

# 1 Implementing remote monitoring for COVID-19 patients in 2 primary care

3 Svea Holtz<sup>1,a</sup>, Susanne M. Köhler<sup>1,a,\*</sup>, Peter Jan Chabiera<sup>1</sup>, Nurlan Dauletbaev<sup>2,3,4,5</sup>, Kim  
4 Deutsch<sup>6</sup>, Zoe Oftring<sup>6,11</sup>, Dennis Lawin<sup>7</sup>, Lukas Niekrenz<sup>8</sup>, Teresa Euler<sup>9</sup>, Rainer Gloeckl<sup>10</sup>,  
5 Rembert Koczulla<sup>10</sup>, Gernot Rohde<sup>9</sup>, Michael Dreher<sup>8</sup>, Claus F. Vogelmeier<sup>2</sup>, Sebastian  
6 Kuhn<sup>6,11,a</sup> and Beate Sigrid Müller<sup>1,12,a</sup>

7 <sup>1</sup> Goethe University Frankfurt, Institute of General Practice, 60590 Frankfurt am Main,  
8 Germany

9 <sup>2</sup> Department of Internal, Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, Philipps University of  
10 Marburg, 35043 Marburg, Germany

11 <sup>3</sup> Department of Pediatrics, McGill University, Montreal, QC H4A 3J1, Canada

12 <sup>4</sup> The Research Institute of McGill University Health Centre, Montreal, QC H4A 3J1, Canada

13 <sup>5</sup> al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty 050040, Kazakhstan

14 <sup>6</sup> Department of Digital Medicine, Medical Faculty OWL, Bielefeld University, 33615  
15 Bielefeld, Germany

16 <sup>7</sup> Department of Cardiology and Intensive Care Medicine, University hospital OWL of  
17 Bielefeld University, Campus Klinikum Bielefeld, Bielefeld, Germany

18 <sup>8</sup> Department of Pneumology and Intensive Care Medicine, University Hospital Aachen,  
19 52074 Aachen, Germany

20 <sup>9</sup> Goethe University Frankfurt, University Hospital, Medical Clinic 1, Department of  
21 Respiratory Medicine, 60590 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

22 <sup>10</sup> Schoen Clinic Berchtesgadener Land, Institute for Pulmonary Rehabilitation Research,  
23 83471 Schoenau am Koenigssee, Germany

24 <sup>11</sup> Institute of Digital Medicine, Philipps University of Marburg, 35043 Marburg, Germany

25 <sup>12</sup> Institute of General Practice, University of Cologne, Faculty of Medicine and University  
26 Hospital Cologne, 50937 Cologne, Germany

27 \*Correspondence: Dr. Susanne M. Köhler, Institut für Allgemeinmedizin, Theodor-Stern-Kai  
28 7, 60590 Frankfurt am Main, Germany, koehler@allgemeinmedizin.uni-frankfurt.de

29 <sup>a</sup> Shared first authorship and shared last authorship

## 30 **Abstract**

### 31 **Background**

32 In Germany, most patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) are treated in an  
33 outpatient setting. To improve assessments of the health status of COVID-19 outpatients,  
34 various remote monitoring models have been developed. However, little information exists  
35 on experiences acquired with remote monitoring in an outpatient setting, particularly from a  
36 patient perspective. The aim of our 'COVID-19@home' study was therefore to implement  
37 and evaluate an app-based remote monitoring concept for acute and post-acute COVID-19-  
38 patients in primary care. In this paper, we focus on the patients' evaluation of our remote  
39 monitoring approach.

### 40 **Methods**

41 Patients with acute COVID-19 measured heart rate, blood pressure, oxygen saturation, and  
42 body temperature daily for 28 days. Patients with post-acute COVID-19 determined the  
43 same parameters for 12 weeks, supplemented by lung parameters and daily step count. The  
44 data were documented using the 'SaniQ' smartphone app. COVID-19 symptoms were  
45 assessed daily using an app-based questionnaire. Patients' GPs could access the data on the  
46 'SaniQ Praxis' telemedicine platform. We used an app-based questionnaire consisting of 11  
47 questions presented with a 4-point Likert scale to evaluate patient satisfaction. Data were  
48 analyzed descriptively.

### 49 **Results**

50 Of the 51 patients aged 19-77 years that participated in the study, 42 completed the  
51 questionnaire. All patients rated home monitoring as 'very good' or 'rather good' and were  
52 able to integrate the measuring processes into their daily routines. Overall, 93% would  
53 recommend the app and the measuring devices to their family and friends. About 60% felt  
54 that their COVID-19 treatment had benefited from home monitoring. Only few patients were  
55 unsettled by the app and use of the measuring devices. During the course of the study, the  
56 implementation process was optimized.

### 57 **Conclusions**

58 The use of remote monitoring in COVID-19 patients is feasible and was evaluated positively  
59 by most study patients. However, it is difficult to imagine how general practices could cope  
60 with monitoring patients with acute diseases without any further organizational support.

61 Future research should address cost-effectiveness and changes in such clinical outcomes as  
62 hospitalization and mortality.

