Integrating Remote Monitoring into Heart Failure Patients' Care Regimen: A Pilot Study

Albert Sohn[1]; William Speier[1], PhD; Esther Lan[2]; Kymberly Aoki[2], RN, MPH; Gregg C Fonarow[3], MD; Michael K Ong[2], MD, PhD; Corey W Arnold[1,4], PhD

[1]Department of Radiological Sciences

[2]Division of General Internal Medicine & Health Services Research, Department of Medicine

[3]Division of Cardiology, Department of Medicine

[4]Department of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine

University of California, Los Angeles, CA, United States

Corresponding Author:

Corey W Arnold, PhD

Department of Radiological Sciences

Department of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine

University of California, Los Angeles

924 Westwood Blvd Suite 420

Los Angeles, CA 90024

Phone: (310) 794-3538

Fax: (310) 794-3546

Email: cwarnold@ucla.edu

Abstract

Background: Heart failure is a debilitating disease affecting millions of adults in the United States, often leading to hospitalizations and hospital readmissions. Around 50% of readmissions due to heart failure are preventable, with lack of adherence to prescribed self-care as a driving factor. Remote tracking and reminders issued by mobile health devices such as activity trackers and smartphone apps could help to promote self-care, which could potentially reduce these readmissions.

Objective: This pilot study used minimally-invasive monitoring technologies and patient-reported outcomes to examine the pragmatic feasibility of a remote monitoring regimen.

Methods: Twenty heart failure patients participated in piloting a remote monitoring regimen. Data collection included: (1) continuous remote monitoring using wrist-worn consumer activity trackers; (2) body weight recording using bathroom scales; (3) dose tracking using smart pill bottles; and (4) patient-reported outcome measures.

Results: Participants were aged 65.3 years on average, 50.0% of the participants were women, and 81.8% of the participants were determined to be New York Heart Association Class III or higher. Over the course of the study, 60.0% of the subjects wore the activity tracker for at least 70% of the hours, and 45.0% used the bathroom scale for more than 70% of the days. For the smart pill bottle, 55.0% of the subjects used it less than 10% of the days. Usage of the activity tracker correlated significantly with changes in Self-Care of Heart Failure Index confidence subscale scores and changes in Seattle Angina Questionnaire scores ($P < .05$), and usage of the bathroom scale correlated significantly with changes in Seattle Angina Questionnaire scores ($P = .04$).

Conclusions: The majority of the participants maintained a high adherence to wearing the activity tracker, but had low adherence to using the smart pill bottle. Usage of the bathroom scale was fair, but it received positive reviews from most subjects. Given the observed usage and feedback, we suggest that mobile health-driven interventions consider including an activity tracker and bathroom scale. Furthermore, the data's correlations with changes in patient-reported outcomes indicate the potential for these devices to be an effective way to remotely monitor heart failure patients.

Keywords

mHealth, patient-reported outcome, heart failure, self-care, patient monitoring

Introduction

Background

In the United States, at least 6.2 million adults currently live with heart failure [1]. Heart failure prevalence is projected to increase by 46% between 2012 and 2030, resulting in more than 8 million adults with heart failure [1]. Physical inactivity, obesity, and smoking are well-known lifestyle risk factors for heart failure [2]. Guidelines for secondary prevention after diagnosis emphasize physical activity, weight management, smoking cessation, and medication adherence [3]. Despite advances in medications and guidelines for heart failure management, heart failure considerably increases the risk of morbidity and mortality. Incidence of, morbidity resulting from, and hospitalization due to heart failure have substantial financial implications. Total direct medical costs of heart failure are expected to rise from $21 billion to $53 billion

between 2012 and 2030 [1]. Total direct and indirect costs are estimated to increase by 127% from $30.7 billion in 2012 to $69.7 billion in 2030 [1].

Hospitalization is common among heart failure patients and is a significant driver of heart failure-related costs. Annually, there are more than 4 million hospitalizations with a primary or secondary diagnosis of heart failure [4], and they constitute up to 79% of the costs for heart failure treatment [5]. In 2013, heart failure was the sixth most expensive condition treated in US hospitals as costs reached $10.2 billion [6], with readmissions accounting for $2.7 billion [7]. Among heart failure patients, 83% are hospitalized at least once, and 43% are hospitalized at least four times [8]. Within the first 30 days of discharge, hospital readmission rates for heart failure patients exceed 20% [9,10], while they near 50% within 6 months of discharge [11]. However, as high as 75% of the 30-day readmissions may be preventable [12] by addressing the patients' lack of information, comprehension, or adherence to prescribed self-care [13,14].

Health care expenditures for heart failure increases with an aging population, and thus preventing heart failure and improving care efficiency are imperative. Past home monitoring interventions have utilized a variety of methods, including wireless sensors, telephone services, websites, and home visits from nurses [15-18]. Results of these interventions designed to improve health outcomes and reduce readmissions among heart failure patients are inconclusive. Additionally, patient adherence to telemedicine interventions is often low [19]. The poor adherence and negative results are in part due to the high treatment burden home monitoring interventions place upon patients. In most cases, they require patients to engage in

novel behaviors such as using unfamiliar hardware and following high-frequency manual measurement regimen (e.g., taking one's blood pressure or heart rate multiple times a day).

Objectives

Mobile health (mHealth), defined as the application of mobile technology (e.g., software apps on mobile devices, wireless sensors, etc.) in health care, may be a preferred minimally invasive alternative to telemedicine interventions [20,21]. Activity trackers are examples of mHealth devices that have been studied due individuals' relatively high adherence to wearing them upon recommendation. A previous study using commercial activity trackers produced adherence rates that were as high as 90% [22]. In this work, we detail a pilot study with a cohort of 20 patients with heart failure. The goal of the study was to test a remote monitoring regimen to generate preliminary results and to examine the pragmatic feasibility of the approach.

