajectories. *Sociological Methods &*
607 *Research*. 2001;29:374-393.
- 608 21. Haviland AM, Jones BL and Nagin DS. Group-based Trajectory Modeling
609 Extended to Account for Nonrandom Participant Attrition. *Sociological Methods &*
610 *Research*. 2011;40:367-390.
- 611 22. Petersen J, Vettorazzi E, Winter L, Schmied W, Kindermann I and
612 Schäfers HJ. Physical and mental recovery after conventional aortic valve
613 surgery. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 2016;152:1549-1556.e2.
- 614 23. Calvert M, Kyte D, Price G, Valderas JM and Hjollund NH. Maximising the
615 impact of patient reported outcome assessment for patients and society. *BMJ*.
616 2019;364:k5267.
- 617 24. Anderson M, Perrin A. Tech Adoption Climbs Among Older Adults.
618 [https://www.pewinternet.org/wp-](https://www.pewinternet.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/9/2017/05/PI_2017.05.17_Older-Americans-Tech_FINAL.pdf)
619 [content/uploads/sites/9/2017/05/PI_2017.05.17_Older-Americans-](https://www.pewinternet.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/9/2017/05/PI_2017.05.17_Older-Americans-Tech_FINAL.pdf)
620 [Tech_FINAL.pdf](https://www.pewinternet.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/9/2017/05/PI_2017.05.17_Older-Americans-Tech_FINAL.pdf). Published 2017. Accessed March 30, 2019.

621
622

623

624

625 **Tables and Figures**

626 Table 1: Candidate predictors of recovery trajectory

Demographic	Comorbidity	Operative factors	Postoperative factors
Age	Diabetes	Cardiopulmonary bypass time	Length of ICU stay
Sex	Prior stroke	Cross clamp time	Length of hospital stay
Race	Congestive heart failure	Operation type	Surgical site infection
Insurance status	Chronic kidney disease	Non-elective status	Prolonged ventilation
BMI	Dialysis	Transfusion requirement	Transfusion requirement
	Prior MI	Minimally invasive approach	Stroke
	Prior cardiac surgery		Reoperation for any reasons
	Ejection fraction		Death
	Arrhythmias		Readmission
	Prior PCI		Pneumonia
	Cardiogenic shock		
	Hypertension		
	Dyslipidemia		
	Smoking status		
	Chronic lung disease		
	Endocarditis		
	Pneumonia		
	Peripheral artery disease		
	Immunocompromised		
	Mechanical circulatory support use		
	Valvular disease severity		

627


628

629 Table 2: 24 features of trajectory used in group-based trajectory model

N	Features
1	Range
2	Mean-over-time
3	Standard deviation (SD)
4	Coefficient of variation (CV)
5	Change
6	Mean change per unit time
7	Change relative to the first score
8	Change relative to the mean over time
9	Slope of the linear model
10	Proportion of variance explained by the linear model
11	Maximum of the first differences
12	SD of the first differences
13	SD of the first differences per time unit
14	Mean of the absolute first differences
15	Maximum of the absolute first differences
16	Ratio of the maximum absolute difference to the mean-over-time
17	Ratio of the maximum absolute first difference to the slope
18	Ratio of the SD of the first differences to the slope
19	Mean of the second differences
20	Mean of the absolute second differences
21	Maximum of the absolute second differences
22	Ration of the maximum absolute second difference to the mean-over-time
23	Ratio of the maximum absolute second difference to mean absolute first difference
24	Ratio of the mean absolute second difference to the mean absolute first difference

630

631 Figure 1: Timing of patient enrollment and PROM administration




632

633 The figure shows the timing of patient enrollment and PROM administration over
634 the clinical course. Baseline function is assessed by retrospectively asking the
635 patient about their state of health during 1 month prior to the operation. 24-item
636 Quality of Recovery questionnaire is administered every 3 days for 30 days
637 following discharge from the intensive care unit.

638

639 Figure 2: Sample trajectories of recovery in 5 patients



640

641 The figures display trajectories of recovery in different domains in 5 patients.
642 Each color corresponds to the same patient. Overall recovery is the patient's
643 perception of overall recovery in 0 to 100% scale. Pain in surgical site is reported
644 in 0 to 10 point scale, with 10 representing the worst pain. Being able to take care
645 of own hygiene is reported in 0 to 10 point scale, with 10 representing complete
646 independence in managing own hygiene. Patient's perception of sleep quality is
647 reported in 0 to 10 point scale, with 10 being the best sleep.