63 **Keywords**

64 Primary Health Care; telemedicine; COVID-19; mobile applications; patient satisfaction

## 65 **1. Introduction**

66 In Germany, the majority of patients with a severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2  
67 (SARS-CoV-2) infection are treated in an outpatient setting. This was true for 6/7 patients in  
68 the first phase of the pandemic and thereafter for 32/33 patients, as a result of milder  
69 disease courses in vaccinated patients [1]. While most patients present with mild or  
70 moderate symptoms [2], some develop severe clinical outcomes and require hospitalization.  
71 Despite receiving such treatment as invasive mechanical ventilation, or kidney replacement  
72 therapy, some of these patients may die [3]. The early identification of patients showing  
73 preliminary signs of deterioration is therefore crucial, since early interventions, including  
74 hospitalization, are associated with better outcomes and prognoses [4]. Furthermore, the  
75 severity of symptoms may not adequately reflect organ damage, especially as coronavirus  
76 disease 2019 (COVID-19) is sometimes associated with ‘silent hypoxia’, an abrupt and  
77 initially asymptomatic drop in oxygen saturation [5, 6]. Standardized monitoring of blood  
78 oxygen saturation is expected to enable the timely recognition of patients requiring  
79 treatment escalation [6–8].

80 To better assess the health status of outpatients with COVID-19, health care providers in  
81 several countries reacted to the global outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 by applying remote  
82 monitoring solutions [9, 10]. Some providers, for example, used (video) phone-calls to gather  
83 information, while others developed mobile applications (apps) to collect data on vital signs  
84 [9]. However, both general practitioners and patients have little experience of using remote  
85 monitoring for acute diseases [11].

86 We therefore initiated the ‘Covid-19@home’ study, with the aim of implementing and  
87 evaluating a remote monitoring concept for COVID-19-patients, i.e. patients with an acute  
88 disease, in primary care. We used the ‘SaniQ’ app and the corresponding ‘SaniQ Praxis’  
89 telemonitoring platform [12]. In this paper, we focus on participating patients’ adherence  
90 and their evaluation of our approach to remote monitoring, as well as the optimization of  
91 the implementation process.

## 92 **2. Methods**

### 93 **Study design and setting**

94 We conducted a prospective observational study (COVID-19@home) in Frankfurt, Germany.  
95 The study was carried out from January to December 2021, whereby the period from

96 January 2021 to July 2021 was a pilot phase to optimize the implementation process. The  
97 data presented in this study were collected between January and November 2021. For this  
98 paper, we followed STROBE reporting guidelines for cohort studies, where applicable [13].

### 99 **Study registration and ethical approval**

100 COVID-19@home was part of the egePan Unimed project, and one of the thirteen projects  
101 that make up 'Netzwerk Universitätsmedizin' [14]. It was registered in the German Clinical  
102 Trials Register (DRKS00024604, [https://www.drks.de/drks\\_web/setLocale\\_EN.do](https://www.drks.de/drks_web/setLocale_EN.do),  
103 26.04.2021). The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Goethe University  
104 Frankfurt (No. 20-1023, 18.01.2021), and written informed consent was obtained from all  
105 participants.

### 106 **GPs**

107 Eight GPs participated in the study. Seven of them belonged to a research network of  
108 general practices in Hesse, Germany (ForN) and were recruited after participating in a virtual  
109 network meeting. One GP agreed to participate after receiving an invitation to participate by  
110 mail. All GPs provided written informed consent prior to study participation. Qurasoft  
111 GmbH, Koblenz, Germany, provided each GP with his or her own password-protected user  
112 account for version 1.x of the SaniQ Praxis telemonitoring platform free of charge. Before  
113 recruiting patients, each GP attended a 30-minute one-on-one online training session on  
114 how to use the platform. The session was conducted by the software company Qurasoft  
115 GmbH using Microsoft Teams software. GPs did not receive any compensation for their  
116 participation.

### 117 **Patients**





118 Participating GPs asked patients that had had a PCR test for COVID-19 at their practice if  
119 they wished to participate. They were included in the study if their PCR test result was  
120 positive (acute COVID-19 patients). Patients that were being treated by their GPs for  
121 persistent COVID-19 symptoms (post-acute COVID-19 patients) were also asked if they  
122 wanted to participate. Patients had to be aged  $\geq 18$  years and have access to a smartphone  
123 that they, or someone in the same household, was able to use. GPs decided which patients  
124 to invite. They handed out a flyer that contained information on the study, and the phone  
125 number and email address of the study team. Patients could then contact the study team via  
126 telephone or email if they were interested in participating. The study team at the Institute of  
127 General Practice at Goethe University Frankfurt answered all questions by telephone.

128 Patients received detailed written study information and were required to give their written  
129 informed consent. They were also informed that neither the study team nor the treating GP  
130 provided 24/7-supervision, and that they were required to monitor their vital signs  
131 themselves. In case of medical queries, patients were advised to call their GPs or the  
132 emergency services. They were further required to confirm that they had understood these  
133 conditions on the consent form. Study participation was voluntary and could be terminated  
134 at any time. The patients received no monetary compensation but were permitted to keep  
135 the measuring devices.

