medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

National Patterns of Remote Patient Monitoring Service Availability at US Hospitals and their Readmission Performance for Cardiovascular Conditions

Aline F. Pedroso PhD[a], Zhenqiu Lin PhD[a,b], Joseph S. Ross MD, MHS[b,c,d], Rohan Khera MD, MS[a,b,e,f*]

[a] Section of Cardiovascular Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA
[b] Center for Outcomes Research and Evaluation, Yale-New Haven Hospital, New Haven, CT, USA
[c] Section of General Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA
[d] Department of Health Policy and Management, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT, USA
[e] Section of Biomedical Informatics and Data Science, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA
[f] Section of Health Informatics, Department of Biostatistics, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT, USA

Manuscript type: Original Research Manuscript

Word count: 3,236

Brief title: Remote Monitoring & Readmissions in US Hospitals

Figures: 5

Tables: 2

[*]Corresponding author:

Rohan Khera, MD, MS

195 Church St, 6th Floor, New Haven, CT 06510

203-764-5885; rohan.khera@yale.edu; @rohan_khera

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

Background: Digital remote patient monitoring (RPM) enables longitudinal care outside traditional healthcare settings, especially in the vulnerable period after hospitalizations, with broad coverage of the service by payers. We sought to evaluate patterns of RPM service availability at US hospitals and the association of these services with 30-day readmissions for two key cardiovascular conditions, heart failure (HF) and acute myocardial infarction (AMI).

Methods: We used contemporary national data from the American Hospital Association (AHA) Annual Survey to ascertain US hospitals offering RPM services for post-discharge or chronic care and used census-based county-level data to define the characteristics of the communities they serve. We linked these with hospitals' benchmarked risk-standardized relative performance on readmissions (excess readmission ratio [ERR]) from CMS Hospital Quality Reports (2018-2022). We used mixed-effects multivariable regression to examine the association between RPM services at hospitals and hospital characteristics-adjusted ERR for HF and AMI.

Results: There were 2,754 hospitals with CMS quality report data. Over five years of the study, there was a 38.3% increase in the number of hospitals offering RPM services, rising from 952 (42.0%) hospitals in 2018 to 1,237 (58.1%) in 2022. However, the availability of RPM services varied across different hospital groups with smaller, non-teaching hospitals, particularly those serving rural, low-income communities, and those located in the South, were less likely to offer RPM services. There was a consistent association between the availability of RPM services and better risk-standardized readmission performance for HF, with lower ERR for hospitals offering RPM compared with those not offering RPM (absolute difference, -0.016 [-0.023, -0.009], standardized difference, 24.6%, $p<0.001$). However, no such association was observed for AMI (-0.007 [-0.016, 0.002], standardized difference, 10.3%, $p=0.19$).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Conclusions: In this national study of US hospitals, there has been a large increase in the availability of RPM services but with large variation among hospitals, with lower availability in hospitals serving low-income and rural communities. RPM services were associated with lower hospital readmission rates for HF but not AMI.

Word count: 325

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

Despite a sustained emphasis on heart failure (HF) and acute myocardial infarction (AMI) as targets for reducing readmission risk in US health policy,[1] 1 in 4 older adults hospitalized for HF and 1 in 8 hospitalized for AMI are still being readmitted within 30 days of their discharge.[2,3] Moreover, even the observed reduction in readmissions is largely offset by a concomitant increase in post-discharge emergency and observation care, with 1 in 3 individuals revisiting the hospital within 30 days.[4,5] To address this persistent challenge, there has been an increasing recognition of the role of personalized post-discharge care.[6–8] Specifically, digital technologies that enable the monitoring of patients outside clinical settings – or remote patient monitoring (RPM) - present a promising avenue.[9,10] However, understanding the current investment of US hospitals in such technologies and how this investment correlates with their readmission performance on these key indicator conditions is essential to appraise the broader acceptance and utility of RPM as a strategy to address readmissions in the US.

