Remote Patient Monitoring in Heart Failure: Firm Evidence for Mortality Reduction and a Critical Geographic Evidence Gap — Systematic Review, Meta-Analysis, and Trial Sequential Analysis

Title: Remote Patient Monitoring in Heart Failure: Firm Evidence for Mortality Reduction and a Critical Geographic Evidence Gap — Systematic Review, Meta-Analysis, and Trial Sequential Analysis

Authors: Vicky Muller Ferreira, MD[1]; Victor Ayres Muller, MD[1]

[1]Independent Researcher, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Corresponding Author: Vicky Muller Ferreira, MD. Email: vickymuller@heartlandprotocol.org

Word Count: ~6,000

Keywords: remote patient monitoring; telemonitoring; telehealth; heart failure; geographic access; meta-analysis

Registration: PROSPERO CRD420261323628

Abstract

Whether the cumulative evidence for remote patient monitoring (RPM) in heart failure (HF) has reached a definitive threshold — and whether benefits extend to geographically underserved populations — remains uncertain. We conducted a systematic review, meta-analysis, and trial sequential analysis (TSA) of 65 RCTs (59 poolable; ~23,000 participants) across four databases through February 2026, encompassing structured telephone support (15 trials), non-invasive telemonitoring (33), and invasive hemodynamic monitoring (11). Random-effects meta-analysis used REML with Hartung-Knapp-Sidik-Jonkman adjustment. RPM significantly reduced all-cause mortality (RR 0.890, 95% CI 0.819–0.966; P=0.007; I^2=2.3%; k=41; NNT 84/year; prediction interval 0.820–0.965). TSA confirmed that accrued evidence exceeded the required information size, establishing firm evidence that additional RPM-versus-control trials are unlikely to overturn the mortality benefit. HF hospitalization was reduced (RR 0.782, 95% CI 0.711–0.859; P<0.001; k=39; NNT 17/year), though the prediction interval crossed 1.0 (0.589–1.038), indicating that in some settings the effect may be attenuated. No interaction by RPM type was observed ($P_{interaction}$=0.15–0.24). GRADE certainty was moderate for mortality and low for HF hospitalization. A pre-specified geographic access analysis revealed that only 2 of 59 trials reported rural/urban subgroups — a critical evidence gap that precludes conclusions about whether RPM differentially benefits underserved populations.

Highlights

- Trial sequential analysis confirms firm evidence for RPM mortality benefit
- All-cause mortality reduced 11% (NNT 84/yr, prediction interval excludes null)
- HF hospitalization reduced 22% (NNT 17/yr), though prediction interval crosses 1.0

- No differential benefit by RPM type (STS vs TM vs invasive; $P_{interaction}$=0.24–0.34)
- Only 2 of 59 trials reported rural/urban subgroups — a critical geographic evidence gap

Introduction

Heart failure (HF) affects over 64 million people worldwide and remains a leading cause of hospitalization, disability, and death [1,2]. Despite advances in pharmacological therapy, HF hospitalization rates remain high, with 30-day readmission rates exceeding 20% in many health systems [3]. The burden is disproportionately borne by patients in rural and underserved areas, where access to specialized HF care is limited [4].

Remote patient monitoring (RPM) encompasses a spectrum of technologies designed to extend clinical oversight beyond the hospital or clinic setting. Three broad categories have been studied in HF: structured telephone support (STS), in which nurses or automated systems contact patients at regular intervals to assess symptoms and guide self-management; non-invasive telemonitoring (TM), which involves the electronic transmission of physiological data (weight, blood pressure, heart rate, oxygen saturation) from the patient's home to a clinical team; and invasive hemodynamic monitoring, using implanted sensors (such as the CardioMEMS pulmonary artery pressure sensor) or cardiac implantable electronic device (CIED) algorithms to detect congestion before clinical decompensation [5].

The evidence base for RPM in HF has grown substantially over the past two decades. The Cochrane reviews by Inglis et al. in 2010 and 2015 established that both STS and non-invasive TM reduced all-cause mortality compared with usual care, with mortality risk ratios of 0.87 for STS and 0.79 for non-invasive TM [6,7]. Since then, several landmark trials have been published. The TIM-HF2 trial demonstrated that structured remote management reduced the percentage of days lost to unplanned cardiovascular hospitalization or death [8], while the CHAMPION and MONITOR-HF trials showed that hemodynamic-guided management with the

CardioMEMS sensor reduced HF hospitalizations [9,10]. The GUIDE-HF trial, however, yielded neutral overall results, with benefit confined to a pre-COVID sensitivity analysis [11]. The recently published PROACTIVE-HF trial expanded invasive monitoring to HFpEF [12], and the MIGHTY-HEART trial tested a smartphone-based coaching intervention in a diverse urban population, though its primary composite endpoint was neutral [13].

Despite this growing evidence, important questions remain unanswered. First, no prior meta-analysis has applied trial sequential analysis (TSA) to determine whether the cumulative evidence for RPM has reached a definitive threshold — a question with direct implications for the ethical justification of further placebo-controlled trials. Second, the most recent comprehensive meta-analysis predates several important trials (PROACTIVE-HF, MIGHTY-HEART, PRADOC, MESSAGE-HF, MONITOR-HF). Third, whether the benefits of RPM extend to geographically underserved populations — where RPM could theoretically provide the greatest incremental value — has not been systematically examined, despite evidence from TIM-HF2 suggesting that patients farther from cardiologists derive greater benefit [8]. Fourth, HF phenotype-specific data (HFrEF, HFpEF, HFmrEF) remain limited, as most trials enrolled mixed populations [14].

We therefore conducted a systematic review, meta-analysis, and TSA to evaluate the effects of RPM on mortality, hospitalization, and patient-reported outcomes in adults with HF, with the primary objectives of (1) determining whether the cumulative evidence has reached a firm evidentiary threshold and (2) testing a pre-specified hypothesis that geographic access context modifies RPM efficacy.

Methods

Protocol and Registration

This systematic review was prospectively registered with PROSPERO (CRD420261323628) and conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) 2020 guidelines [15]. The completed PRISMA 2020 checklist is available in the online data repository (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18779727).

Eligibility Criteria

We included randomized controlled trials that enrolled adults (age $$18 years) with an established diagnosis of HF (any LVEF phenotype: HFrEF $$40%, HFmrEF 41–49%, or HFpEF $$50%), randomized to any form of RPM (structured telephone support, non-invasive telemonitoring, or invasive hemodynamic monitoring) versus usual care or standard care, with a minimum follow-up of 3 months, reporting at least one outcome of interest (all-cause mortality, HF hospitalization, all-cause hospitalization, cardiovascular mortality, composite outcomes, emergency department visits, or quality of life). Exclusion criteria included observational studies, single-arm trials, studies with fewer than 20 participants, conference abstracts without a full publication, and studies where the RPM intervention could not be isolated from other components (e.g., bundled cardiac rehabilitation programs).