### 136 **Measuring devices and patient app**

137 The patients received the required measuring equipment within 48 hours of inclusion in the  
138 study, so they could quickly begin monitoring their vital signs. Acute COVID-19 patients  
139 received a pulse oximeter, a blood pressure monitor, and a non-contact thermometer, while  
140 post-acute patients additionally received a peak flow and FEV1 meter, and an activity sensor  
141 (see table 1). Patients were also provided with two codes to activate and authorize the  
142 smartphone app 'SaniQ' (module 'Infekt'). All equipment was provided free of charge. After  
143 installing the app and entering the activation code, the patients used the devices to measure  
144 their health parameters. Data were entered into the app manually, or transmitted from the  
145 devices via Bluetooth®. The app was used to document the measured data and patients  
146 could view the data in the app (raw data and graphs), enabling them to monitor the course  
147 of the disease themselves. When a health parameter fell outside the normal range, the app  
148 sent an in-app notification or email to the patient (alert) stating that, for example, 'The  
149 measured value for your heart rate is outside the normal range. Please repeat the  
150 measurement. In case of uncertainty, contact your GP practice, or the emergency services.'  
151 During business hours, the study team could be reached on the telephone to answer  
152 questions that were unrelated to health. Additionally, the app and platform provider  
153 (Qurasoft GmbH) provided a hotline for technical problems.

154 **Table 1.** Measuring devices used in the study

| Device                   | Image   | Model   |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| Pulse oximeter           | <br>[12]   | Beurer PO 60 pulse oximeter, Beurer GmbH, Ulm, Germany                              |
| Blood pressure monitor   | <br>[12]   | Aponorm Basis Plus Bluetooth, WEPA APOTHEKENBEDARF GmbH & Co KG, Montabaur, Germany |
| Non-contact thermometer  | <br>[12]   | Beurer FT 95 non-contact thermometer, Beurer GmbH, Ulm, Germany                     |
| Peak flow and FEV1 meter | <br>[12]  | Smart One, MIR - Medical International Research s.r.l., Rome, Italy                 |
| Activity sensor          | <br>[12] | Beurer AS 99 Activity Tracker, Beurer GmbH, Ulm, Germany                            |

155 **Remote monitoring platform**

156 By entering an authorization code, patients could link their account to their GP's 'SaniQ  
 157 Praxis' account, thus permitting them to view their data. Developments in their vital signs  
 158 were displayed as a list or graph. GPs decided individually – i.e. according to a patient's risk  
 159 profile and the course of the disease - how often to check a patient's data. Upper and lower  
 160 limits for the vital signs were defined in accordance with standard operating procedures  
 161 (SOPs) of participating pneumology departments and the COVID-19 treatment  
 162 recommendations available at the time [15] (see supplementary material table S.1). GPs  
 163 could also tailor these predefined limits to suit the needs of individual patients. If a vital sign  
 164 was outside the limits, the patient's GP received an automatic email from 'SaniQ Praxis'  
 165 informing him or her accordingly. The GP could then check the available data on the

166 platform and contact the patient if necessary. The optional alarm function could be  
167 deactivated by GPs for each individual patient.

## 168 **Data collection**

### 169 a. Measurements

170 For 28 days, acute patients measured their heart rate, blood pressure, SpO<sub>2</sub>, and body  
171 temperature once a day. Post-acute patients determined the same vital signs for 12 weeks,  
172 supplemented by lung parameters (peak flow [PEF], forced expiratory pressure in 1 second  
173 [FEV1]) and activity parameters (daily step count).

### 174 b. Questionnaires

175 Patients filled in three in-app questionnaires consisting of questions relating to their medical  
176 history, daily symptoms and views on remote monitoring:

177 The medical history questionnaire included questions on current COVID-19 symptoms,  
178 relevant pre-existing medical conditions and current medication. Overall, the medical history  
179 questionnaire consisted of 35 questions requiring yes or no answers (see supplementary  
180 material table S.2) and was developed on the basis of available publications [16–19]. As the  
181 pandemic was evolving rapidly and studies in an ambulatory setting were urgently needed,  
182 the first patients were included while the questionnaire was still under development. The  
183 study team therefore took the medical history of the first 22 patients by phone, and filled in  
184 their medical history questionnaires retrospectively. In response to new research findings  
185 (e.g. skin rashes), further questions on symptoms were added later.

186 The second questionnaire consisted of seven questions on the most common COVID-19  
187 symptoms. It was based on the SOPs of participating pneumology departments, DEGAM  
188 recommendations, and validated questionnaires on fatigue and shortness of breath [20–22].

189 Patients received the questionnaire daily for the duration of their participation in the study.

190 After completion of the study, patients were asked to fill in an evaluation questionnaire that  
191 asked about their experiences and satisfaction with remote monitoring (see supplementary  
192 material table S.3). The 11 questions were presented with a 4-point Likert scale and based  
193 on validated questionnaires on telemedicine satisfaction and telehealth usability [23–26].

194 Patients that stopped taking measurements before completing the study also received an  
195 evaluation questionnaire and, if necessary, a telephone or email reminder at the end of the  
196 study period.



197 **Data analysis**

198 A certified server hosted in Germany was used as an online platform to store all data. Patient  
199 data were exported from the platform in a comma-separated values (csv) format. Personal  
200 data were pseudonymized before analysis. We used Microsoft Excel 2016 to descriptively  
201 analyze the data. Continuous variables such as age are provided with their mean and  
202 standard deviation, while absolute and relative frequencies are provided for discrete data.  
203 The results also include information on the sample size n.