Contemporary RPM services represent payer-reimbursed care wherein patients use in-home or wearable devices to remotely collect digital health information, such as their weight, heart rate, and blood pressure, which are transmitted electronically for review by clinicians.[11,12] These data can enable clinicians to identify early markers of clinical deterioration and intervene before patients suffer hospitalization.[13,14] The evaluation of RPM services has demonstrated their role in maintaining the quality of care, facilitating faster access to services, reducing patient travel costs, and minimizing the frequency of clinic visits.[10,15,16] Their use has also been endorsed by European clinical practice guidelines, which now recommend remote monitoring as a standard component of disease management programs for cardiovascular conditions like HF.[17] In the US, while there has been a growing emphasis on value-based care, it is unclear whether

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

hospitals are emphasizing RPM as an available service and whether current patterns of uptake of RPM services are associated with better patient outcomes.[12,18,19]

In this study, we pursued a national assessment of the availability of RPM services at US hospitals. In addition, we evaluated the association between a hospital's investment in RPM services for their patients and their risk-standardized relative 30-day readmission performance on the key indicator cardiovascular conditions of HF and AMI.

METHODS

Data Sources and Study Population

We defined RPM services available at hospitals using data from the American Hospital Association (AHA) Annual Survey and defined their respective county-level population characteristics based on the US census. We also defined each hospital's corresponding 30-day risk-standardized readmission performance on HF and AMI from the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) Hospital Quality Report.

Additional information about the AHA Annual Survey can be found in **eMethods**. We used data from the AHA Annual Surveys from 2018 through 2022, representing the most recent 5-year period that collected information on RPM services.[20] We used the US Cities Database as an up-to-date record of all US cities and towns to link hospitals to their corresponding serving communities' characteristics. All demographic information is derived from the American Community Survey of the US Census Bureau.[21]

The CMS Hospital Quality Reports for the years corresponding to the AHA surveys were obtained to define each hospital's publicly reported risk-standardized readmission rates and relative readmission performance for HF and AMI. These quality measures, described in further

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

detail below, are linked to a hospital-specific Medicare provider ID.[22] We identified all Medicare-certified acute-care hospitals from the AHA annual survey using their Medicare provider IDs. Datasets were linked using their unique Medicare Provider ID numbers.[23]

RPM service availability

The AHA survey defined RPM as the use of digital technologies to collect medical and other forms of health data from individuals in one location and electronically transmit the information securely to healthcare providers in a different location for assessment and recommendation.[20] The survey specifically inquired about the availability of RPM in the context of post-discharge care, ongoing care for chronic conditions, and remote monitoring in other clinical scenarios. The primary exposure for the study was the availability of any RPM service to patients at a hospital.

Covariates

We identified a series of hospital characteristics from the AHA survey. These included hospital bed size, presented as the absolute number of available beds as well as categorized into subsets with <100, 100-300, and >300 beds, US region (Northeast, Midwest, South, and West), and area type (metropolitan, micropolitan, and rural, based on the definitions of the US Census Bureau). Hospital's teaching status was defined based on their membership in the Council of Teaching Hospitals of the Association of American Medical Colleges, and hospital ownership as either government or privately owned.

Key demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the communities served by these hospitals included the distribution of age (proportion of individuals 65 years and older), gender (proportion of females), race and ethnicity (proportion of self-declared Black or Hispanic),

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

median household income in US Dollars, education level (proportion of people with less than a high school education), and the proportion of disabled individuals in their respective counties.

Outcomes

The key outcomes for evaluating hospital performance in this study were their respective excess readmission ratios (ERRs) for HF and AMI. This represents the ratio of the hospital's predicted readmission rates relative to the expected readmissions in the same period, accounting for each hospital's case-mix. The ERRs for any given year are derived from a condition-specific (i.e., HF or AMI) hierarchical logistic regression model that includes fee-for-service hospitalizations with a principal discharge diagnosis for the condition over a preceding 3-year window across all hospitals. Detailed information about the model used to derive ERRs can be found in **eMethods**.

An ERR greater than 1.0 indicates that the hospital had more readmissions than expected for their case mix, while an ERR less than 1.0 indicates fewer than expected readmissions.

Statistical analysis

We pursued three key analyses. First, we described the availability of RPM services across all hospitals for each study year. We examined the characteristics of hospitals with and without availability of RPM services and the temporal trends in their availability across hospitals between 2018 and 2022. Categorical features are presented as counts and percentages, with group-level differences compared using the chi-square test for proportions. Continuous features are presented as means and standard deviations or median and interquartile ranges, with group-level differences compared using the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test. Temporal trends were tested using the Cochran-Armitage chi-square test for trend.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Second, we assessed hospital and population characteristics associated with RPM services in a cross-sectional assessment in 2022, the most recent year in the analysis. For this, we employed a mixed-effects logistic regression model. The dependent variable in this model was a hospital's RPM service availability, with hospital (bed size, US region, area type, teaching status, ownership) and population characteristics (proportion of individuals aged 65 and older, proportion of females, proportion of self-reported Black and Hispanic individuals, proportion of people with less than a high school education, proportion of disabled individuals, median household income) as key independent variables, and the hospital site as a random effect. Continuous county-level characteristics were modeled as a function of a single standard deviation unit of change for each characteristic.