Information Sources and Search Strategy

We searched PubMed/MEDLINE, Cochrane CENTRAL, ClinicalTrials.gov, and the WHO International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ICTRP) from inception through February 15, 2026, without language restrictions. The search strategy combined Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) and free-text terms for remote monitoring technologies (including telemonitoring, telehealth, structured telephone support, CardioMEMS, home monitoring, mHealth, wearable

devices) and heart failure, with an RCT filter. The full electronic search strategies for all four databases are provided in eTable 1 of the Supplementary Material. The protocol was registered with English-language restriction; however, the search was subsequently conducted without language restriction to maximize sensitivity (protocol amendment #6).

Study Selection

Records were imported, combined, and deduplicated using a multi-pass approach (exact DOI/PMID matching, normalized title matching, and fuzzy matching with manual adjudication). Title and abstract screening was performed using a semi-automated approach with predefined exclusion rules validated against a reference set of known eligible trials. Records flagged by the algorithm (n=219, 8.3%) underwent independent manual review by both authors, with discrepancies resolved by consensus. A post-hoc sensitivity analysis of the screening algorithm identified two false negatives due to missing search terms (telemanagement, CHF), which were rescued and included. Records passing initial screening underwent a structured audit to exclude registry-only entries, protocols, conference abstracts, and non-RCT designs. All remaining records were assessed at full-text level. The PRISMA 2020 flow diagram is presented in Figure 1.

Data Extraction

Data were extracted using a standardized form encompassing 185 variables, including study characteristics, participant demographics, intervention details following the TIDieR framework [16], geographic context (rural/urban classification, distance to care), outcomes (event counts for binary outcomes; means and standard deviations for continuous outcomes; hazard ratios with 95% confidence intervals when reported), and risk of bias domains. RPM interventions were

classified into three pre-specified categories: structured telephone support (STS), non-invasive telemonitoring, and invasive hemodynamic monitoring.

Risk of Bias Assessment

Risk of bias was assessed using the Cochrane Risk of Bias 2 (RoB 2) tool [17] across five domains: randomization process (D1), deviations from intended interventions (D2), missing outcome data (D3), measurement of the outcome (D4), and selection of the reported result (D5). All RPM trials are inherently open-label for participants and clinical staff; therefore, D2 ratings reflect whether knowledge of group assignment could have influenced co-interventions or adherence beyond the intended effect.

Effect Measures and Statistical Analysis

The primary outcomes were all-cause mortality, HF hospitalization, and all-cause hospitalization. Secondary outcomes included cardiovascular mortality, composite of all-cause mortality and hospitalization, emergency department visits, and quality of life (Minnesota Living with Heart Failure Questionnaire [MLHFQ] and Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire [KCCQ]).

For binary outcomes with event counts, risk ratios (RR) were calculated using the Mantel-Haenszel method. Studies reporting only hazard ratios (HR) with confidence intervals — without extractable event counts — were not included in the primary RR analysis but were pooled separately using the generic inverse-variance method with log-transformed HRs and corresponding standard errors. This yielded two parallel analyses for each primary outcome: a primary RR analysis maximizing the number of contributing studies (e.g., k=41 for all-cause mortality) and a sensitivity HR-only analysis restricted to time-to-event data (e.g., k=16 for all-

cause mortality). Continuous outcomes were pooled as mean differences (MD). RR and HR estimates are reported separately throughout and are not combined in a single model, as mixing effect measures can introduce bias [18].

Random-effects meta-analysis was performed using restricted maximum likelihood (REML) estimation for the between-study variance (τ^2) with the Hartung-Knapp-Sidik-Jonkman (HKSJ) adjustment for confidence intervals [19,20]. Statistical heterogeneity was assessed using I^2, τ^2, Cochran's Q test, and 95% prediction intervals [21,22].

Subgroup and Sensitivity Analyses

Pre-specified subgroup analyses examined the influence of RPM type (STS, non-invasive TM, invasive), HF phenotype (HFrEF, HFpEF, HFmrEF, mixed), geographic context (rural/remote, urban, mixed, not reported), country income level (high-income versus other), follow-up duration ($6□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ > 6□□□□□□□), □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□($2015 versus >2015), and risk of bias (high versus low/some concerns). Interaction P values were calculated using the Q-test for between-subgroup differences.

Ten pre-specified sensitivity analyses were performed for each primary outcome: (1) leave-one-out analysis, (2) fixed-effect (common-effect) model, (3) exclusion of active comparator arms, (4) exclusion of invasive RPM studies, (5) exclusion of cluster-randomized trials, (6) exclusion of high risk of bias studies, (7) exclusion of flagged outliers, (8) restriction to HR-reporting studies only, (9) restriction to follow-up $3□□□□□□, □□□(10)□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

Publication Bias

Publication bias was assessed visually using funnel plots and statistically using Egger's regression test [23], Begg's rank correlation test [24], and Peters' regression test [25]. The trim-and-fill method was applied to estimate the impact of potential missing studies [26]. Contour-enhanced funnel plots were generated to distinguish asymmetry due to publication bias from asymmetry due to other causes. A large-trial sensitivity analysis (N$$200) was performed to assess whether small-study effects drove the overall signal.

Trial Sequential Analysis

Trial sequential analysis (TSA) was performed using □=0.05, □=0.20 (80% power), and relative risk reductions (RRR) of 15% and 20%, with O'Brien-Fleming spending boundaries [27]. TSA determines whether the cumulative evidence has reached a statistically firm conclusion or whether additional trials are needed.

Certainty of Evidence

The certainty of evidence was assessed using the Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluations (GRADE) framework [28] across five domains: risk of bias, inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision, and publication bias.

All analyses were performed in R (version 4.5.2) using the `meta` [29] and `metafor` [30] packages. Statistical significance was defined as $P < 0.05$ (two-sided).

Results

Study Selection

The systematic search identified 4,037 records across four databases: PubMed (n=1,387), Cochrane CENTRAL (n=2,138), ClinicalTrials.gov (n=348), and WHO ICTRP (n=164). After identifying 1,405 duplicate records and rescuing one that had been incorrectly flagged, 1,404 records were removed, yielding 2,633 unique records for title and abstract screening. Of these, 1,616 were excluded, and 1,017 records proceeded to full-text assessment. A structured audit excluded 701 records (registry entries, protocols, conference abstracts, non-RCTs), while 26 records were added or reclassified into the full-text pool (Tier B candidates, manual review survivors, and pipeline rescues), yielding 342 records for full-text review across four tiers (A–D). After detailed eligibility evaluation, 65 studies met all inclusion criteria (including two records rescued from title/abstract screening via post-hoc algorithm sensitivity analysis), of which 59 were poolable for quantitative synthesis (Figure 1).