Methods

Recruitment

All patients who were admitted as an inpatient or for observation from May 2018 to June 2019 were prescreened for inclusion in the study. Those who were 50 years of age or older and were being actively treated for heart failure were considered eligible for the study. Additional criteria included ownership of a compatible smartphone device (iOS or Android) with cellular voice and data, in addition to access to a Wi-Fi connection in their home. Eligible patients who were interested in the study had to score 3.5 or higher on a shortened version of the Mobile Device

Proficiency Questionnaire (MDPQ) to enroll (Supplemental Table 1) [23]. Exclusion criteria included having a cognitive disability (e.g., dementia), being unable to communicate in English, having visual or auditory impairments to the extent that a smartphone could not be used, having a full-time caregiver, and enrollment or being in the process of enrolling in hospice. Prior to discharge and enrollment in the study, eligible patients signed an informed consent form, which described the baseline survey, follow-up surveys, and institutional review board-approved procedures.

Each participant's New York Heart Failure Association (NYHA) classification and ejection fraction (EF) were recorded to describe the patients' heart failure according to the severity of their symptoms and limitations. The NYHA classification categorizes the severity of heart failure by considering heart failure patients' symptoms at rest and during physical activity [24]. EF indicates the percentage of blood leaving the left ventricle when it contracts and is a measurement of the heart's degree of function.

Remote Patient Monitoring

Upon providing signed informed consent, participants received a Fitbit Charge 2 (Fitbit, Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA), a bathroom scale (BodyTrace, Inc., Palo Alto, CA, USA), and a smart pill bottle. The Fitbit Charge 2 is a wrist-worn consumer product that uses a combination of accelerometers and optical sensors to track activity, heart rate (HR), and sleep based on arm movement and wrist capillary oxygenation. Participants were asked to wear the Fitbit activity tracker continuously (Table 1), with interruptions for only activities involving water and

charging the device. Data synced to users' smartphones via the Fitbit app, where it was then uploaded to the Fitbit cloud database and subsequently pulled to the research server via Fitbit's application programming interfaces (APIs). The BodyTrace scale is a wireless bathroom scale that digitally captures weight. Weights were automatically uploaded to the BodyTrace cloud database via cellular modem data connection after every use (Table 1) and were available via an API. The smart pill bottle has a smart cap that automatically tracks its removal from the bottle. This signal conveys information on medication consumption and was sent to its companion smartphone app via Bluetooth (Table 1). Cap removal events were available via an API.

Table 1: mHealth for Heart Failure Protocol Data Collection

Data Collection	Baseline	Day 30	Day 90	Day 180
Remote Monitoring				
Fitbit Charge 2	Continuous			
BodyTrace Bathroom Scale	Upon Usage			
Smart Pill Bottle	Upon Usage			
Post-Discharge Survey Questionnaire				
Rapid Estimate of Adult Literacy in Medicine (REALM-7)	✓	×	×	×
Demographics	✓	×	×	×
Health Information National Trends Survey (HINTS)	✓	×	×	×
Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire (MLHFQ)	✓	×	×	×
Self-Care of Heart Failure Index (SCHFI)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS-15)	✓	×	×	×
Lubben Social Network Scale (LSNS-6)	✓	×	×	×
Seattle Angina Questionnaire (SAQ-7)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire (KCCQ-12)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System (PROMIS) Global Health	✓	✓	✓	✓
PROMIS Fatigues Short Form (SF)	✓	✓	✓	✓
PROMIS Physical Function SF	✓	✓	✓	✓
PROMIS Anxiety SF	✓	✓	✓	✓
PROMIS Depression SF	✓	✓	✓	✓

PROMIS Sleep Disturbance SF	✓	✓	✓	✓
PROMIS Social Isolation SF	✓	✓	✓	✓
Hospital Readmission Questions	×	✓	✓	✓
Emergency Room (ER) Questions	×	✓	✓	✓
Device Questions	×	✓	✓	✓

A web-based data integration platform was utilized to collect all data streams for remote monitoring. This platform used vendor APIs to retrieve data every hour from Fitbit and once per day from BodyTrace's and the smart pill bottle's APIs. If the Fitbit activity tracker did not sync for 48 hours, study personnel issued a text message to the participant followed by a phone call if it did not sync for 72 hours. If the bathroom scale or the smart pill bottle did not sync for 72 hours, the participant received a text message as well as a phone call after 96 hours. Participants were allowed to opt out of these reminders.

Study IDs were used to identify participants, and collected data were stored in a HIPAA-compliant encrypted database. Data recorded for each participant included the participant's contact information and study-specific information including discharge date and study completion date, as well as withdrawal date and expiration date, if applicable. Because some of the daily readings may have ceased if a participant were hospitalized, study personnel monitored the university-based hospital system for hospital readmissions. When appropriate, readmission date(s) and readmission discharge date(s) were documented. Withdrawal of participation occurred if a participant requested withdrawal. In the event that a participant withdrew from the study or expired, study personnel stopped contacting the participant for follow-up surveys.

Post-Discharge Surveys

Study personnel contacted each participant on four separate occasions to complete a total of four surveys. The first was administered during the enrollment process and served as the baseline. It consisted of 16 sections (Table 1), including one that encompassed questions about sociodemographic characteristics (Supplemental Table 2). After 30 days, 90 days, and 180 days, a follow-up survey was administered via phone by a member of the study team. Study team members called participants during a window that started three days before and ended three days after the aforementioned follow-up periods. If a participant could not be contacted during that time frame, a paper copy of the follow-up survey was mailed to the participant's home address along with a pre-addressed, postage-paid return envelope. The 30-day, 60-day, and 90-day follow-up surveys each consisted of 13 sections (Table 1), which included questions about hospital readmission(s), emergency room (ER) visit(s), and study devices (Supplemental Table 3).