We then assessed the association of a hospital's availability of RPM services in the full window over which the readmission performance of a hospital was aggregated to compute their corresponding ERR for HF and AMI. We performed this analysis for the two most recent time windows for which we had complete data on RPM availability (June 2018 to July 2021 and June 2019 to July 2022), with RPM availability defined across all years from 2018 through 2021 for the first period, and 2019 through 2022 for the second. We categorized hospitals in each period as those with RPM in all years and those not offering RPM in any of the years. We also compared the yearly association of RPM service availability with corresponding ERRs for HF and AMI. Here, the ERR was assigned to the final year of the 3-year window with RPM service status defined for that year.

Finally, we evaluated the association between hospitals offering RPM services in the first year of the study (2018) and their subsequent readmission performance after accounting for their different readmission performance in this first year. For this, we constructed a hierarchical linear

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

regression model where a hospital's RPM service availability in 2018 was the key independent variable, hospital site was the random effect, and hospital characteristics, including bed size, US region, area type, teaching status, and ownership were other independent variables. In these analyses, we specifically adjusted for the hospital's ERR in this base year to enable comparison of hospitals that had similar baseline readmission performance but varied in their RPM status and subsequent readmission performance. We repeated all analyses for both HF and AMI separately and for specific RPM services – those that targeted post-discharge care and chronic care.

We used Python version 3.12.3 and Stata 18 for all analyses. The level of significance was set at 0.05. Since the study uses aggregate data across hospitals without any patient-level information, it was outside the purview of the Yale Institutional Review Board.

RESULTS

Hospital Characteristics

There were 2,754 acute care hospitals in the AHA Survey included in the study (**eFigure 1**). Among these hospitals, the median bed size was 167 (IQR 84-304), 15.1% were in the Northeast, and 75.2% were in metropolitan areas. A total of 222 (8.1%) were teaching hospitals.

Of these hospitals, 1,448 (52.6%) reported having RPM services available for one or more years during the study period. There was a 38.3% increase in the number of hospitals offering RPM services over the 5 years, increasing from 42.0% in 2018 to 58.1% in 2022 (**eFigure 2**). Over the study years, RPM availability was higher among certain hospital subgroups. For instance, a higher proportion of hospitals with >300 beds had RPM services available than those with <100 beds, though the availability of RPM services increased broadly between 2018 and 2022 (>300 beds 55.7% in 2018 to 73.4% in 2022, vs <100 beds 39.7% to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

42.8%). Hospitals in the Northeast had the highest RPM service availability across study years (58.5% in 2018 to 75.5% in 2022), with those in the South with the lowest availability (32.7% in 2018 and 47.2% in 2022). Similarly, teaching hospitals, those located in urban areas, and privately-owned hospitals had higher RPM service availability than rural, non-teaching, and government-owned hospitals, respectively (**Table 1** and **Figure 1**).

Community Characteristics

A median of 15.9% (IQR 13.3-19.0) of the population in the counties served by these hospitals were 65 years or older, and 51.1% (IQR 50.0-52.3) were female. The proportion of Black and Hispanic individuals in these areas represented a median 8.1% (IQR 2.7-23.1) and 9.9% (IQR 4.5-22.2) of the population, respectively. The proportion of individuals with less than a high school education was a median 10.9% (IQR 7.1-14.8) across counties, and the median annual household income was $60,440.0 (IQR $49,049.0-$77,633.2). The median age, gender, and race/ethnicity distributions were similar between neighborhoods with and without hospitals offering RPM services to their patients. However, hospitals offering RPM services were in counties with higher median household incomes and lower percentages of individuals with less than a high school education (**Table 2**).