204 **3. Results**

205 **Sample Characteristics**

206 Overall, 51 outpatients participated in the COVID-19@home study, of whom 32 were acute  
207 COVID-19 patients and 19 post-acute patients. Patients were between 19 and 77 years old,  
208 and their mean age was 48.7 (SD: 12.5). Thirty women (58.8%) and 21 men (41.2%)  
209 participated. Eight (15.7%) patients were obese (body mass index 30 or more). Information  
210 on further pre-existing conditions were provided by 48 patients (94.1%), of whom 10 (20.8%)  
211 had one risk factor for a potentially severe course of COVID-19, eight (16.7%) had two, and  
212 three (6.3%) had three risk factors. Eight patients had cardiovascular disease (16.7%), while  
213 six each had diabetes mellitus or lung disease (12.5%). The patients reported a mean of 4.2  
214 symptoms upon study inclusion (SD: 2.8, minimum: 0, maximum: 11) (see table 2).

215 **Table 2.** COVID-19 symptoms (n=50)

| Questionnaire Item                      | Acute patients         |                |      | Post-acute patients    |                |      |
|---|------------------------|----------------|------|------------------------|----------------|------|
|   | n (total) <sup>1</sup> | n <sup>2</sup> | %    | n (total) <sup>1</sup> | n <sup>2</sup> | %    |
| Number of symptoms upon study inclusion | 31                     |                | 100  | 19                     |                | 100  |
| • 0                                     |                        | 0              | 0.0  |                        | 7              | 36.8 |
| • 1-3                                   |                        | 10             | 32.3 |                        | 4              | 21.1 |
| • 4-6                                   |                        | 13             | 41.9 |                        | 6              | 31.6 |
| • 7-9                                   |                        | 7              | 22.6 |                        | 2              | 10.5 |
| • ≥10                                   |                        | 1              | 3.2  |                        | 0              | 0.0  |
| <b>Symptoms upon study inclusion</b>    |                        |                |      |                        |                |      |

|                              |    |    |      |    |    |      |
|------------------------------|----|----|------|----|----|------|
| Lethargy/exhaustion          | 29 | 26 | 89.7 | 19 | 10 | 52.6 |
| Headache/dizziness           | 10 | 8  | 80.0 | 19 | 7  | 36.8 |
| Cough                        | 31 | 23 | 74.2 | 19 | 4  | 21.1 |
| Pain in muscles/joints       | 28 | 20 | 71.4 | 19 | 4  | 21.1 |
| Difficulty concentrating     | 10 | 5  | 50.0 | 19 | 8  | 42.1 |
| Head cold                    | 29 | 12 | 41.4 | 19 | 3  | 15.8 |
| Sore throat                  | 30 | 12 | 40.0 | 19 | 3  | 15.8 |
| Gastro-intestinal complaints | 30 | 12 | 40.0 | 19 | 0  | 0.0  |
| Fever/chills                 | 31 | 11 | 35.5 | 19 | 1  | 5.3  |
| Smell/taste impairment       | 30 | 11 | 36.7 | 19 | 6  | 31.6 |
| Breathing difficulties       | 30 | 9  | 30.0 | 19 | 4  | 21.1 |
| Chest pain                   | 30 | 6  | 20.0 | 19 | 0  | 0.0  |
| Skin rash                    | 26 | 3  | 11.5 | 19 | 2  | 10.5 |

216 <sup>1</sup>n (total): number of patients being asked about symptoms. Differences in n (total) reflect  
217 regular updates to the medical history questionnaire.

218 <sup>2</sup>n: number of patients with symptoms.

## 219 **Participation**

220 Acute patients started taking measurements 1 to 26 days after receiving their positive PCR  
221 test result, or an average of 5.7 days (SD: 5.7). Patients with post-acute symptoms began 22  
222 to 447 days after receiving their positive PCR test result (mean: 152.4, SD: 112.6).

223 Adherence to daily measuring was high, with 93.8% of acute patients and 89.5% of post-  
224 acute patients measuring vital signs as intended. The overall dropout rate was 7.8% (four  
225 patients).

## 226 **Evaluation**

227 Overall, 48 patients received the evaluation questionnaire and 42 (87.5%) completed it. Of  
228 the respondents, 31 (73.8%) had 'rarely' or 'never' recorded their health data before.

229 Nevertheless, 39 patients, or 92.9% 'completely agreed' or 'partially agreed' that they had  
230 managed to cope with using the app and measuring devices. All 42 respondents (100%)  
231 'completely agreed' or 'partially agreed' that they 'could comfortably integrate  
232 measurement-taking' into their daily routines. Overall, 34 patients (81.0%) managed to deal  
233 with the app and devices on their own and 'rarely' or 'never' required aid in using them. Use

234 of the app and measuring devices rarely seemed to have unsettled users: 38 (90.5%) of our  
 235 cohort ‘partially disagreed’ or ‘disagreed’ that they had ‘experienced uncertainty when using  
 236 the app and measuring devices’.

237 Twenty-five patients (59.5%) agreed that treatment of their COVID-19 illness had benefited  
 238 from remote monitoring. Patients’ overall opinion of remote monitoring was very positive,  
 239 with all 42 respondents describing it as ‘very good’ or ‘rather good’ (100%). Moreover, 39 of  
 240 them (92.9%) would recommend the app and measuring devices to their family and friends  
 241 (see table 3 for more details).