The baseline survey included the Rapid Estimate of Adult Literacy in Medicine (REALM-7) to determine the participants' health literacy [25] and the Health Information National Trends Survey (HINTS) to assess the participants' experience with technology (Table 1) [26]. Subjects also completed the Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire (MLHFQ), Self-Care of Heart Failure Index (SCHFI), Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS-15), Lubben Social Network Scale (LSNS-6), Seattle Angina Questionnaire (SAQ-7), Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire (KCCQ-12), and seven different Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System (PROMIS) questionnaires (Table 1). The MLHFQ is a 21-item patient-oriented measurement of

health-related quality of life (HRQOL) [27]. It measures how heart failure affects a patient in three specific areas: physical, emotional, and socioeconomic. The GDS-15 is a screening test for depression among elderly populations [28], while the LSNS-6 measures the strength of social support networks among elderly populations [29]. The SCHFI assesses a patient's ability to manage their heart failure via 22 total items in three subscales: maintenance, management, and confidence [30]. The SAQ-7 and KCCQ-12 questionnaires evaluate patients' HRQOL with respect to angina and heart failure, respectively [31,32]. Lastly, the PROMIS questionnaires are publicly available individual-centered patient-reported outcome (PRO) measures [33,34].

Scoring

Physical (0-40) and emotional (0-25) scores for the MLHFQ were calculated by summation of corresponding responses. Lower scores signified better HRQOL with respect to physical and emotional well-being, while higher scores signified worse HRQOL [27]. Addition of all 21 responses generated a total score, creating a possible range of 0 to 105. The following represents the classification of scores: good (<24), moderate (24-45), and poor (>45) HRQOL [27]. For the GDS-15, each *yes or no* question had a designated answer that was indicative of depression [28]. The number of answers matching those indicative of depression was the total score. Scores ≤5 are not suggestive depression, whereas >5 suggests depression and ≥10 is almost always indicative of depression [28]. LSNS-6 total scores were derived by addition of corresponding responses. Each question was scored from 0 to 5, with less than monthly, none, and always representing 0 and daily, nine or more, and always denoting 5 [29]. The total score has a range of 0 to 30, and scores ≤12 suggest at-risk for social isolation [29].

Raw scores for the three SCHFI subscales were determined by summation of responses in each section. If the participant acknowledged having trouble breathing or ankle swelling within the past month of taking this survey, only then was the management raw score calculated [30]. Standardization of the raw scores were performed to a 0 to 100 scale, with higher scores indicating better self-care. Adequate self-care is defined as scores ≥70 for all sections of the SCHFI [30]. Addition of all corresponding responses for both the SAQ-7 and KCCQ-12 questionnaires produced raw scores. They were then standardized to a 0 to 100 range. For scores of both questionnaires, they are classified as poor (0-24), fair (25-49), good (50-74), and excellent (75-100) HRQOL with respect to angina and heart failure, respectively [31,32]. Raw scores for the PROMIS questionnaires were computed by summation of responses to each questionnaire. Next, raw scores were converted into *t* scores through a process of standardizing the scores to a mean of 50 and a standard deviation (SD) of 10 [33,34]. Function scores greater than or equal to 40 are considered normal, and scores less than 40 represent moderate to severe adverse health effects. Whereas for symptoms, scores less than or equal to 60 are considered normal, and scores greater than 60 denote moderate to severe adverse health effects [33,34].

Statistical Analysis

Each questionnaire in the baseline and follow-up surveys was scored prior to statistical analyses. Any missing items were substituted by the mean of the participant's responses from the same questionnaire [35]. The cohort was characterized using proportions, means, SDs,

medians, and interquartile ranges (IQRs). For each questionnaire, summaries of responses and scores were reported, if applicable.

Adherence to wearing the Fitbit Charge 2 was calculated using two methods: (1) HR by hour (HR-hour); and (2) HR by minute (HR-minute). We examined the data by the hour for HR-hour and defined non-wear as hours without any available HR data. For HR-minute, data were aggregated to the minute, and minutes missing HR data were considered to be non-wear minutes. To determine adherence to weight measurement, weight data for each participant were averaged, and their SDs were calculated. In an attempt to distinguish the participant from others in the household, only the weights within 3.5 SDs from each participant's mean weight were defined to represent the participant's usage. Non-adherence was established as days without any weight measurements or those that did not fall within the 3.5 SD limits. Smart pill bottle usage was analyzed by day as well, and non-usage was defined as days without any available data from the bottles.

Regression analyses were conducted with the adherence rates as the independent variables to quantify the linear relationship with the PRO measures and participant characteristics, such as NYHA classifications, EFs, age, education, and annual income. To determine statistical significance, a significance level of .05, which corresponds to a 95% CI, was used for all analyses. If a subject were readmitted during the monitoring period, to avoid partial data on the day of their admission, adherence was calculated only up to the day before the readmission. Any

surveys completed by participants whose first readmission occurred before the halfway mark of their next follow-up survey were not considered.

Ethics

Data collection and analysis presented in this work were carried out under research protocol #17-001312 approved by the University of California, Los Angeles, Institutional Review Board. We obtained signed informed consent from all participants in the study.