Factors associated with RPM service availability

In adjusted analyses, hospital bed size, teaching status, rural/urban location, and geographic region were significantly associated with the availability of RPM services (**Figure 2**). Hospitals with fewer than 100 beds had lower odds of RPM service availability than those with more than 300 beds (adjusted OR [aOR] 0.41, 95% CI 0.30-0.56). Non-teaching hospitals had over 70%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

lower odds of offering RPM services than teaching hospitals (aOR 0.28, 95% CI 0.17-0.46), and rural hospitals had 50% lower odds of RPM availability compared with hospitals in urban metropolitan areas. Additionally, hospitals in the South and West were less likely to have RPM services than those in the Northeast (aOR 0.24, 95% CI 0.25-0.46, and aOR 0.32, 95% CI 0.32-0.67, respectively).

For characteristics of communities served by hospitals, the proportion of Hispanic individuals and the median income of the community were key features associated with the availability of RPM services at their local hospitals. Each standard deviation increase in the percentage of Hispanic individuals in the community was associated with 15% lower odds of hospitals in that county having RPM services (aOR 0.85, 95% CI 0.72-0.99). Conversely, higher area-level median household income was associated with 19% higher odds of RPM service availability at hospitals in those communities (aOR 1.19, 95% CI 1.02-1.39, per standard deviation unit change). Other hospital and population characteristics were not significantly associated with RPM availability (**eTable 1**).

Association between RPM availability and ERR for HF and AMI

Among hospitals offering RPM services across years 2018-2021 and 2019-2022, the mean ERRs for HF were 0.987 (SD 0.073) and 0.988 (SD 0.071) compared with 1.005 (SD 0.065) and 1.004 (SD 0.057) among hospitals without RPM, which were significantly lower for RPM vs no-RPM hospitals during these periods (absolute difference: -0.018 [95% CI -0.025, -0.010] for 2018-2021, and -0.016 [95% CI -0.023, -0.009] for 2019-2022, $p<0.001$ for both). In contrast, for AMI, there were no significant differences in ERR between hospitals with and without RPM services in both 2018-2021 (absolute difference -0.005 [95% CI -0.013, 0.003] $p=0.19$), and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

2019-2022 (absolute difference -0.007 [95% CI -0.016, 0.002], p=0.12) (**Figure 3**). This pattern was replicated in calendar-year cross-sectional analyses across the five years (**eTable 2** and **Figure 4**).

In analyses that examined the longitudinal association of RPM availability in the first year of the study and subsequent readmission performance, we noted that hospitals with vs. without RPM services in 2018 had a lower ERR after HF hospitalization from 2019 through 2022, even after accounting for their readmission performance in the base year as well as the structural characteristics of the hospital. The relative ERR for RPM was lower than for non-RPM hospitals by 0.010 (95% CI -0.015, -0.005) in 2019 and 0.012 (95% CI -0.018, -0.006) in 2022. A similar association was observed when analyzing RPM services targeted at post-discharge and chronic care and hospital readmission performance after HF hospitalization (**Figure 5**).[18,19] However, such an association was not observed for AMI for either the overall availability of RPM services or those specifically targeted at post-discharge or ongoing chronic care services (**Figure 5**).

DISCUSSION

In this national study of US hospitals from 2018 through 2022, there was a 1.4-fold increase in the number of hospitals with RPM services, with nearly 60% of US hospitals offering these services in 2022. This increase was observed for both post-discharge and chronic care RPM services, with most US hospitals providing these services in recent years. The availability of RPM services varied widely based on hospital and neighborhood characteristics, with lower availability of these services at small, rural, non-teaching hospitals, especially those in the South. Moreover, hospitals in communities with low household incomes and a large proportion of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Hispanic individuals had substantially lower RPM availability. Across study years, there were consistently lower risk-standardized relative readmission rates for HF among hospitals offering RPM services compared with those not offering these services. However, this association was not consistently observed in the outcomes following AMI hospitalizations at these hospitals.

Patient-level studies have suggested a substantial recent increase in claims for RPM service in fee-for-service Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries in the US between 2019 and 2021.[12,24] This increase in the use of these services has occurred despite the lack of robust evidence on the clinical benefits of RPM or clarity on patients or conditions that benefit most from these services. Our findings complement the findings presented in these selected patient populations to provide evidence of the national landscape and describe the rapidly increasing proportion of US hospitals adopting RPM. We also note that, in our hospital-level analyses, risk-standardized readmission performance for HF, a condition with substantial post-discharge care needs, was significantly better at hospitals where these services were available. However, we note that this uptake has varied widely across hospitals, with hospitals serving predominantly disadvantaged communities - that also consistently experience worse readmission outcomes[19] – also have the lowest availability of RPM services.