Study Characteristics

Table 1. Characteristics of Included Studies

Study	Trial Name	RPM Type	Design	N (Int)	N (Ctrl)	Follow-up (mo)	Age	Female (%)	HF Type	LVEF (%)	NYHA III-IV (%)	Setting	Country	RoB Overall
CHAMPION (Abraham 2011)	CHAMPION	Invasive	Parallel RCT	270	280	6.0	61.6 ± 12.8	27	Mixed	23	100	NR	USA	Some concerns
REDUCEhf (Adamson 2011)	REDUCE hf	Invasive	Parallel RCT	202	198	12.0	55.0 ± 15.0	30	HFrEF	23 ± 8	51	Outpatient	USA	Some concerns
EVOLVO (Landolina 2012)	EVOLVO	Invasive	Parallel RCT	99	101	16.0	NR	18	HFrEF	NR	17	Outpatient	Italy	Some concerns
IN-TIME (Hindricks 2014)	IN-TIME	Invasive	Parallel RCT	333	331	12.0	65.3 ± 9.3	18	HFrEF	26 ± 6	57	Tertiary hospital (36 centres, 7 countries: Aus...	Germany	Some concerns
CONNECT-OptiVol (Lüthje 2015)	CONNECT-OptiVol	Invasive	Parallel RCT	87	89	15.0	66.0 ± 12	20	HFrEF	33 ± 11	43	Inpatient implant / outpatient follow-up	Germany	High

Study	Trial Name	RPM Type	Design	N (Int)	N (Ctrl)	Follow-up (mo)	Age	Female (%)	HF Type	LVEF (%)	NYHA III-IV (%)	Setting	Country	RoB Overall
							.0					(singl...		
OptiLink HF (Böhm 2016)	OptiLink HF	Invasive	Parallel RCT	505	497	22.8	66.1 ± 10.1	23	HFrEF	27 ± 6	81	Outpatient	Germany	Some concerns
TELECART (Sardu 2016)	TELECART	Invasive	Parallel RCT	96	95	12.0	71.8 ± 8.5	28	HFrEF	NR	55	Multicentre (3 Italian centres); outpatient+dev...	Italy	Some concerns
MORE-CARE (Boriani 2017)	MORE-CARE	Invasive	Parallel RCT	437	428	24.0	66.0 ± 11.0	21	HFrEF	27 ± 7	63	Outpatient	Italy (multinational)	Some concerns
RESULT (Tajstra 2020)	RESULT	Invasive	Parallel RCT	299	301	12.0	NR	18	HFrEF	NR	22	Outpatient	Poland	Some concerns
GUIDE-HF (Lindenfeld 2021)	GUIDE-HF	Invasive	Parallel RCT	497	503	12.0	71.0	38	Mixed	38	71	Outpatient	USA/Canada	Some concerns
MONITOR-HF (Brugts 2023)	MONITOR-HF	Invasive	Parallel RCT	176	172	48.0	66.9 ± 11.4	22	Mixed	30	100	Outpatient (25 hospitals, Netherlands)	Netherlands	Some concerns
Jerant 2001 (3-arm) (Jerant 2001)	Jerant 2001 (3-arm)	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	13	12	6.0	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	Post-discharge	USA	High
Benatar (2003)	—	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	108	108	3.0	62.9 ± 13.2	64	Mixed	38	NR	Outpatient/Post-discharge	USA	Some concerns
Jerant 2003 (3-arm) (Jerant 2003)	Jerant 2003 (3-arm)	Non-invasive TM	3-arm RCT	13	12	6.0	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	Post-discharge	USA	High
TEN-HMS (Cleland 2005)	TEN-HMS	Non-invasive TM	3-arm RCT	173	85	8.0	67.0 ± 13.0	20	HFrEF	25 ± 8	31	Outpatient/Post-discharge (patients recently di...	Germany/Netherlands/UK	Some concerns
Antonicelli (2008)	—	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	28	29	12.0	77.0 ± 8.0	43	Mixed	35 ± 6	42	Post-discharge	Italy	Some concerns
Dansky 2008 (Dansky 2008)	Dansky 2008	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	172	112	4.0	77.1	NR	NR	NR	NR	Post-discharge	USA	High
Kashem	Kashem	Non-	Paral	24	24	12.0	53	28	HFrE	25 ±	NR	Outpatient	United States	Some

Study	Trial Name	RPM Type	Design	N (Int)	N (Ctrl)	Follow-up (mo)	Age	Female (%)	HF Type	LVEF (%)	NYHA III-IV (%)	Setting	Country	RoB Overall
2008 (Kashem 2008)	2008	invasive TM	lel RCT				.0 ± 10 .0		F	3				concerns
Dansky 2009 (Health Buddy) (Dansky 2009)	Dansky 2009 (Health Buddy)	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	64	46	6.0	76 .9	NR	NR	NR	NR	Post-discharge	USA	High
Home-HF (Dar 2009)	Home-HF	Non-invasive TM	—	91	91	6.0	70 .0 ± 12 .8	32	Mixed	NR	NR	Post-discharge	UK	Some concerns
Giordano (2009)	—	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	23 0	230	12.0	57 .0 ± 10 .0	NR	NR	NR	NR	Outpatient	Italy	High
HHH (Mortara 2009)	HHH	Non-invasive TM	—	30 1	160	12.0	60 .0 ± 12 .0	14	HFrEF	28 ± 7	NR	Home-based	UK (multinational)	High
MOBITEL (Scherr 2009)	MOBITEL	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	66	54	6.0	65 .0	26	Mixed	25	87	Post-discharge	Austria	High
Tompkins 2010 (Tompkins 2010)	Tompkins 2010	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	19 3	197	6.0	76 .7 ± 8. 2	42	NR	NR	NR	Outpatient/Home	USA	Some concerns
TIM-HF (Koehler 2011)	TIM-HF	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	35 4	356	26.0	66 .9 ± 10 .8	20	HFrEF	27 ± 6	50	Outpatient ambulatory	Germany	Some concerns
THCM (Wade 2011) (Wade 2011)	THCM (Wade 2011)	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	16 4	152	6.0	75 .8	58	NR	NR	NR	Post-discharge	USA	High
TEHAF (Boyne 2012)	TEHAF	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	19 7	185	12.0	71 .0 ± 11 .9	42	Mixed	36	43	Outpatient HF clinic (3 centres: Maastricht, He...	Netherlands	Some concerns
TEMA-HF 1 (Dendale 2012)	TEMA-HF 1	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	80	80	6.0	75 .9 ± 9. 6	38	Mixed	35 ± 15	NR	Post-discharge	Belgium	Some concerns
Gámez-López 2012 (Gámez-López	Gámez-López 2012	Non-invasive TM	4-arm RCT	52	52	11.0	71 .0	NR	Mixed	NR	40	Post-discharge	Spain	Some concerns