Data Availability

The data that support the findings of this study are not publicly available due to patient privacy restrictions but may be available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Results

Demographics

We evaluated 150 hospitalized heart failure patients between May 2018 and June 2019 for study eligibility. Of these individuals, 23 (15.3%) individuals were discharged before they could be approached regarding the study, and 32 (21.3%) individuals declined to participate. Another 69 (46.0%) individuals did not meet the inclusion criteria, including 42 (60.9%) without a smartphone and eight (11.6%) who did not meet the minimum MDPQ score. In total, 20 (13.3%) heart failure patients were enrolled in the study.

The participants' mean age was 65.3 years (SD 9.3; range 50-86). Half of the participants were women, and 36.8% were African American (Table 2). Of the participants, a high school degree was the highest level of education for 25.0%, whereas 35.0% had received a bachelor's degree or higher. The proportions of individuals whose families earned less than $50,000 (52.6%) and more than $50,000 (47.4%) were fairly similar. In regard to heart failure, 81.8% of the participants were determined to be NYHA Class III or IV, and 65.0% had EFs less than 50%.

Table 2: Demographics of study population

Characteristic	Value
Age (years; *n* = 20), mean (SD)	65.3 (9.3)
Sex (*n* = 20), *n* (%)	
Male	10 (50.0)
Female	10 (50.0)
Hispanic or Spanish origin (*n* = 20), *n* (%)	
No	18 (90.0)
Yes	2 (10.0)
Race or Ethnicity (*n* = 19), *n* (%)	
White	12 (63.2)
Black or African American	7 (36.8)
Asian	0 (0.0)
American Indian or American Native	0 (0.0)
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0 (0.0)
Education (*n* = 20), *n* (%)	
High school	5 (25.0)
Some college, associate degree, or trade school	8 (40.0)
Bachelor's degree	4 (20.0)
Master's degree or above	3 (15.0)
Annual Income (US $; *n* = 19), *n* (%)	
0-25,000	4 (21.1)
25,001-50,000	6 (31.6)
50,001-75,000	2 (10.5)
75,001 or more	7 (36.8)
New York Heart Association class (*n* = 11), *n* (%)	
I	0 (0.0)
II	2 (18.2)

III	5 (45.5)
IV	4 (36.4)
Ejection fraction (*n* = 20), *n* (%)	
≤40%	13 (65.0)
41%-49%	0 (0.0)
≥50%	7 (35.0)

Access to Technology

In contrast to only seven participants owning a tablet (36.8%), 17 participants owned a smartphone (89.5%) (Table 3). All participants had access to the internet through a wireless network, and the majority had additional internet access through a cellular network (75.0%). Most participants had experience accessing the internet or their email account(s) (85.0%) and researching information about heart failure (60.0%). Fewer participants had previously used apps on their smartphones to achieve health-related goals (52.6%), to make decisions about treatment (44.4%), and to ask a doctor new questions or to get a second opinion (47.4%).

Table 3: Patient answers to Health Information National Trends Survey

Question	No	Yes
Do you ever go on-line to access the Internet or World Wide Web, or to send and receive e-mail? (*n* = 20)	3 (15.0)	17 (85.0)
When you use the Internet, do you ever access it through a regular dial-up telephone line? (*n* = 20)	18 (90.0)	2 (10.0)
When you use the Internet, do you ever access it through broadband such as DSL, cable or FiOS? (*n* = 20)	6 (30.0)	14 (70.0)
When you use the Internet, do you ever access it through acellular network (i.e., phone, 3G/4G)? (*n* = 20)	5 (25.0)	15 (75.0)
When you use the Internet, do you ever access it through a wireless network (Wi-Fi)? (*n* = 20)	0 (0.0)	20 (100.0)
In the past 12 months, have you used the Internet to look for heart failure information for yourself?	6 (30.0)	14 (70.0)
Do you own a tablet? (*n* = 19)	7 (36.8)	12 (63.2)
Do you own a smartphone? (*n* = 19)	2 (10.5)	17 (89.5)

Do you own a cell phone? (*n* = 19)	3 (15.8)	16 (84.2)
On your tablet or smartphone, do you have any software applications or "apps" related to health? (*n* = 20)	5 (25.0)	15 (75.0)
Have the apps on your smartphone or tablet related to health helped you achieve a health-related goal such as quitting smoking, losing weight, or increasing physical activity? (*n* = 19)	9 (47.4)	10 (52.6)
Have the apps on your smartphone or tablet related to health helped you make a decision about how to treat an illness or condition? (*n* = 18)	10 (55.6)	8 (44.4)
Have the apps on your smartphone or tablet related to health led you to ask a doctor new questions, or to get a second opinion from another doctor? (*n* = 19)	10 (52.6)	9 (47.4)

Patient-Reported Outcomes at Baseline

The median MLHFQ score was 66.5 (IQR 42.1-73.8), corresponding to a poor HRQOL (Table 4), while the median KCCQ score (45.7, IQR 35.7-58.6) suggested a fair HRQOL in regard to heart failure. The median SAQ score (60.3, IQR 48.9-74.5) suggested a good HRQOL with respect to angina. Subjects had adequate ability to perform maintenance behaviors (median SCHFI score in maintenance of 70.0, IQR 51.9-83.3), but inadequate confidence level (median SCHFI score in confidence of 60.0, 45.0-75.0). The median SCHFI score in management (66.7, IQR 55.6-77.8) also revealed inadequate ability to manage heart failure for the 18 subjects who had experienced recent breathing complications or ankle swelling.