242 **Table 3.** Evaluation of ‘SaniQ’ app and measuring devices (n = 42)

| Questionnaire Item  | n  | %    |
|---|----|------|
| <b><i>Previous experience of recording health data</i></b>        |    |      |
| Regularly   | 6  | 14.3 |
| Sometimes   | 5  | 11.9 |
| Rarely  | 8  | 19.0 |
| Never   | 23 | 54.8 |
| <b><i>Coped with using the app and measuring devices</i></b>      |    |      |
| Completely agreed   | 30 | 71.4 |
| Partially agreed  | 9  | 21.4 |
| Partially disagreed   | 3  | 7.1  |
| Completely disagreed  | 0  | 0    |
| <b><i>Easy integration into everyday life</i></b>                 |    |      |
| Completely agreed   | 27 | 64.3 |
| Partially agreed  | 15 | 35.7 |
| Partially disagreed   | 0  | 0    |
| Completely disagreed  | 0  | 0    |
| <b><i>Required aid in using the app and measuring devices</i></b> |    |      |
| Regularly   | 3  | 7.1  |
| Sometimes   | 5  | 11.9 |
| Rarely  | 6  | 14.3 |
| Never   | 28 | 66.7 |
| <b><i>Treatment benefited from remote monitoring</i></b>          |    |      |

|  |    |      |
|--|----|------|
| Completely agreed  | 12 | 28.6 |
| Partially agreed   | 13 | 31.0 |
| Partially disagreed  | 13 | 31.0 |
| Completely disagreed   | 4  | 9.5  |
| <b><i>Experienced uncertainty when using the app and measuring devices</i></b> |    |      |
| Completely agreed  | 0  | 0    |
| Partially agreed   | 4  | 9.5  |
| Partially disagreed  | 10 | 23.8 |
| Completely disagreed   | 28 | 66.7 |
| <b><i>Overall assessment of remote monitoring</i></b>                          |    |      |
| Very good  | 30 | 71.4 |
| Rather good  | 12 | 28.6 |
| Rather poor  | 0  | 0    |
| Very poor  | 0  | 0    |
| <b><i>Recommendation of app to friends and family</i></b>                      |    |      |
| Yes  | 34 | 81.0 |
| Yes, probably  | 5  | 11.9 |
| No, probably not   | 3  | 7.1  |
| No   | 0  | 0    |

243

#### 244 **Changes to the implementation process**

245 In order to include acute patients as quickly as possible the study team put on full protection  
246 gear to avoid infection and handed over the consent forms and measuring devices in person.  
247 Afterwards, consent forms were returned via email. The measuring devices were sent to  
248 patients via express mail, as this proved to be reliable and fast enough (delivery within 48  
249 hours).

250 We also distributed a detailed manual provided by the software partner, which resulted in a  
251 sharp drop in the number of calls due to technical problems.

252 As the pandemic was evolving rapidly and studies were urgently needed in an ambulatory  
253 setting, we started enrolling patients in January 2021, even though the development of our  
254 in-app questionnaires had not yet been finalized. During the pilot phase, we took patients'  
255 medical histories and gathered information on their COVID-19 symptoms by telephone.

256 Further questions on symptoms were added when new research findings were published  
257 (e.g. gastro-intestinal complaints, skin rashes). The evaluation questionnaire was presented  
258 to 48/51 patients.

## 259 **4. Discussion**

### 260 **Main findings**

261 We implemented a remote monitoring concept for COVID-19 outpatients. Patients used the  
262 included app to self-monitor their vital parameters and symptoms daily. GPs could then view  
263 the results on a software platform. Patient adherence was high with 93.8% of acute patients  
264 and 89.5% of post-acute patients measuring vital signs as intended. All patients that  
265 completed an evaluation questionnaire rated the app as 'very good' or 'rather good'. Almost  
266 all patients would recommend the app and measuring devices to their families and friends.  
267 We optimized the implementation process during the pilot phase.

### 268 **Findings in relation to the literature**

269 Our study is one of only a few to focus on patients' use of remote monitoring to  
270 communicate with their GP practice [27]. In contrast to other studies and in order to gain  
271 broad experience, we included patients of all ages and with any pre-existing conditions.  
272 Several studies on remote monitoring have, however, investigated COVID-19 patients that  
273 required ongoing supervision and treatment in secondary settings, such as pre-admission  
274 wards, virtual wards, or that were receiving care in a 'hospital at home' (following an early  
275 release from hospital) [9, 28, 29]. Some studies included all patients suspected of having  
276 COVID-19, regardless of their PCR test results [30]. In our study, however, a positive PCR  
277 result was an inclusion criterion, which allowed us to focus on COVID-19 patients and their  
278 specific needs (e.g., self-isolation at home).

279 International studies on remote monitoring generally used pulse oximetry, while only a few  
280 used non-contact thermometers and blood pressure monitors [9, 28]. Telephone-, app- and  
281 paper-based protocols were used for data transfer [9, 28, 31, 32]. We decided to use an app  
282 to ensure instant documentation and data transfer, a low risk of transmission errors, and  
283 greater opportunities for data analysis. We managed to enrol acute COVID-19 patients  
284 quickly, and included them in our study a median of 3.5 days after a positive PCR test result.  
285 While other studies also emphasized the importance of speed, they provided no exact  
286 enrolment data [9].