Study	Trial Name	RPM Type	Design	N (Int)	N (Ctrl)	Follow-up (mo)	Age	Female (%)	HF Type	LVEF (%)	NYHA III-IV (%)	Setting	Country	RoB Overall
2012)														
Seto 2012 (Seto 2012)	Seto 2012	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	50	50	6.0	55.1 ± 13.7	18	HFrEF	27 ± 8	46	Outpatient heart function clinic	Canada	Some concerns
Delaney 2013 (Delaney 2013)	Delaney 2013	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	46	47	3.0	77.6	67	NR	NR	100	Post-discharge / Home care	USA	Some concerns
Pedone 2015 (Pedone 2015)	Pedone 2015	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	50	46	6.0	79.9 ± 6.8	53	Mixed	44 ± 13	68	Mixed	Italy	High
TIM-HF2 (Koehler 2018)	TIM-HF2	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	765	773	12.0	70.0 ± 11.0	30	Mixed	41 ± 13	47	Outpatient (post-hospitalization)	Germany	Some concerns
Renewing Health (Olivari 2018) (Olivari 2018)	Renewing Health (Olivari 2018)	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	229	110	12.0	NR	NR	Mixed	NR	NR	Post-discharge	Italy (multinational)	Some concerns
Pekmezaris 2019 (Pekmezaris 2019)	Pekmezaris 2019	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	46	58	3.0	58.4 ± 15.2	41	Mixed	NR	70	Post-discharge	USA	Some concerns
OSICAT (Galinier 2020)	OSICAT	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	482	455	18.0	70.0 ± 12.4	27	Mixed	39 ± 14	49	Outpatient/post-discharge (hospitalised for acu...	France	Some concerns
Yanicelli 2021 (Yanicelli 2021)	Yanicelli 2021	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	20	20	3.0	NR	34	HFrEF	36 ± 12	30	Outpatient	Argentina	High
Johnson 2022 (Johnson 2022)	Johnson 2022	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	16	15	3.0	60.4 ± 12.9	38	Mixed	NR	NR	Inpatient → post-discharge (academic hospital)	USA	High
AMULET (Krzesiński 2022)	AMULET	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	300	305	12.0	67.0 ± 16.0	21	Mixed	32 ± 15	25	Outpatient ambulatory clinics (9 sites)	Poland	Some concerns
ControlVit (Achury-Saldaña 2024)	ControlVit	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	70	70	6.0	64.1 ± 12.0	30	HFrEF	30 ± 10	11	Outpatient	Colombia	Some concerns
Arnar 2025 (Arnar	Arnar	Non-invasi	Parallel	86	89	12.0	64.7	34	Mixed	44 ±	13	Outpatient HF clinic	Iceland	Some conce

Study	Trial Name	RPM Type	Design	N (Int)	N (Ctrl)	Follow-up (mo)	Age	Female (%)	HF Type	LVEF (%)	NYHA III-IV (%)	Setting	Country	RoB Overall
2025)	2025	ve TM	RCT				± 13.2			13		(Landspitali—The National ...		rns
M-Cardio (ERICA-HF) (Rustambekova 2025)	M-Cardio (ERICA-HF)	Non-invasive TM	—	127	117	12.0	60.8 ± 7.2	37	HFmrEF	42 ± 12	78	Post-discharge	Kyrgyzstan	Some concerns
Vietnam HFrEF RCT (Tran 2025)	Vietnam HFrEF RCT	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	87	83	6.0	60.9 ± 15.3	26	HFrEF	33 ± 6	37	Outpatient	Vietnam	Some concerns
TeleMedBot (Zheleznykh 2025)	TeleMed Bot	Non-invasive TM	Parallel RCT	57	43	6.0	61.5 ± 13.1	26	Mixed	46 ± 12	NR	Post-discharge	Russia	High
Riegel (2002)	—	STS	Parallel RCT	130	228	6.0	72.5 ± 13.1	46	Mixed	42 ± 17	98	Post-discharge	United States	Some concerns
Laramee (2003)	—	STS	Parallel RCT	141	146	3.0	70.6 ± 11.4	42	Mixed	NR	38	Post-discharge	United States	Some concerns
DIAL (GESICA investigators 2005)	DIAL	STS	Parallel RCT	760	758	24.0	64.8 ± 13.9	27	Mixed	30	50	Outpatient (ambulatory); 51 centers public and ...	Argentina	Some concerns
HFHC (Heart Failure Home Care Trial) (Soran 2008)	HFHC (Heart Failure Home Care Trial)	STS	—	160	155	6.0	76.9 ± 7.1	69	HFrEF	24 ± 9	42	Post-discharge	USA	Some concerns
VA TeleHF (Wakefield) (Wakefield 2008)	VA TeleHF (Wakefield)	STS	3-arm RCT	47	49	12.0	71.8 ± 10.2	0	Mixed	44	72	Post-discharge	USA	Some concerns
Wakefield 2009 (3-arm) (Wakefield 2009)	Wakefield 2009 (3-arm)	STS	3-arm RCT	47	49	6.0	69.0 ± 10.0	1	Mixed	NR	NR	Post-discharge	USA	Some concerns
Tele-HF (Chaudhry 2010)	Tele-HF	STS	Parallel RCT	826	827	6.0	61.0	44	Mixed	35	57	Outpatient cardiology practices (33 sites, USA)	USA	Some concerns
SPAN-CHF II (Weintraub 2010)	SPAN-CHF II	STS	Parallel RCT	95	93	3.0	69.5 ± 14	37	Mixed	32 ± 17	53	Multicenter (4 sites: NEMC, RIH, Lahey,	USA	Some concerns

Study	Trial Name	RPM Type	Design	N (Int)	N (Ctrl)	Follow-up (mo)	Age	Female (%)	HF Type	LVEF (%)	NYHA III-IV (%)	Setting	Country	RoB Overall
							.2					BIDMC)		
CHAT (Krum 2013)	CHAT	STS	Cluster RCT	139	161	12.0	73.0 ± 10.0	38	Mixed	37 ± 14	42	Primary care (general practice)	Australia	Some concerns
BEAT-HF (Ong 2016)	BEAT-HF	STS	Parallel RCT	715	722	6.0	73.0	47	Mixed	43	75	Hospital (post-discharge)	USA	Low
Negarandeh 2019 (Negarandeh 2019)	Negarandeh 2019	STS	—	40	40	2.0	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	Iran	Some concerns
DAA/Feijó Brazil (Feijó 2021)	DAA/Feijó Brazil	STS	Parallel RCT	99	107	3.0	64.0 ± 12.0	42	Mixed	33 ± 12	44	Outpatient (HF clinic, Hospital de Clínicas de ...	Brazil	Some concerns
MESSAGE-HF (Rohde 2024)	MESSAGE-HF	STS	Parallel RCT	352	347	6.0	61.3 ± 14.6	32	HFrEF	27	39	Outpatient HF clinics (post-HF hospitalization,...	Brazil	Some concerns
PRADOC (Roubille 2024)	PRADOC	STS	—	202	202	12.0	75.0 ± 12.0	30	Mixed	42 ± 16	90	Post-discharge	France	Some concerns
Ribeiro (2025)	—	STS	Parallel RCT	70	57	6.0	63.6 ± 10.7	50	Mixed	NR	NR	Post-discharge	Brazil	Some concerns

The 65 included RCTs encompassed approximately 23,000 participants across 20 countries. RPM interventions were classified as structured telephone support (15 trials), non-invasive telemonitoring (33 trials), or invasive hemodynamic monitoring (11 trials), with 6 trials excluded from quantitative synthesis because they used active comparators (nurse-led home visits or enhanced usual care rather than standard care), had single-arm feasibility designs, or reported only surrogate endpoints incompatible with pooling (Table 1). The median sample size was 244 (range 25–1,653) and the median follow-up was 6 months (range 2–48 months; one study [Negarandeh 2019] had 2-month follow-up, retained by investigator decision as a borderline

case). HF phenotype was predominantly HFrEF or mixed; no trials enrolled HFpEF patients exclusively among the 59 poolable studies.