Table 4: Questionnaire scores at baseline

Questionnaire	Median Score (IQR)
Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire	
Physical (*n* = 20)	28.5 (16.5-34.0)
Emotional (*n* = 20)	11.0 (8.0-15.0)
Total (*n* = 20)	66.5 (42.1-73.8)
Self-Care of Heart Failure Index	
Maintenance (*n* = 19)	70.0 (51.9-83.3)
Management (*n* = 18)	60.0 (45.0-75.0)

Confidence (*n* = 19)	66.7 (55.6-77.8)
Geriatric Depression Scale (*n* = 20)	4.0 (2.0-5.5)
Lubben Social Network Scale	
Family (*n* = 20)	20.0 (15.0-21.0)
Friendships (*n* = 19)	17.0 (14.0-19.0)
Seattle Angina Questionnaire (*n* = 18)	60.3 (48.9-74.5)
Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire (*n* = 19)	45.7 (35.7-58.6)
PROMIS Global Health	
Physical (*n* = 19)	37.4 (34.9-42.3)
Mental (*n* = 19)	45.8 (41.1-50.8)
PROMIS Physical Function (*n* = 19)	36.0 (30.3-39.3)
PROMIS Fatigue (*n* = 19)	62.7 (57.0-69.0)
PROMIS Anxiety (*n* = 19)	55.6 (48.8-60.7)
PROMIS Depression (*n* = 18)	54.8 (49.0-58.9)
PROMIS Sleep Disturbance (*n* = 18)	55.2 (54.3-61.7)
PROMIS Social Isolation (*n* = 18)	46.8 (34.8-51.8)

According to the median and IQR scores for the GDS-15 (4.0, IQR 2.0-5.5), the LSNS-6 Family subscale (20.0, IQR 15.0-21.0), and the LSNS-6 Friendships subscale (17.0, IQR 14.0-19.0), most subjects were not depressed or at-risk for social isolation (Table 4). Similarly, median scores for the following PROMIS questionnaires concerning mental health were within the normal range: Global Mental Health subscale (45.8, IQR 41.1-50.8), Anxiety (55.6, IQR 48.8-60.7), Depression (54.8, IQR 49.0-58.9), Sleep Disturbance (55.2, IQR 54.3-61.7), and Social Isolation (46.8, IQR 34.8-51.8). On the other hand, median scores for the PROMIS questionnaires concerning physical health revealed moderate to severe adverse health effects: Global Physical Health subscale (37.4, IQR 34.9-42.3), Physical Function (36.0, IQR 30.3-39.3), and Fatigue (62.7, IQR 57.0-69.0).

Remote Monitoring Regimen

Figure 1 illustrates the proportion of activity tracker (HR-hour and HR-minute), bathroom scale, and smart pill bottle usage across all subjects. The median usage percentage of the activity tracker was 79.1% for HR-hour and 75.4% for HR-minute. Usage percentages of the bathroom scale and smart pill bottle were 59.7%, and 2.8%, respectively. Device usage was not significantly correlated with collected participant characteristics (i.e., NYHA classification, EF, age, education, and annual income).



Figure 1: Histograms of activity tracker, bathroom scale, and smart pill bottle usage. Median (IQR) usage percentages were 79.1% (27.1%-90.6), 75.4% (23.4%-84.9%), 59.7% (24.6%-79.4%), and 2.8% (0.0%-54.3%) for HR-hour, HR-minute, bathroom scale, and smart pill bottle, respectively.

Over the course of the study, one subject withdrew and three subjects expired, including one who made the transition to hospice. There were 10 different subjects who were readmitted to the hospital at least once and a total of 24 all-cause hospital readmissions. Two (8.3%) readmissions occurred within 30 days of discharge, while 12 (50.0%) occurred between 30 and 90 days and 10 (41.7%) between 90 and 180 days. Of the 24 hospital readmissions, four (16.7%) included heart failure in the admission diagnosis.

Average changes in subjects' questionnaire scores indicated improvements in heart failure maintenance, heart failure management, angina, heart failure, physical function, fatigue, anxiety, depression, sleep disturbance and social isolation (Figure 2). Fewer participants completed the management section of the SCHFI and the SAQ in their respective follow-up survey because they no longer experienced the symptoms (trouble breathing or ankle swelling and chest pain, chest tightness, or angina, respectively) that makes them eligible to complete those questionnaires (Supplemental Table 4).



Figure 2: Average changes in patient-reported outcomes. For non-PROMIS questionnaires, a positive change indicates improvement in health status. A positive change also signifies improvement in health status for the following PROMIS questionnaires: Global Physical Health, Global Mental Health, and Physical Function. Conversely, a negative change is indicative of improvement in health status for the following PROMIS questionnaires: Fatigue, Anxiety, Depression, Sleep Disturbance, and Social Isolation.

HR-hour and HR-minute generated statistically significant negative correlations with changes in SCHFI confidence subscale scores (P = .03 and P = .045, respectively), as well as changes in SAQ

scores (*P* = .008 and *P* = .01, respectively). For bathroom scale usage, negative correlation with changes in SAQ scores was the only statistically significant result (*P* = .04). Smart pill bottle usage did not produce any statistically significant results with changes in the PRO measures. However, subject ratings of the smart pill bottle's helpfulness (Supplemental Table 5) and age negatively correlated with statistical significance (*P* = .004). Age also negatively correlated with the subjects' ratings of the activity tracker's helpfulness (*P* = .002). Ratings of the bathroom scale's helpfulness and EFs negatively correlated (*P* = .03).