287 Several authors have concluded that remote monitoring cannot be successful unless  
288 patients' needs are taken into account [7, 28]. A lack of patient training, technical barriers,  
289 and insufficient usability appear to explain most patient dropouts [11, 28, 33]. In our study,  
290 some patients experienced initial difficulties installing the app and connecting the measuring  
291 devices. We therefore added a detailed manual to emails and packages containing the  
292 devices. This resulted in a sharp drop in the number of calls due to technical problems, and  
293 the overall dropout rate was low (7.8%). Patients' evaluations indicate that our remote  
294 monitoring concept is suitable for patients that have no experience of recording health data.  
295 However, patients without German language skills could not participate in our remote  
296 monitoring program, unlike some remote home monitoring models in the UK that developed  
297 culturally appropriate patient information in different languages [28].  
298 Our patients were advised to monitor their vital signs 'at least once a day'. However, the  
299 frequency with which they measured them varied. This complicated data management,  
300 analysis and interpretation. We would therefore recommend specifying frequency more  
301 precisely in future studies. It might also be appropriate to adjust the frequency of  
302 measurements over the course of the disease and to intensify it in high-risk acute COVID-19  
303 patients, as was the case in a study on remote monitoring conducted in Tuscany [34]. To  
304 raise compliance, post-acute patients might also be asked to take their measurements less  
305 often, e. g. three times a week.

### 306 **Strengths and limitations**

307 Despite the relatively small sample size, our study provides real-world experience from  
308 patients who used the app intensively over a long period of time. They were thus able to  
309 accumulate considerable experience of remote monitoring, which increased the informative  
310 value of our evaluation results.

311 However, our study also has several limitations. As our questionnaires were still under  
312 development when the pilot phase began, they were partially conducted on the telephone  
313 and partially via the app itself. Furthermore, the medical history questionnaire evolved  
314 throughout the study to take account of new scientific findings on COVID-19 symptoms,  
315 limiting the generalizability of our results. In addition, we did not use a validated  
316 questionnaire, and several adjustments were made to the implementation process during  
317 the course of the study. At the beginning of the study, for example, we wore full protective  
318 gear to avoid infection and provided the consent forms and measuring devices in person.

319 Afterwards, consent forms were distributed and collected via email, and measuring devices  
320 were sent to patients using express mail. As a result, the processes assessed by the patients  
321 were not identical, which may have limited the validity of our results.  
322 However, as these modifications mainly concerned organizational processes, and the self-  
323 monitoring process remained unchanged, we would expect their influence on the evaluation  
324 to have been small. As quarantine limited technical support options, our approach to remote  
325 monitoring was only suitable for patients that owned a smartphone and were familiar with  
326 installing and using apps. It was therefore impossible to include persons that were unable to  
327 use the technical infrastructure. This also applied to people with language barriers or  
328 disabilities that would have prevented them from using the app and devices. In future  
329 research, attempts should be made to make remote monitoring possible for these people,  
330 too. Future research should also address cost-effectiveness and changes in such clinical  
331 outcomes as hospitalization and mortality, which we did not consider.

## 332 **5. Conclusion**

333 In this study, we implemented remote monitoring among COVID-19 outpatients and  
334 iteratively optimized our approach during a pilot phase. During the implementation process,  
335 we learned that the success of remote monitoring depends on certain conditions being  
336 fulfilled. First, non-contact delivery of measuring devices should be arranged for acute  
337 COVID-19 patients as soon as possible after the disease is diagnosed. Second, patients need  
338 precise and comprehensive instructions on how to correctly install and use the app and  
339 measuring devices. Patients' evaluations indicate that most patients then accepted and were  
340 able to use remote monitoring as we intended. Third, as some patients initially experienced  
341 technical difficulties, background support was required to ensure both patient adherence  
342 and that the system worked as planned. However, it is difficult to imagine how general  
343 practices could cope with these additional tasks. Sufficient patient and practice support  
344 should therefore be provided if the model is to be implemented on a larger or even  
345 nationwide scale.

## 346 **Acknowledgments**

347 The authors would like to express their thanks to all participating patients and GPs. We are  
348 also grateful to Phillip Elliott for the language review of the paper.

## 349 **Funding**

350 This research was funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research, BMBF,  
351 grant number 01KX2021.

## 352 **Competing interest statement**

353 The institutions of S.H., S.M.K., P.J.C., N.D., L.N., T.E., R.G., R.K., G.R., M.D., C.F.V. and B.S.M  
354 received funding for this study from the German Federal Ministry of Education and  
355 Research, BMBF, grant number 01KX2021. The funder had no role in the design of the study;  
356 in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript, or in  
357 the decision to publish the results. P.J.C. is an employee at OncologyInformationService e.K.  
358 N.D. has received the CSL Behring award ‘Translational Research on Extracellular Vesicles in  
359 COPD’. R.K. and R.G. have been involved in projects and publications using the Kaia COPD  
360 App. SK is founder and managing partner of MED.digital GmbH. He holds shares of BioNTech,  
361 Pfizer, and CRISPR Therapeutics. He is member of the commission ‘New Professions’ of  
362 Stiftung Münch and of several committees of the German Medical Association  
363 (‘Digitalization of health care’ and ‘Medical Education and University Medicine’). B.S.M. has  
364 received personal honoraria for scientific consultancy to health insurance fund ‘Die  
365 Techniker’. The remaining authors declare no conflict of interest.

## 366 **Availability of data and materials**

367 The datasets generated and analyzed during the study are available from the corresponding  
368 author on reasonable request.