Risk of Bias

The majority of studies (44 of 59) were judged as having “some concerns” for overall risk of bias, primarily driven by the open-label design inherent to RPM interventions (D2: deviations from intended interventions). Thirteen studies were rated as high risk of bias, and two as low risk. Detailed RoB 2 assessments are presented in eFigures 1–2 and eTable 2.

Primary Outcomes

All-Cause Mortality

Table 2. Summary of Meta-Analysis Results

Category	Outcome	Measure	k	Effect [95% CI]	p-value	I2 (%)	Prediction Interval
Primary outcomes (RR, Mantel-Haenszel)	All-cause mortality (primary)	RR	41	0.890 [0.819, 0.966]	0.0065	2.3	[0.820, 0.965]
Primary outcomes (RR, Mantel-Haenszel)	HF hospitalization (primary)	RR	39	0.782 [0.711, 0.859]	0.0000	47.2	[0.589, 1.038]
Primary outcomes (RR, Mantel-Haenszel)	All-cause hospitalization (primary)	RR	28	0.952 [0.884, 1.027]	0.1934	56.2	[0.788, 1.151]
Primary sensitivity (HR subset, metagen)	All-cause mortality	HR	16	0.880 [0.784, 0.989]	0.0335	0.0	[0.783, 0.989]
Primary sensitivity (HR subset, metagen)	HF hospitalization	HR	13	0.766 [0.698, 0.841]	0.0000	1.1	[0.698, 0.841]
Primary sensitivity (HR subset, metagen)	All-cause hospitalization	HR	10	0.870 [0.711, 1.064]	0.1514	71.0	[0.505, 1.497]
Secondary outcomes (ratio)	CV Mortality	RR	9	0.814 [0.668, 0.992]	0.0433	0.0	—
Secondary outcomes (ratio)	ED Visits	RR	6	0.795 [0.550, 1.149]	0.1699	41.4	—
Secondary outcomes (ratio)	Composite ACM+Hospitalization	HR	25	0.827 [0.765, 0.894]	0.0000	37.5	—
Secondary outcomes (continuous, MD)	MLHFQ	MD	11	-6.53 [-10.28, -2.79]	0.0030	93.6	—
Secondary outcomes	KCCQ	MD	3	8.14 [-24.03,	0.3902	83.7	—

Category	Outcome	Measure	k	Effect [95% CI]	p-value	I2 (%)	Prediction Interval
(continuous, MD)				40.30]			

RPM significantly reduced all-cause mortality across 41 RCTs (RR 0.890, 95% CI 0.819–0.966; P=0.007; I^2=2.3%; □^{2}=0) (Figure 2, Table 2). The 95% prediction interval was 0.820–0.965, indicating that the benefit would be expected in virtually all future settings. The number needed to treat was 84 per year. In sensitivity analysis restricted to studies reporting hazard ratios (k=16), the result was consistent (HR 0.880, 95% CI 0.784–0.989; P=0.034).

HF Hospitalization

RPM significantly reduced HF hospitalization across 39 RCTs (RR 0.782, 95% CI 0.711–0.859; P<0.001; I^2=47.2%; □^{2}=0.018) (Figure 3). The 95% prediction interval was 0.589–1.038, crossing 1.0, consistent with moderate heterogeneity. The NNT was 17 per year. In HR sensitivity (k=13), the effect was more pronounced (HR 0.766, 95% CI 0.698–0.841; P<0.001; I^2=1.1%).

All-Cause Hospitalization

RPM did not significantly reduce all-cause hospitalization across 28 RCTs (RR 0.952, 95% CI 0.884–1.027; P=0.19; I^2=56.2%) (Figure 4). The prediction interval was 0.788–1.151.

Secondary Outcomes

Cardiovascular mortality was significantly reduced (RR 0.814, 95% CI 0.668–0.992; P=0.043; I^2=0%; k=9; moderate certainty, downgraded for imprecision given the upper confidence limit approaching 1.0). The composite of all-cause mortality and hospitalization was significantly reduced (HR 0.827, 95% CI 0.765–0.894; P<0.001; I^2=37.5%; k=25; high certainty). Emergency

department visits showed a non-significant reduction (RR 0.795, 95% CI 0.551–1.149; P=0.17; I^2=41.4%; k=6). Quality of life measured by MLHFQ improved significantly (MD –6.59 points, 95% CI –10.78 to –2.39; P=0.006; I^2=94.2%; k=10), favoring RPM (lower scores indicate better quality of life), though with very high heterogeneity. KCCQ showed a non-significant improvement (MD 8.14, 95% CI –24.0 to 40.3; P=0.39; I^2=83.7%; k=3).

Subgroup Analyses

No significant interaction by RPM type was observed for any primary outcome. For all-cause mortality, the test for subgroup differences yielded $P_{interaction}$=0.24, with non-invasive TM showing the largest point estimate reduction (RR 0.779) and invasive monitoring showing a non-significant trend (RR 0.925). For HF hospitalization, $P_{interaction}$=0.26, and for all-cause hospitalization, $P_{interaction}$=0.34 (Table 2, Figure 7).

HF phenotype showed a significant interaction for all-cause hospitalization ($P_{interaction}$=0.038), with mixed HF phenotype trials showing greater reduction (RR 0.932) compared with HFrEF-only trials (RR 1.037). This was not significant for all-cause mortality ($P_{interaction}$=0.58) or HF hospitalization ($P_{interaction}$=0.067). The single trial classified as HFmrEF in the subgroup analysis (M-Cardio [ERICA-HF], mean LVEF 42%) contributed a directionally favorable but imprecise estimate, though this subgroup comprises only one study and should be interpreted cautiously.

Geographic context was examined as a novel subgroup. Among 41 trials reporting all-cause mortality, 13 were classified as rural/remote and 28 as not reported. No significant interaction was observed ($P_{interaction}$=0.53). The sparse reporting of geographic context — only two trials (TIM-HF2 and CHAT) provided formal rural/urban subgroup analyses — limited the interpretability of this analysis.

No significant interaction was observed for follow-up duration ($6□□ > 6□□□□□□), □□□□□□□

Outcome	Analysis	k	RR	LCI	UCI	P	I2 (%)	Note
HF_hosp	9_fu_ge3mo	39	0.782	0.711	0.859	<0.001	47.2	FU >=3 months only (n excl.=0)

All 10 sensitivity analyses were consistent with the primary results for both all-cause mortality and HF hospitalization (Table 3). For all-cause mortality, leave-one-out analysis showed pooled RR ranging from 0.882 to 0.905, with no single study disproportionately influencing the result. The fixed-effect model was consistent (RR 0.885, P=0.002). Excluding invasive RPM studies yielded RR 0.879 (P=0.012), excluding high RoB studies yielded RR 0.892 (P=0.011), and restricting to large trials (N$$200) yielded RR 0.904 (P=0.027; k=25). For HF hospitalization, all sensitivities remained significant (all P<0.001).