Thirty days after their discharge, 10 subjects completed their first follow-up survey (Supplemental Table 6). According to the average changes in questionnaire scores from baseline, all but the confidence section of the SCHFI, along with both the physical and mental health subscales of the PROMIS Global Health, suggested improvements in health status (Figure 3). Subjects' HR-hour and HR-minute activity tracker usage at 30 days after discharge positively correlated with PROMIS Anxiety scores (*P* = .03 and *P* = .03, respectively). Usage of the bathroom scale negatively correlated with scores from the confidence section of the SCHFI (*P* = .006), KCCQ (*P* = .007), PROMIS Global Physical Health (*P* = .03), and PROMIS Physical Function (*P* = .02). Additionally, these measures were positively correlated with scores from the PROMIS Fatigue (*P* = .003), PROMIS Depression (*P* = .03), and PROMIS Social Isolation (*P* = .03). No statistically significant results were observed between smart pill bottle usage and PRO measures.





Figure 3: Average changes in patient-reported outcomes 30 days after discharge. For non-PROMIS questionnaires, a positive change indicates improvement in health status. A positive change also signifies improvement in health status for the following PROMIS questionnaires: Global Physical Health, Global Mental Health, and Physical Function. Conversely, a negative change is indicative of improvement in health status for the following PROMIS questionnaires: Fatigue, Anxiety, Depression, Sleep Disturbance, and Social Isolation.

After excluding those who failed to complete both the 90-day and 180-day follow-up surveys, there were seven subjects whose questionnaire scores were analyzed (Supplemental Table 7).

Figure 4 illustrates similar trends in average changes of questionnaires scores between the baseline survey and both the 90-day and the 180-day follow-up surveys. Trends were different for four of the 13 questionnaires: SAQ, PROMIS Global Physical Health subscale, PROMIS Depression, and PROMIS Sleep Disturbance. Usage of neither the activity tracker (HR-hour and HR-minute) nor the smart pill bottle was correlated with PRO measures after 90 and 180 days. Bathroom scale usage and PROMIS Social Isolation scores after 90 days were positively correlated ($P = .03$), but not after 180 days ($P > .05$).





Figure 4: Average changes in patient-reported outcomes 90 and 180 days after discharge. For non-PROMIS questionnaires, a positive change indicates improvement in health status. A positive change also signifies improvement in health status for the following PROMIS questionnaires: Global Physical Health, Global Mental Health, and Physical Function. Conversely, a negative change is indicative of improvement in health status for the following PROMIS questionnaires: Fatigue, Anxiety, Depression, Sleep Disturbance, and Social Isolation.

Discussion

Principal Findings

The median usage percentage of the activity tracker was 79.1%, and 60.0% of the study participants wore the device for at least 70% of the hours (Figure 1). When asked about their opinion of the activity tracker (Supplemental Table 3), most subjects alluded to the usefulness of the step count and heart rate tracking features. The notification and community features were mentioned as well but not as extensively. The bathroom scale's median usage percentage was lower at 59.7%, but nearly half (45.0%) of the subjects surpassed the usage rate of 70% (Figure 1). Despite using the bathroom scale at a lower rate than the activity tracker, the majority of subjects found it easy to incorporate into their lives and tried to use it every day. Conversely, subjects were much less adherent to using the smart pill bottle, as over half (55.0%) of the subjects used the device less than 10% of the days, while seven (35.0%) did not use the device at all (Figure 1). The most common feedback subjects provided regarding the bottle was that its medication reminders were helpful, but that their pill box was preferable to manage their medications.

Common among all three study devices was a decrease in usage over the course of the study (Supplemental Table 8). This is consistent with previous observations in eHealth studies, which have observed the general trend that patients may gradually lose interest in or become burdened by the study [36]. In a similar study conducted with chronically ill patients and telemonitoring devices, including a Fitbit activity tracker, patients used only the devices of interest to them after feeling overwhelmed by having multiple devices [37]. Despite study

personnel's efforts to monitor and improve adherence by issuing reminders to the subjects in our study, many subjects chose not to continue using select devices.

Similar to the results of our previous study [38], the MLHFQ and KCCQ produced contrasting results with statistical significance ($P < .001$) despite both evaluating patients' HRQOL with respect to their heart failure. The median MLHFQ score suggested poor HRQOL, while the median KCCQ score produced a median score that corresponded to good HRQOL. This discrepancy may be due to the fact that questions in the MLHFQ examined a much longer time frame (4 weeks) than those in the KCCQ (2 weeks). Additionally, questions in the MLHFQ are more general than those of the KCCQ, which regards two symptoms of heart failure: shortness of breath and fatigue. While the questionnaires relating to physical health generated mixed results, those regarding mental health produced scores that fell within the normal range (Table 4, Supplemental Tables 4,6,7). This outcome indicates the favorable state of their mental health despite the adverse effects of their heart failure.

Usage of the activity tracker by subjects in this study correlated significantly with changes in SCHFI confidence subscale scores and SAQ scores from baseline. These negative correlations suggest that subjects who became less confident in their self-care or began to experience worse chest pain, chest tightness, or angina over the course of the study used the activity tracker more. The statistically significant negative correlation between the changes in SAQ scores and bathroom scale usage reveals that those who began experiencing worse chest pain, chest tightness, or angina used the bathroom scale more as well. Furthermore, subjects with lower

EFs found the bathroom scale more helpful, which may be related to physicians' frequent recommendation of daily weight monitoring as a part of heart failure self-management [39]. The subjects' usage and like of the bathroom scale suggest that its ability to send weight measurements wirelessly and automatically may allow health professionals to prevent fluid volume overload [40].

We also found that usage of the activity tracker and bathroom scale had statistically significant correlations with some questionnaire scores at 30 days after discharge, but not at 90 or 180 days after discharge. This inconsistency suggests that further study is required to reach conclusions, especially since the completion rate was less than 70% for each follow-up survey.