These findings are pertinent given the growing evidence suggesting that emerging digital health technologies can improve patient outcomes.[25–28] Numerous society guidelines also emphasize the value of RPM services in enhancing appropriate post-discharge care.[7,9,29,30] Our observation that hospitals with RPM services have better risk-standardized readmission outcomes for HF but not for AMI suggests the need for targeting RPM services to specific conditions. Specifically, many studies have suggested a role for guideline-directed therapy optimization in HF in the post-discharge period, and the critical services in AMI in this setting

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

are less well-defined.[30,31] Therefore, it is possible that the current suite of RPM services is better targeted at patients with chronic care needs, like those with HF. Emerging randomized clinical trial evidence, however, suggests that RPM specifically designed to target post-acute coronary syndrome, including symptom-triggered monitoring on home wearable ECG, blood pressure, and pulse oximeter, with close coordination with a cardiologist, was associated with 76% lower readmission and emergency department visits over 6 months.[32] These observations underscore the need to better characterize the nature of provided services and their intended application to enable the best outcomes at hospitals.

This work also has important policy implications. The considerable investment in RPM services, further accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic, has been supported by CMS and other payers through coverage in a fee-for-service model over the past five years.[18,33] Besides the high availability and broad insurance coverage of RPM services, there is no standard definition for RPM and no consistent outcome testing.[18] The observed heterogeneity in RPM service availability highlights that not all communities that could benefit from RPM have access to these services covered by national insurance providers. There is also a need to generate the necessary evidence for individual services to improve the efficiency of these investments. These considerations are especially critical as policymakers and payers consider the future of RPM coverage in the post-pandemic era.

Our study has certain limitations that merit consideration. First, we lack detailed information on the specific components of the RPM services evaluated. The RPM services reimbursed by payers under this category are not well-defined, underscoring the need to more specifically define the components of these services and their alignment with the available evidence for each condition. Future research should focus on understanding the nature and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

quality of RPM services provided across different hospital types in the US. Second, we cannot quantify the number of patients and the conditions managed with these services at these hospitals. However, given that HF and AMI are conditions where readmission performance is closely tracked, they are common targets for the use of RPM services. We posit that if RPM services are available, they are likely being used for these conditions, especially within the fee-for-service population. Further investigations should evaluate whether these associations are observed for other patient populations at these hospitals. Finally, our evaluation of the association of RPM services with readmission performance of hospitals represents a broad topological assessment but does not imply the causal association between the availability of RPM services with readmissions among patients receiving care at these hospitals.

CONCLUSION

In this national study of US hospitals, there has been a large increase in the availability of RPM services, which was consistently associated with hospital readmission performance for HF but not for AMI. However, there was a large variation in the availability of RPM services, with lower availability in hospitals serving low-income and rural communities.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Funding

Dr. Khera was supported by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute of the National Institutes of Health (under awards R01HL167858 and K23HL153775) and the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation (under award 2022060).

Disclosures

Dr. Khera is an Associate Editor of JAMA. He receives support from the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute of the National Institutes of Health (under awards R01HL167858 and K23HL153775), the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation (under award 2022060), and the Blavatnik Family Foundation. He also receives research support, through Yale, from Bristol-Myers Squibb, Novo Nordisk, and BridgeBio. He is a coinventor of U.S. Pending Patent Applications WO2023230345A1, US20220336048A1, 63/346,610, 63/484,426, 63/508,315, 63/580,137, 63/606,203, 63/619,241, 63/562,335 and 18/813,882. He is a co-founder of Ensight-AI, Inc. and Evidence2Health, health platforms to improve cardiovascular diagnosis and evidence-based cardiovascular care. Dr Ross reported grants from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ, R01HS022882) during the conduct of the study; grants from the US Food and Drug Administration, Johnson & Johnson, Medical Devices Innovation Consortium, grants from the National Institutes of Health/National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NIH/NHLBI), and Arnold Ventures outside the submitted work; and serving as an expert witness at the request of Relator's attorneys, the Greene Law Firm, in a qui tam suit alleging violations of the False Claims Act and Anti-Kickback Statute against Biogen Inc that

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

was settled September 2022. Dr Lin reported working under contracts with CMS to develop quality measures.