## 369 **References**

- 370 1. KBV. Ambulante Versorgung in der Corona-Pandemie.  
371 [https://www.kbv.de/media/sp/Ambulante\\_Versorgung\\_Corona\\_Pandemie\\_Zahlen\\_Fakten.pdf](https://www.kbv.de/media/sp/Ambulante_Versorgung_Corona_Pandemie_Zahlen_Fakten.pdf). Accessed 9 Nov 2022.  
372
- 373 2. Neef V, Piekarski F, Zacharowski K, Raimann FJ. SARS-CoV-2-Pandemie – eine Meta-  
374 Analyse zur Klinik, Diagnostik und Therapie der Infektion. Anästh Intensivmed.  
375 2020;61:480–91. doi:10.19224/ai2020.480.
- 376 3. Richardson S, Hirsch JS, Narasimhan M, Crawford JM, McGinn T, Davidson KW, et al.  
377 Presenting Characteristics, Comorbidities, and Outcomes Among 5700 Patients



- 378 Hospitalized With COVID-19 in the New York City Area. *JAMA*. 2020;323:2052–9.  
379 doi:10.1001/jama.2020.6775.
- 380 4. Gandhi RT, Lynch JB, Del Rio C. Mild or Moderate Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*.  
381 2020;383:1757–66. doi:10.1056/NEJMcp2009249.
- 382 5. Rahman A, Tabassum T, Araf Y, Al Nahid A, Ullah MA, Hosen MJ. Silent hypoxia in COVID-  
383 19: pathomechanism and possible management strategy. *Mol biol rep*. 2021;48:3863–9.  
384 doi:10.1007/s11033-021-06358-1.
- 385 6. Levitan RM. Pulse Oximetry as a Biomarker for Early Identification and Hospitalization of  
386 COVID-19 Pneumonia. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2020;27:785–6. doi:10.1111/acem.14052.
- 387 7. Greenhalgh T, Knight M, Inda-Kim M, Fulop NJ, Leach J, Vindrola-Padros C. Remote  
388 management of covid-19 using home pulse oximetry and virtual ward support. *BMJ*.  
389 2021;372:n677. doi:10.1136/bmj.n677.
- 390 8. Shah S, Majmudar K, Stein A, Gupta N, Suppes S, Karamanis M, et al. Novel Use of Home  
391 Pulse Oximetry Monitoring in COVID-19 Patients Discharged From the Emergency  
392 Department Identifies Need for Hospitalization. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2020;27:681–92.  
393 doi:10.1111/acem.14053.
- 394 9. Vindrola-Padros C, Singh KE, Sidhu MS, Georghiou T, Sherlaw-Johnson C, Tomini SM, et  
395 al. Remote home monitoring (virtual wards) during the COVID-19 pandemic: a  
396 systematic review. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.10.07.20208587.  
397 doi:10.1101/2020.10.07.20208587.
- 398 10. Bokolo AJ. Use of Telemedicine and Virtual Care for Remote Treatment in Response to  
399 COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Med Syst*. 2020;44:132. doi:10.1007/s10916-020-01596-5.
- 400 11. Flodgren G, Rachas A, Farmer AJ, Inzitari M, Shepperd S. Interactive telemedicine: effects  
401 on professional practice and health care outcomes. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*.  
402 2015:CD002098. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD002098.pub2.
- 403 12. SaniQ. 2022. <https://saniq.org/>. Accessed 22 Mar 2022.
- 404 13. Elm E von, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The  
405 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE)  
406 statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2008;61:344–  
407 9. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.008.

- 408 14. Netzwerk Universitätsmedizin. Projekte. Forschungsarbeiten für die bestmögliche  
409 Patientenversorgung. 2022. <https://www.netzwerk-universitaetsmedizin.de/>. Accessed  
410 5 Dec 2022.
- 411 15. Greenhalgh T, Thompson P, Weiringa S, Neves AL, Husain L, Dunlop M, et al. What items  
412 should be included in an early warning score for remote assessment of suspected  
413 COVID-19? qualitative and Delphi study. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10:e042626.  
414 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-042626.
- 415 16. Hübner A, Kiefl D, Baacke M, Zöllner R, Loza Mencía E, Schellein O, et al.  
416 Risikostratifizierung durch Implementierung und Evaluation eines COVID-19-Scores : Eine  
417 retrospektive Diagnostikstudie. [Risk stratification through implementation and  
418 evaluation of a COVID-19 score : A retrospective diagnostic study]. *Med Klin Intensivmed  
419 Notfmed*. 2020;115:132–8. doi:10.1007/s00063-020-00754-4.
- 420 17. Docherty AB, Harrison EM, Green CA, Hardwick HE, Pius R, Norman L, et al. Features of  
421 20 133 UK patients in hospital with covid-19 using the ISARIC WHO Clinical  
422 Characterisation Protocol: prospective observational cohort study. *BMJ*.  
423 2020;369:m1985. doi:10.1136/bmj.m1985.
- 424 18. Brian E. Dixon, Kara Wools-Kaloustian, William F. Fadel, Thomas J. Duszynski, Constantin  
425 Yiannoutsos, Paul K. Halverson, Nir Menachemi. Symptoms and symptom clusters  
426 associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection in community-based populations: Results from a  
427 statewide epidemiological study.
- 428 19. Patienten-Info zum Coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2): Symptom-Checkliste für SARS-CoV-2.  
429 07.06.2022. [https://thieme-](https://thieme-compliance.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Download/Informationsmaterialien/Coronavirus/de/symptomchecker.html)  
430 [compliance.de/fileadmin/user\\_upload/Download/Informationsmaterialien/Coronavirus/  
431 de/symptomchecker.html](https://thieme-compliance.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Download/Informationsmaterialien/Coronavirus/de/symptomchecker.html). Accessed 23 Nov 2022.
- 432 20. Chalder T, Berelowitz G, Pawlikowska T, Watts L, Wessely S, Wright D, Wallace EP.  
433 Development of a fatigue scale. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*. 1993;37:147–53.  
434 doi:10.1016/0022-3999(93)90081-P.
- 435 21. Eakin EG, Resnikoff PM, Prewitt LM, Ries AL, Kaplan RM. Validation of a new dyspnea  
436 measure: the UCSD Shortness of Breath Questionnaire. University of California, San  
437 Diego. *Chest*. 1998;113:619–24. doi:10.1378/chest.113.3.619.
- 438 22. DEGAM. SARS-CoV-2/-Covid-19-Informationen & Praxishilfen für niedergelassene  
439 Hausärztinnen und Hausärzte: S2e-Leitlinie. 2022.