Publication Bias

For all-cause mortality, Egger's test was significant (P=0.027) and Begg's test was significant (P=0.014), suggesting funnel plot asymmetry. However, Peters' regression test was non-significant (P=0.060), and the large-trial sensitivity analysis (N$$200; k=25) yielded RR 0.904 (P=0.027), demonstrating that the mortality reduction persisted when small studies were excluded. Trim-and-fill analysis estimated 6 missing studies on the right side and yielded an adjusted RR of 0.903 (95% CI 0.829–0.984; P=0.021), which remained statistically significant (Figure 6). The contour-enhanced funnel plot suggested that asymmetry was driven primarily by small studies in regions of statistical significance, consistent with small-study effects rather than selective non-publication of negative results.

For HF hospitalization, all three tests were significant (Egger P<0.001, Begg P<0.001, Peters P<0.001), with trim-and-fill estimating 12 missing studies and an adjusted RR of 0.848 (P=0.008). The substantial asymmetry was consistent with small-study effects and potentially greater treatment effects in smaller, more intensive interventions.

Trial Sequential Analysis

For all-cause mortality with RRR=15%, the accrued information size (AIS=18,842 patients) exceeded the required information size (RIS=13,277), and the cumulative Z-curve crossed the O'Brien-Fleming monitoring boundary, establishing that the evidence is firm and additional trials are unlikely to overturn the conclusion of benefit (Figure 8). For HF hospitalization, the AIS did not reach the RIS at RRR=15%, but crossed the monitoring boundary at RRR=20%, indicating that firm evidence exists for a 20% or greater relative risk reduction but not for a 15% reduction.

NNT and GRADE

For all-cause mortality, the NNT was 75 overall and 84 per year (based on a control event rate of 12.1% over a median follow-up of 13.5 months among studies contributing event counts). For HF hospitalization, the NNT was 15 overall and 17 per year (control event rate 30.2%, median follow-up 14.0 months among studies contributing event counts; based on 41 studies with event count data, compared with 39 in the primary RR analysis). GRADE certainty was moderate for all-cause mortality (downgraded for suspected publication bias), low for HF hospitalization (downgraded for inconsistency and suspected publication bias), very low for all-cause hospitalization, moderate for cardiovascular mortality (downgraded for imprecision, with the upper confidence limit approaching 1.0), and high for the composite outcome (eTable 3).

Discussion

This systematic review and meta-analysis — the largest to date on RPM in HF, encompassing 59 poolable RCTs — demonstrates that RPM significantly reduces all-cause mortality by 11% (RR 0.890; NNT 84 per year) and HF hospitalization by 22% (RR 0.782; NNT 17 per year), with no significant effect on all-cause hospitalization. These findings were robust across 10 pre-specified

sensitivity analyses, and trial sequential analysis confirmed that the evidence for the mortality benefit has reached a definitive threshold.

The mortality reduction is notably consistent (I^2=2.3%), with a narrow prediction interval (0.820–0.965) indicating that the benefit would be expected in virtually all future clinical settings. This is an important distinction from many other HF interventions, where heterogeneity across populations and healthcare systems can complicate generalizability. The HKSJ method provides more reliable confidence interval coverage than the DerSimonian-Laird approach, particularly with a moderate number of studies [19,20], lending further credibility to these estimates.

A key finding is the absence of a significant interaction by RPM technology type. STS, non-invasive TM, and invasive hemodynamic monitoring all showed directionally consistent benefits, with no statistically significant subgroup difference for any primary outcome ($P_{interaction}$=0.24–0.34). This suggests that the mechanism of benefit is not inherent to the technology itself but rather to the clinical feedback loop that RPM enables — the systematic detection of deterioration, timely clinical response, and guided self-management. This interpretation aligns with the TIM-HF2 rationale, where the structured management protocol was considered as important as the monitoring technology [8].

Our results update and extend the Cochrane reviews by Inglis et al., which reported STS mortality RR 0.87 (95% CI 0.77–0.98) and TM mortality RR 0.80 (95% CI 0.68–0.94) in 2015 [7]. Our overall RR of 0.890 is broadly consistent with but slightly less favorable than these earlier estimates, reflecting the inclusion of several large neutral trials published since 2015 (BEAT-HF, OSICAT, PRADOC, MESSAGE-HF) and the dilution of earlier positive signals by

more pragmatic, larger-scale designs. The attenuated estimate does not diminish the clinical significance: with an NNT of 84 per year for mortality and 17 per year for HF hospitalization, the absolute benefit is clinically meaningful and comparable to established HF therapies.

The invasive monitoring evidence deserves specific commentary. The CHAMPION trial showed a striking 28% reduction in HF hospitalization with CardioMEMS-guided management [9], subsequently replicated in MONITOR-HF (HR 0.56) [10]. However, the GUIDE-HF trial yielded neutral overall results (HR 0.88, P=0.16), with benefit confined to a pre-COVID sensitivity analysis [11] — the pandemic reduced event rates in both arms, narrowing the between-group difference. The MORE-CARE trial, which evaluated a different mechanism (remote monitoring of CRT-D device diagnostics rather than direct hemodynamic measurement), was similarly neutral. When pooled, invasive monitoring did not significantly reduce all-cause mortality (RR 0.925, P=0.35), though HF hospitalization was significantly reduced (RR 0.846, P=0.006). This pattern is consistent with the mechanism of action: hemodynamic monitoring primarily targets congestion (the driver of hospitalization) rather than arrhythmia or pump failure (drivers of mortality).

HF phenotype showed limited interaction effects. The predominance of HFrEF or mixed populations in the included trials reflects the historical focus of RPM research. None of the 59 poolable trials enrolled HFpEF patients exclusively; PROACTIVE-HF, which targeted HFpEF, was excluded from quantitative synthesis owing to its single-arm design. The significant interaction for all-cause hospitalization by HF phenotype (P=0.038) should be interpreted cautiously given the small number of subgroup-specific trials and the potential for confounding by intervention type and era.

Geographic access was examined as a pre-specified hypothesis, motivated by the expectation that RPM could provide the greatest incremental benefit in populations with limited access to in-person HF care. The findings were informative precisely in their absence. Only two of 59 poolable trials reported formal rural/urban subgroup analyses: TIM-HF2 found no significant interaction (P=0.66), and CHAT was specifically designed for rural and remote patients. Laramee et al. (2003) reported substantial differences between rural (2% HF rehospitalization) and urban (14%) subgroups, but this was a single-center study. The overwhelming majority of trials did not report geographic context at all, making pooled analysis infeasible. This represents a critical gap: if RPM is to be deployed as a strategy to address healthcare disparities, trials must be designed and powered to detect geographic access interactions.

The publication bias analysis warrants careful interpretation. While Egger's and Begg's tests were significant for all-cause mortality, Peters' regression test — which is less sensitive to small-study effects unrelated to publication bias [25] — was non-significant (P=0.060). The large-trial sensitivity analysis (N$$200; k=25) yielded RR 0.904 (P=0.027), confirming that the mortality signal persists when small studies are excluded. Trim-and-fill adjustment yielded an RR of 0.903 that remained significant. Taken together, these findings suggest that the funnel plot asymmetry reflects small-study effects (smaller trials with more intensive, better-implemented interventions showing larger effects) rather than true selective non-publication of negative results. The contour-enhanced funnel plots support this interpretation.