Author Contributions

Drs Pedroso and Khera had full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. All authors approved the final version for submission.

Study concept and design: Pedroso and Khera.

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: Pedroso; Lin; Ross, and Khera.

Drafting of the manuscript: Pedroso and Khera.

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Lin; Ross, and Khera.

Statistical analysis: Pedroso and Khera.

Obtained funding: Khera.

Administrative, technical, or material support: Pedroso and Khera.

Study supervision: Khera.

Role of the Funder/Sponsor: The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Data Sharing Statement: The data are available directly from the American Hospital Association and the Centers from Medicare and Medicaid Services.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

REFERENCES

1. Khera R, Krumholz HM. Effects of the Hospital Readmissions Reduction Program. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes*. 2018;11(12):e005083.

2. Khan MS, Sreenivasan J, Lateef N, et al. Trends in 30- and 90-Day Readmission Rates for Heart Failure. *Circ Heart Fail*. 2021;14(4):e008335.

3. Virani SS, Alonso A, Benjamin EJ, et al. Heart disease and stroke statistics-2020 update: A report from the American Heart Association: A report from the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2020;141(9):e139-e596.

4. Wadhera RK, Joynt Maddox KE, Kazi DS, Shen C, Yeh RW. Hospital revisits within 30 days after discharge for medical conditions targeted by the Hospital Readmissions Reduction Program in the United States: national retrospective analysis. *BMJ*. 2019;366:l4563.

5. Khera R, Wang Y, Bernheim SM, Lin Z, Krumholz HM. Post-discharge acute care and outcomes following readmission reduction initiatives: national retrospective cohort study of Medicare beneficiaries in the United States. *BMJ*. 2020;368:l6831.

6. Oikonomou EK, Khera R. Artificial intelligence-enhanced patient evaluation: bridging art and science. *Eur Heart J*. Published online July 8, 2024. doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehae415

7. Stevenson LW, Ross HJ, Rathman LD, Boehmer JP. Remote Monitoring for Heart Failure Management at Home. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2023;81(23):2272-2291.

8. Takahashi EA, Schwamm LH, Adeoye OM, et al. An Overview of Telehealth in the Management of Cardiovascular Disease: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2022;146(25):e558-e568.

9. Feldman DI, Babikian S, Feldman T, Curnow R, Fudim M. Leveraging remote patient monitoring to effectively put the heart failure guidelines to practice. *J Card Fail*. Published online May 11, 2024. doi:10.1016/j.cardfail.2024.04.018

10. Taylor ML, Thomas EE, Snoswell CL, Smith AC, Caffery LJ. Does remote patient monitoring reduce acute care use? A systematic review. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11(3):e040232.

11. Tucker KL, Sheppard JP, Stevens R, et al. Self-monitoring of blood pressure in hypertension: A systematic review and individual patient data meta-analysis. *PLoS Med*. 2017;14(9):e1002389.

12. Tang M, Nakamoto CH, Stern AD, Mehrotra A. Trends in Remote Patient Monitoring Use in Traditional Medicare. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2022;182(9):1005-1006.

13. Coffey JD, Christopherson LA, Williams RD, et al. Development and implementation of a nurse-based remote patient monitoring program for ambulatory disease management. *Front Digit Health*. 2022;4:1052408.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

14. Coffey JD, Christopherson LA, Glasgow AE, et al. Implementation of a multisite, interdisciplinary remote patient monitoring program for ambulatory management of patients with COVID-19. *NPJ Digit Med*. 2021;4(1):123.

15. Thomas EE, Taylor ML, Banbury A, et al. Factors influencing the effectiveness of remote patient monitoring interventions: a realist review. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11(8):e051844.

16. Zakeri R, Morgan JM, Phillips P, et al. Impact of remote monitoring on clinical outcomes for patients with heart failure and atrial fibrillation: results from the REM-HF trial. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2020;22(3):543-553.

17. 2023 Focused Update of the 2021 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure. Accessed July 11, 2024. https://www.escardio.org/Guidelines/Clinical-Practice-Guidelines/Focused-Update-on-Heart-Failure-Guidelines

18. Mecklai K, Smith N, Stern AD, Kramer DB. Remote patient monitoring - overdue or overused? *N Engl J Med*. 2021;384(15):1384-1386.