- 440 [https://register.awmf.org/assets/guidelines/053-054l\\_S2e\\_SARS-CoV-2-Covid-19-](https://register.awmf.org/assets/guidelines/053-054l_S2e_SARS-CoV-2-Covid-19-Informationen-Praxishilfen-Hausaerztinnen-Hausaerzte_2022-02_2.pdf)  
441 [Informationen-Praxishilfen-Hausaerztinnen-Hausaerzte\\_2022-02\\_2.pdf](https://register.awmf.org/assets/guidelines/053-054l_S2e_SARS-CoV-2-Covid-19-Informationen-Praxishilfen-Hausaerztinnen-Hausaerzte_2022-02_2.pdf). Accessed 5 Dec  
442 2022.
- 443 23. Finkelstein SM, MacMahon K, Lindgren BR, Robiner WN, Lindquist R, VanWormer A,  
444 Hertz MI. Development of a remote monitoring satisfaction survey and its use in a  
445 clinical trial with lung transplant recipients. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2012;18:42–6.  
446 doi:10.1258/jtt.2011.110413.
- 447 24. PARMANTO B, LEWIS AN, GRAHAM KM, BERTOLET MH. Development of the Telehealth  
448 Usability Questionnaire (TUQ). *Int J Telerehabil*. 2016;8:3–10. doi:10.5195/ijt.2016.6196.
- 449 25. Ruiz Díaz MA, Egea García M, Muñoz Aguilera R, Viñolas Prat X, Silvestre García J, Álvarez  
450 Orozco M, Martínez Ferrer J. Patient satisfaction with remote monitoring of cardiac  
451 implantable electronic devices: the VALIOSA questionnaire. *BMC Health Serv Res*.  
452 2020;20:354. doi:10.1186/s12913-020-05216-3.
- 453 26. Yip MP, Chang AM, Chan J, MacKenzie AE. Development of the Telemedicine Satisfaction  
454 Questionnaire to evaluate patient satisfaction with telemedicine: a preliminary study. *J*  
455 *Telemed Telecare*. 2003;9:46–50. doi:10.1258/135763303321159693.
- 456 27. Wurzer D, Spielhagen P, Siegmann A, Gercekioglu A, Gorgass J, Henze S, et al. Remote  
457 monitoring of COVID-19 positive high-risk patients in domestic isolation: A feasibility  
458 study. *PLoS One*. 2021;16:e0257095. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0257095.
- 459 28. Vindrola-Padros C, Sidhu MS, Georghiou T, Sherlaw-Johnson C, Singh KE, Tomini SM, et  
460 al. The implementation of remote home monitoring models during the COVID-19  
461 pandemic in England. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2021;34:100799.  
462 doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.100799.
- 463 29. Motta LP, Da Silva PPF, Borguezan BM, Amaral JLMd, Milagres LG, Bóia MN, et al. An  
464 emergency system for monitoring pulse oximetry, peak expiratory flow, and body  
465 temperature of patients with COVID-19 at home: Development and preliminary  
466 application. *PLoS One*. 2021;16:e0247635. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0247635.
- 467 30. Dirikgil E, Roos R, Groeneveld GH, Heringhaus C, Silven AV, Petrus AHJ, et al. Home  
468 monitoring reduced short stay admissions in suspected COVID-19 patients: COVID-box  
469 project. *Eur Respir J*. 2021;58:2100636. doi:10.1183/13993003.00636-2021.

- 470 31. Yordanov Y, Dechartres A, Lescure X, Apra C, Villie P, Marchand-Arvier J, et al. Covidom,  
471 a Telesurveillance Solution for Home Monitoring Patients With COVID-19. *J Med Internet*  
472 *Res.* 2020;22:e20748. doi:10.2196/20748.
- 473 32. Schinköthe T, Gabri MR, Mitterer M, Gouveia P, Heinemann V, Harbeck N, Subklewe M.  
474 A Web- and App-Based Connected Care Solution for COVID-19 In- and Outpatient Care:  
475 Qualitative Study and Application Development. *JMIR Public Health Surveill.*  
476 2020;6:e19033. doi:10.2196/19033.
- 477 33. Bardy P. *The Human Challenge of Telemedicine: Toward a Time-Sensitive and Person-*  
478 *Centered Ethics of Home Telecare.* San Diego: ISTE Press Limited - Elsevier Incorporated;  
479 2018.
- 480 34. Panicacci S, Donati M, Lubrano A, Vianello A, Ruiu A, Melani L, et al. Telemonitoring in  
481 the Covid-19 Era: The Tuscany Region Experience. *Healthcare.* 2021;9:516–27.  
482 doi:10.3390/healthcare9050516.