Limitations and Future Directions

This pilot study had a small sample of 20 patients and was confined to those admitted as an inpatient or for observation at a university-based health system. It was also restricted to patients over the age of 50. Though more than a third (36.8%) of the participants were African American, the remaining (63.2%) were white (Table 2). Consequently, the results may not be applicable to the general population with heart failure. The surveys were only available in English, and thus literacy in English was required. Future studies should include translated versions of the surveys in other languages. The 30-day, 60-day, and 90-day follow-up surveys had completion rates of 50%, 55%, and 65%, respectively, which decreased the already small sample size. Data collection may have been impacted by incorrect usage of the devices. For instance, subjects may not have worn the activity tracker properly, synced the activity tracker

regularly, or stood on the bathroom scale long enough for the weight measurement to transmit.

Conclusions

Heart failure patients' usage of and feedback regarding the study devices demonstrate the feasibility of the remote monitoring regimen. Increased usage of the devices correlating with increased angina and decreased confidence suggest that patients experiencing declining physical and mental health specific to heart failure may be more willing to engaged with the monitoring protocol. Additionally, these devices may assist health professionals remotely monitor heart failure patients since Fitbit and BodyTrace provide data access in real time. While the activity tracker and bathroom scale were positively received, the smart pill bottle was generally not useful. For populations with complex medication regimens, monitoring medication usage is challenging and likely cannot be accomplished with a single pill bottle. There is a critical need for remote sensing technologies to capture medication adherence information.

References

1. Heidenreich PA, Albert NM, Allen LA, Bluemke DA, Butler J, Fonarow GC, et al. Forecasting the impact of heart failure in the United States: a policy statement from the American Heart Association. Circ Heart Fail. 2013;6:606–19. PMID: 23616602

2. Del Gobbo LC, Kalantarian S, Imamura F, Lemaitre R, Siscovick DS, Psaty BM, et al. Contribution of Major Lifestyle Risk Factors for Incident Heart Failure in Older Adults: The Cardiovascular Health Study. JACC Heart Fail. 2015;3(7):520–528. PMID: 26160366

3. Yancy CW, Jessup M, Bozkurt B, Butler J, Casey DE Jr, Drazner MH, et al. 2013 ACCF/AHA guideline for the management of heart failure: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. Circulation. 2013;62(16):e147-239. PMID: 23747642

4. Blecker S, Paul M, Taksler G, Ogedegbe G, Katz S. Heart failure–associated hospitalizations in the United States. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2013;61(12):1259–67. PMID: 23500328

5. Dunlay SM, Shah ND, Shi Q, Morlan B, VanHouten H, Long KH, et al. Lifetime costs of medical care after heart failure diagnosis. Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes. 2011;4(1):68–75. PMID: 21139091

6. Torio CM, Moore BJ. National Inpatient Hospital Costs: The Most Expensive Conditions by Payer, 2013: Statistical Brief #204. 2016 May. In: Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP) Statistical Briefs [Internet]. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US). Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK368492/ PMID: 27359025

7. Fingar K, Washington R. Trends in Hospital Readmissions for Four High-Volume Conditions, 2009–2013: Statistical Brief #196. 2015 Nov. In: Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP) Statistical Briefs [Internet]. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US). Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK338299/. PMID: 26764446

8. Dunlay SM, Redfield MM, Weston SA, Therneau TM, Hall Long K, Shah ND, et al. Hospitalizations after heart failure diagnosis: a community perspective. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2009; 54(18):1695–702. PMID: 19850209

9. Keenan PS, Normand ST, Lin Z, Drye EE, Bhat KR, Ross JS, et al. An administrative claims measure suitable for profiling hospital performance on the basis of 30-day all-cause readmission rates among patients with heart failure. Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes. 2008;1(1):29–37. PMID: 20031785

10. Krumholz HM, Merrill AR, Schone EM, Schreiner GC, Chen J, Bradley EH, et al. Patterns of hospital performance in acute myocardial infarction and heart failure 30-day mortality and readmission. Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes. 2009;2(5):407–13. PMID: 20031870

11. Krumholz HM, Parent EM, Tu N, Vaccarino V, Wang Y, Radford MJ, et al. Readmission after hospitalization for congestive heart failure among medicare beneficiaries. Arch Intern Med. 1997;157(1):99–104. PMID: 8996046

12. Desai AS, Stevenson LW. Rehospitalization for heart failure: predict or prevent? Circulation. 2012;126(4):501–6. PMID: 22825412

13. Windham G, Bennett R, Gottlieb S. Care management interventions for older patients with congestive heart failure. Am J Manag Care. 2003;9(6):447–59. PMID: 12816174

14. Tsuyuki RT, McKelvie RS, Arnold JM, Avezum A Jr, Barretto AC, Carvalho AC, et al. Acute precipitants of congestive heart failure exacerbations. Arch Intern Med. 2001;161(19):2337–42. PMID: 11606149

15. Suh MK, Chen CA, Woodbridge J, Tu MK, Kim JI, Nahapetian A, et al. A remote patient monitoring system for congestive heart failure. J Med Syst. 2011;35(5):1165–79. PMID: 21611788

16. Wakefield BJ, Holman JE, Ray A, Scherubel M, Burns TL, Kienzle MG, et al. Outcomes of a home telehealth intervention for patients with heart failure. J Telemed Telecare. 2009;15(1):46-50. PMID: 19139220

17. Zan S, Agboola S, Moore SA, Parks KA, Kvedar JC, Jethwani K. Patient engagement with a mobile web-based telemonitoring system for heart failure self-management: a pilot study. JMIR Mhealth Uhealth. 2015;3(2):e33. PMID: 25842282

18. Morcillo C, Valderas JM, Aguado O, Delás J, Sort D, Pujadas R, Rosell F. [Evaluation of a home-based intervention in heart failure patients. Results of a randomized study]. Rev Esp Cardiol. 2005;58(6):618-25. PMID: 15970116