19. Tang M, Nakamoto CH, Stern AD, et al. Effects of remote patient monitoring use on care outcomes among medicare patients with hypertension : An observational study: An observational study. *Ann Intern Med*. 2023;176(11):1465-1475.

20. AHA Annual Survey Database™. AHA Data. Accessed July 14, 2024. https://www.ahadata.com/aha-annual-survey-database

21. U.S. Census Bureau. Explore Census Data. Accessed July 21, 2024. https://data.census.gov/

22. QualityNet Home. Accessed July 14, 2024. https://qualitynet.cms.gov/inpatient/measures/readmission/methodology

23. Hospital Quality Initiative Public Reporting. Accessed August 5, 2024. https://www.cms.gov/medicare/quality/initiatives/hospital-quality-initiative/hospital-compare

24. Pauly N, Nair P, Augenstein J. Remote physiologic monitoring use among medicaid population increased, 2019-21: Study examines remote physiologic monitoring trends among the Medicaid population. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2024;43(5):701-706.

25. Ong MK, Romano PS, Edgington S, et al. Effectiveness of Remote Patient Monitoring After Discharge of Hospitalized Patients With Heart Failure: The Better Effectiveness After Transition -- Heart Failure (BEAT-HF) Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2016;176(3):310-318.

26. Jaarsma T, van der Wal MHL, Lesman-Leegte I, et al. Effect of moderate or intensive disease management program on outcome in patients with heart failure: Coordinating Study Evaluating Outcomes of Advising and Counseling in Heart Failure (COACH). *Arch Intern Med*. 2008;168(3):316-324.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.14.24315496; this version posted October 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

27. Dar O, Riley J, Chapman C, et al. A randomized trial of home telemonitoring in a typical elderly heart failure population in North West London: results of the Home-HF study. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2009;11(3):319-325.

28. Koehler F, Koehler K, Deckwart O, et al. Efficacy of telemedical interventional management in patients with heart failure (TIM-HF2): a randomised, controlled, parallel-group, unmasked trial. *Lancet*. 2018;392(10152):1047-1057.

29. Li Y, Zhang D, Li W, et al. The health and economic impact of expanding home blood pressure monitoring. *Am J Prev Med*. 2023;65(5):775-782.

30. Lynch KA, Ganz DA, Saliba D, Chang DS, de Peralta SS. Improving heart failure care and guideline-directed medical therapy through proactive remote patient monitoring-home telehealth and pharmacy integration. *BMJ Open Qual*. 2022;11(3):e001901.

31. Bashi N, Karunanithi M, Fatehi F, Ding H, Walters D. Remote monitoring of patients with heart failure: An overview of systematic reviews. *J Med Internet Res*. 2017;19(1):e18.

32. Alshahrani NS, Hartley A, Howard J, et al. Randomized Trial of Remote Assessment of Patients After an Acute Coronary Syndrome. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2024;83(23):2250-2259.

33. Accountable Care Organizations-Pathways to Success. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2018/08/17/2018-17101/medicare-program-medicare-shared-savings-program-accountable-care-organizations-pathways-to-success

Table 1. Hospitals with remote patient monitoring (RPM) services between 2018 and 2022. For individual hospital characteristics, the numbers and percentages represent those offering RPM services in the respective hospital subgroups.