This review has several strengths. It is the largest RPM meta-analysis to date, including 59 poolable RCTs across all three RPM categories. The search encompassed four databases without language restrictions. The analytic approach used REML+HKSJ (the recommended method for meta-analysis), included 10 pre-specified sensitivity analyses per outcome, applied TSA to

assess evidential sufficiency, and used GRADE to rate certainty. The geographic access subgroup is novel and highlights an important evidence gap.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the open-label design inherent to RPM trials introduces potential performance and detection bias, though hard endpoints (mortality, hospitalization) are less susceptible to this bias than patient-reported outcomes. Second, heterogeneity was moderate for HF hospitalization (I^2=47.2%) and all-cause hospitalization (I^2=56.2%), likely reflecting variation in intervention intensity, healthcare system context, and patient populations across decades of research. Third, geographic access data were sparse, limiting the power of our novel subgroup analysis. Fourth, some older trials had small sample sizes, contributing to the small-study effects detected in publication bias analysis. Fifth, the mix of effect measures (RR from event counts, HR from time-to-event analyses) required parallel sensitivity analyses rather than a single unified model. Sixth, the median follow-up of 6 months may not capture longer-term effects of sustained RPM programs. Seventh, the search was limited to four databases (PubMed/MEDLINE, Cochrane CENTRAL, ClinicalTrials.gov, and WHO ICTRP); Embase and CINAHL were not searched due to access constraints. This may have resulted in missed studies, particularly from European and Asian settings not fully indexed in PubMed. However, Cochrane CENTRAL aggregates records from multiple sources including Embase, partially mitigating this limitation.

Clinical Implications

The NNT of 17 per year for HF hospitalization is clinically compelling and compares favorably with established HF therapies such as SGLT2 inhibitors (NNT ~19–21/year) and mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists (NNT ~22/year). Combined with the mortality benefit

(NNT 84/year), these results support the routine implementation of RPM programs as an adjunct to guideline-directed medical therapy in HF. The absence of differential effect by RPM type suggests that healthcare systems can select the technology most appropriate to their resources and infrastructure — an important consideration for low- and middle-income countries and for rural health systems where invasive monitoring may not be feasible.

Future research should prioritize geographic access-enriched trials to determine whether RPM differentially benefits patients in rural and underserved settings, HFpEF-specific RPM trials (currently underrepresented), cost-effectiveness analyses comparing RPM modalities, and longer-term follow-up studies to assess sustainability of benefit. The firm evidence established by TSA for mortality suggests that further placebo-controlled trials of RPM versus no monitoring may not be ethically justified; rather, comparative effectiveness trials between RPM modalities and implementation science studies are the logical next step.

Conclusions

In this systematic review, meta-analysis, and trial sequential analysis of 59 poolable RCTs encompassing approximately 23,000 patients, remote patient monitoring significantly reduced all-cause mortality (RR 0.890, 95% CI 0.819–0.966; I^2=2.3%; GRADE moderate certainty), with a prediction interval (0.820–0.965) that excludes the null, suggesting the benefit would be expected across virtually all future settings. Trial sequential analysis confirmed that accrued evidence exceeds the required information size, establishing firm evidence that further RPM-versus-control trials are unlikely to overturn this conclusion. HF hospitalization was significantly reduced (RR 0.782, 95% CI 0.711–0.859; NNT 17/year; GRADE low certainty), though the prediction interval (0.589–1.038) indicates that in some contexts the effect may be attenuated or

absent, consistent with the moderate heterogeneity observed. No differential effect by RPM type was found ($P_{interaction}$=0.24). Geographic access context remains a critical evidence gap: only 2 of 59 trials reported rural/urban subgroups, and dedicated geographic access-enriched trials are urgently needed to determine whether RPM can address disparities in HF care delivery.

Data Availability

All data, analysis code, and materials necessary to reproduce the findings are publicly available in the Zenodo repository (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18779727).

References

1. Savarese G, Becher PM, Lund LH, et al. Global burden of heart failure: A comprehensive and updated review of epidemiology. Cardiovascular Research. 2023; 118(17) :3272–3287.

2. Virani SS, Alonso A, Aparicio HJ, et al. Heart disease and stroke statistics—2021 update: A report from the American Heart Association. Circulation. 2021; 143(8) :e254–e743.

3. Heidenreich PA, Bozkurt B, Aguilar D, et al. 2022 AHA/ACC/HFSA guideline for the management of heart failure. Journal of the American College of Cardiology. 2022; 79(17) :e263–e421.

4. Knorring S von, Salomonsson S, et al. Geographic access to heart failure care: A systematic review. ESC Heart Failure. 2021; 8(3) :1722–1738.

5. Clark RA, Inglis SC, McAlister FA, Cleland JGF, Stewart S. Telemonitoring or structured telephone support programmes for patients with chronic heart failure: Systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ. 2007; 334(7600) :942.

6. Inglis SC, Clark RA, McAlister FA, et al. Structured telephone support or non-invasive telemonitoring for patients with heart failure. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2010; (8) :CD007228.

7. Inglis SC, Clark RA, Dierckx R, Prieto-Merino D, Cleland JGF. Structured telephone support or non-invasive telemonitoring for patients with heart failure. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2015; (10) :CD007228.

8. 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.

9. Abraham WT, Adamson PB, Bourge RC, et al. Wireless pulmonary artery haemodynamic monitoring in chronic heart failure: A randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 2011; 377(9766) :658–666.

10. Brugts JJ, Raber L, et al. Remote haemodynamic monitoring of pulmonary artery pressures in patients with chronic heart failure (MONITOR-HF): A randomised clinical trial. Lancet. 2023; 401(10394) :2113–2123.

11. Lindenfeld J, Zile MR, Desai AS, et al. Haemodynamic-guided management of heart failure (GUIDE-HF): A randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 2021; 398(10304) :991–1001.

12. Guichard JL, Leclercq C, Abraham WT, et al. Hemodynamic-guided management of heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: The PROACTIVE-HF trial. JACC: Heart Failure. 2024; 12(10) :1728–1740.

13. Masterson Creber R et al. Remotely monitoring and coaching heart failure patients after hospital discharge: The MIGHTY-HEART randomized clinical trial. JAMA Internal Medicine. 2025;

14. McDonagh TA, Metra M, Adamo M, et al. 2021 ESC guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure. European Heart Journal. 2021; 42(36) :3599–3726.

15. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021; 372 :n71.

16. Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, et al. Better reporting of interventions: Template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide. BMJ. 2014; 348 :g1687.

17. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, et al. RoB 2: A revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. BMJ. 2019; 366 :l4898.

18. Tierney JF, Stewart LA, Ghersi D, Burdett S, Sydes MR. Practical methods for incorporating summary time-to-event data into meta-analysis. Trials. 2007; 8 :16.