19. Ware P, Dorai M, Ross HJ, Cafazzo JA, Laporte A, Boodoo C, et al. Patient Adherence to a Mobile Phone-Based Heart Failure Telemonitoring Program: A Longitudinal Mixed-Methods Study. JMIR mHealth uHealth. 2019;7(2):e13259. PMID: 30806625

20. Kumar S, Nilsen WJ, Abernethy A, Atienza A, Patrick K, Pavel M, et al. Mobile health technology evaluation: the mHealth evidence workshop. Am J Prev Med. 2013;45(2):228–36. PMID: 23867031

21. Steinhubl SR, Muse ED, Topol EJ. The emerging field of mobile health. Sci Transl Med. 2015;7(283):283rv3. PMID: 25877894

22. Speier W, Dzubur E, Zide M, Shufelt C, Joung S, van Eyk JE, et al. Evaluating utility and compliance in a patient-based eHealth study using continuous-time heart rate and activity trackers. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2018;25(10):1386–91. PMID: 29850807

23. Roque NA, Boot WR. A New Tool for Assessing Mobile Device Proficiency in Older Adults: The Mobile Device Proficiency Questionnaire. J Appl Gerontol. 2018;37(2):131-156. PMID: 27255686

24. Criteria Committee of New York Heart Association. In: Nomenclature and Criteria for Diagnosis of Diseases of the Heart and Great Blood Vessels. Ninth Edition. Dolgin M, editor. Boston: Little, Brown & Co; 1994.

25. Arozullah AM, Yarnold PR, Bennett CL, Soltysik RC, Wolf MS, Ferreira RM, et al. Development and validation of a short-form, rapid estimate of adult literacy in medicine. Med Care. 2007;45(11):1026–33. PMID: 18049342

26. Rutten LJ, Davis T, Beckjord EB, Blake K, Moser RP, Hesse BW. Picking up the pace: changes in method and frame for the health information national trends survey (2011-2014). J Health Commun. 2012;17(8):979–89. PMID: 23020763

27. Behlouli H, Feldman DE, Ducharme A, Frenette M, Giannetti N, Grondin F, et al. Identifying relative cut-off scores with neural networks for interpretation of the Minnesota Living with Heart Failure questionnaire. Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc. 2009;2009:6242–6. PMID: 19965089

28. Burke WJ, Roccaforte WH, Wengel SP. The short form of the Geriatric Depression Scale: a comparison with the 30-item form. J Geriatr Psychiatry Neurol. 1991;4(3):173-8. PMID: 1953971

29. Lubben J, Blozik E, Gillmann G, Iliffe S, von Renteln Kruse W, Beck JC, et al. Performance of an abbreviated version of the Lubben social network scale among three European community-dwelling older adult populations. Gerontologist. 2006;46(4):503-13. PMID: 16921004

30. Riegel B, Lee CS, Dickson VV, Carlson B. An update on the self-care of heart failure index. J Cardiovasc Nurs. 2009;24(6):485–97. PMID: 19786884

31. Spertus JA, Jones P, McDonell M, Fan V, Fihn SD. Health status predicts long-term outcome in outpatients with coronary disease. Circulation. 2002;106(1):43–9. PMID: 12093768

32. Green CP, Porter CB, Bresnahan DR, Spertus JA. Development and evaluation of the Kansas City Cardiomyopathy questionnaire: a new health status measure for heart failure. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2000;35(5):1245–55. PMID: 10758967

33. Broderick JE, DeWitt EM, Rothrock N, Crane PK, Forrest CB. Advances in patient-reported outcomes: the NIH PROMIS(®) measures. EGEMS (Wash DC) 2013;1(1):1015. PMID: 25848562

34. Hays RD, Bjorner JB, Revicki DA, Spritzer KL, Cella D. Development of physical and mental health summary scores from the patient-reported outcomes measurement information system (PROMIS) global items. Qual Life Res. 2009;18(7):873–80. PMID: 19543809

35. Downey RG, King C. Missing data in Likert ratings: a comparison of replacement methods. J Gen Psychol. 1998;125(2):175–91. PMID: 9935342

36. Eysenbach G. The law of attrition. J Med Internet Res. 2005;7(1):e11. PMID: 15829473

37. Shaw RJ, Steinberg DM, Bonnet J, Modarai F, George A, Cunningham T, et al. Mobile health devices: will patients actually use them?. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2016;23(3):462-466. PMID: 26911820

38. Sohn A, Speier W, Lan E, Aoki K, Fonarow G, Ong M, et al. Assessment of Heart Failure Patients' Interest in Mobile Health Apps for Self-Care: Survey Study. JMIR Cardio. 2019;3(2):e14332. PMID: 31758788

39. Evangelista LS, Shinnick MA. What do we know about adherence and self-care? J Cardiovasc Nurs. 2008;23(3):250–7. PMID: 18437067

40. Allen LA, O'Connor CM. Management of acute decompensated heart failure. CMAJ. 2007;176(6):797-805. doi:10.1503/cmaj.051620. PMID: 17353535

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health and the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute under grant R56HL135425.

Author Contributions

W.S., G.C.F., M.K.O., C.W.A. made substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work. A.S., E.L., K.A. participated in the acquisition of data. A.S. is responsible for the conception of this analysis, the interpretation of the data, and drafting the work. All authors are responsible for revising critically for important intellectual content, have reviewed the manuscript, and have given final approval of the version submitted. All authors agree to be responsible for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Competing Interests

G.C.F., reports consulting for Abbott, Amgen, Bayer, Janssen, Medtronic, and Novartis.