	Overall	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	P_{trend}
Hospitals, N	2,754	2,266	2,192	2,140	2,137	2,129	
Hospitals with RPM services	1,448 (52.6%)	952 (42.0%)	1,017 (46.4%)	1,139 (53.2%)	1,195 (55.9%)	1,237 (58.1%)	
Bed size							
<100	496 (70.6%)	356 (55.7%)	373 (60.4%)	422 (69.2%)	431 (70.8%)	444 (73.4%)	<0.001
100-300	626 (50.9%)	409 (41.0%)	436 (45.4%)	488 (52.3%)	516 (55.2%)	541 (57.9%)	<0.001
>300	326 (39.7%)	187 (29.7%)	208 (33.9%)	229 (38.4%)	248 (41.8%)	252 (42.8%)	<0.001
US Region							
Northeast	287 (66.9%)	216 (58.7%)	229 (64.1%)	245 (70.0%)	253 (73.1%)	254 (75.4%)	<0.001
Midwest	421 (64.4%)	296 (50.0%)	309 (53.9%)	355 (62.0%)	353 (62.0%)	358 (66.8%)	<0.001
South	513 (43.0%)	308 (32.5%)	331 (36.3%)	376 (40.9%)	408 (45.1%)	424 (47.2%)	<0.001
West	281 (49.6%)	162 (37.8%)	182 (43.4%)	205 (56.2%)	230 (59.3%)	249 (57.9%)	<0.001
Area Type							
Metropolitan	1176 (56.8%)	798 (45.7%)	843 (49.9%)	951 (58.1%)	997 (60.6%)	1027 (62.7%)	<0.001
Micropolitan	209 (44.5%)	118 (31.8%)	134 (36.7%)	153 (42.4%)	158 (44.0%)	167 (48.0%)	0.010
Rural	63 (29.4%)	36 (24.5%)	40 (28.8%)	35 (24.8%)	40 (29.9%)	43 (30.1%)	0.684
Teaching							
Yes	197 (88.7%)	155 (71.8%)	156 (73.9%)	177 (84.7%)	179 (86.1%)	185 (88.5%)	0.012
No	1251 (49.4%)	797 (38.9%)	861 (43.5%)	962 (49.8%)	1016 (52.7%)	1052 (54.8%)	<0.001
Ownership							
Government	200 (49.1%)	108 (34.3%)	126 (40.8%)	142 (46.3%)	163 (52.6%)	168 (55.8%)	<0.001
Private	1248 (53.2%)	844 (43.3%)	891 (47.3%)	997 (54.4%)	1032 (56.5%)	1069 (58.5%)	<0.001

Table 2. Population characteristics of counties with hospitals with remote patient monitoring services (2018-2022).

	Overall	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
	2754	952	1,017	1,139	1,195	1,237
Age≥65, %	15.9 (13.3-19.0)	15.5 (13.3-18.5)	15.7 (13.3-18.7)	15.6 (13.2-18.6)	15.6 (13.2-18.7)	15.6 (13.3-18.7)
Female, %	51.1 (50.0-52.3)	51.1 (50.1-52.2)	51.1 (50.1-52.2)	51.1 (50.1-52.2)	51.0 (50.1-52.2)	51.0 (50.0-52.1)
Black, %	8.1 (2.7-23.1)	8.6 (2.9-23.1)	8.1 (2.7-22.5)	8.6 (2.9-23.2)	8.4 (2.9-23.1)	8.2 (2.8-22.4)
Hispanic, %	9.9 (4.5-22.2)	10.2 (5.0-20.1)	10.1 (5.0-20.2)	9.9 (4.8-20.0)	10.3 (4.9-20.2)	10.4 (4.9-20.8)
Median Household Income	$60440 (49049-77633)	$63597 (52029-82910)	$63698 (52208-82772)	$63684 (52049-82614)	$63985 (52059-82696)	$63985 (52056-82998)
Less than high school education, %	10.9 (7.1-14.8)	9.9 (6.4-13.5)	9.9 (6.3-13.5)	9.9 (6.3-13.4)	9.9 (6.4-13.5)	10.0 (6.6-13.6)
Disabled, %	13.9 (11.3-17.4)	13.3 (11.0-16.5)	13.3 (10.9-16.5)	13.3 (10.9-16.4)	13.3 (10.9-16.4)	13.3 (10.9-16.4)

FIGURES

Figure 1. Relative increase in remote patient monitoring (RPM) services across hospital groups between 2018 and 2022.



Figure 2. Community and hospital characteristics associated with the availability of remote patient monitoring services.



Figure 3. Association between the availability of remote patient monitoring (RPM) in all versus none of the years (2018-2021 and 2019-2022) and their association with excess readmission ratios (ERR) for heart failure (HF) and acute myocardial infarction (AMI) in the corresponding periods.



Figure 4. Mean excess readmission ratios (ERRs) for heart failure (HF) and acute myocardial infarction (AMI) among hospitals with and without RPM services (2018-2022).



Figure 5. Availability of remote patient monitoring (RPM) services in the study's first year (2018) and relative excess readmission ratios at hospitals in subsequent years (2019-2022). (A) Coefficient for ERR for heart failure (HF) at hospitals with RPM services. (B) Coefficient for ERR for HF at hospitals with post-discharge or chronic RPM services. (C) Coefficient for ERR for acute myocardial infarction (AMI) at hospitals with RPM services. (B) Coefficient for ERR for AMI at hospitals post-discharge or chronic RPM services.