19. Hartung J, Knapp G. On tests of the overall treatment effect in meta-analysis with normally distributed responses. Statistics in Medicine. 2001; 20(12) :1771–1782.

20. Veroniki AA, Jackson D, Viechtbauer W, et al. Methods to estimate the between-study variance and its uncertainty in meta-analysis. Research Synthesis Methods. 2016; 7(1) :55–79.

21. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. BMJ. 2003; 327(7414) :557–560.

22. Riley RD, Higgins JPT, Deeks JJ. Interpretation of random effects meta-analyses. BMJ. 2011; 342 :d549.

23. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. BMJ. 1997; 315(7109) :629–634.

24. Begg CB, Mazumdar M. Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. Biometrics. 1994; 50(4) :1088–1101.

25. Peters JL, Sutton AJ, Jones DR, Abrams KR, Rushton L. Comparison of two methods to detect publication bias in meta-analysis. JAMA. 2006; 295(6) :676–680.

26. Duval S, Tweedie R. Trim and fill: A simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. Biometrics. 2000; 56(2) :455–463.

27. Wetterslev J, Thorlund K, Brok J, Gluud C. Trial sequential analysis may establish when firm evidence is reached in cumulative meta-analysis. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. 2008; 61(1) :64–75.

28. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, et al. GRADE: An emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMJ. 2008; 336(7650) :924–926.

29. Balduzzi S, Rücker G, Schwarzer G. How to perform a meta-analysis with R: A practical tutorial. Evidence-Based Mental Health. 2019; 22(4) :153–160.

30. Viechtbauer W. Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. Journal of Statistical Software. 2010; 36(3) :1–48.

Figures


IDENTIFICATION
Additional records from other sources (n = 0)
Records identified from databases (n = 4,037):
PubMed/MEDLINE (n = 1,387)
Cochrane CENTRAL (n = 2,138)
ClinicalTrials.gov (n = 348)
WHO ICTRP (n = 164)
SCREENING
Duplicates removed (n = 1,404 net)
(1,405 removed; 1 Tele-HF record restored)
Records screened
(n = 2,633)
Records excluded at title/abstract screening
(n = 1,616 net):
Automated exclusion (n = 1,514)
Review queue excluded (n = 77)
Manual review excluded (n = 26)
MONITOR-HF rescue (+ 1)
Records sought for retrieval
(n = 1,017)
(incl. 1 MONITOR-HF rescue)
Records not retrieved
(n = 0)
Full-text audit (Phase 4b):
(n = 1,017 assessed)
Records excluded at full-text audit
(n = 699 net):
Pass 1 — registry/tier filters (n = 595)
Pass 2 — cross-tier rules (n = 82)
REVIEW_MANUAL excluded (n = 24)
REVIEW_MANUAL added (+ 2)
ELIGIBILITY
Full-text articles assessed
for eligibility (n = 342)
(Tier A: 60 | Tier B: 21 | Tier C: 187 | Tier D: 1)
Full-text articles excluded (n = 279):
Tier A (n = 48):
Not RCT / no results (n = 26)
Sub-analysis (n = 13)
Review/editorial (n = 4)
Not RPM primary (n = 3)
Other (n = 2)
Tier B (n = 21):
Sub-analysis (n = 8)
Review/editorial (n = 4)
Not HF population (n = 3)
Other (n = 6)
Tier C (n = 136):
Sub-analysis (n = 22)
Mixed population (n = 19)
Not RPM primary (n = 17)
Review/editorial (n = 15)
No RCT design (n = 14)
Feasibility/pilot (n = 11)
Other (n = 38)
Tier D (n = 1)
Audit survivors excl. at FT (n = 73)
INCLUDED
Studies included in review
(n = 65)*:
Tier A — dedicated trials (n = 12)
Tier C — additional RCTs (n = 53)
* Includes 2 records rescued from T/A screening
via post-hoc algorithm sensitivity analysis
Poolable RCTs in meta-analysis
(n = 59):
Structured Telephone Support (STS)
Non Invasive Telemonitoring (TM)
Invasive (CardioMEMS / ICD-based)
Note: 6 excluded from pool (single-arm,
before/after, no outcome, active comparator)

Figure 1. PRISMA 2020 flow diagram of study selection.

Figure 1. PRISMA 2020 flow diagram of study selection. A total of 4,037 records were identified across four databases. After deduplication, screening, and full-text assessment, 65 studies were included and 59 were poolable for quantitative synthesis.



Figure 2. Forest plot — all-cause mortality (RR).

Figure 2. Forest plot of all-cause mortality. Risk ratios with 95% confidence intervals from random-effects meta-analysis (REML + HKSJ). The diamond represents the pooled estimate (RR 0.890, 95% CI 0.819–0.966; k=41).



Figure 3. Forest plot — HF hospitalization (RR).

Figure 3. Forest plot of heart failure hospitalization. Pooled RR 0.782 (95% CI 0.711–0.859; I^2=47.2%; k=39).



Figure 4. Forest plot — all-cause hospitalization (RR).

Figure 4. Forest plot of all-cause hospitalization. Pooled RR 0.952 (95% CI 0.884–1.027; I^2=56.2%; k=28).

Figure 5. Forest plot — composite ACM + hospitalization (HR).

Figure 5. Forest plot of composite all-cause mortality and hospitalization. Pooled HR 0.827 (95% CI 0.765–0.894; I^2=37.5%; k=25).

Figure 6. Funnel plot — ACM with trim-and-fill.

Figure 6. Funnel plot with trim-and-fill analysis for all-cause mortality. Open circles represent observed studies; filled circles represent imputed studies (k_0=6). Adjusted RR 0.903 (95% CI 0.829–0.984).

Figure 7. Subgroup forest — RPM type x ACM.

Figure 7. Subgroup analysis of all-cause mortality by RPM type. No significant interaction was observed ($P_{interaction}$=0.24). STS: structured telephone support; TM: non-invasive telemonitoring.

Figure 8. Trial sequential analysis — ACM (RRR=15%).

Figure 8. Trial sequential analysis for all-cause mortality (RRR=15%, □=0.05, □=0.20, O'Brien-Fleming boundaries). The cumulative Z-curve (blue) crosses the monitoring boundary, and the accrued information size (18,842) exceeds the required information size (13,277), establishing firm evidence for benefit.


IDENTIFICATION
Additional records from other sources (n = 0)
Records identified from databases (n = 4,037):
PubMed/MEDLINE (n = 1,387)
Cochrane CENTRAL (n = 2,138)
ClinicalTrials.gov (n = 348)
WHO ICTRP (n = 164)
SCREENING
Duplicates removed (n = 1,404 net)
(1,405 removed; 1 Tele-HF record restored)
Records screened
(n = 2,633)
Records excluded at title/abstract screening
(n = 1,616 net):
Automated exclusion (n = 1,514)
Review queue excluded (n = 77)
Manual review excluded (n = 26)
MONITOR-HF rescue (+ 1)
Records sought for retrieval
(n = 1,017)
(incl. 1 MONITOR-HF rescue)
Records not retrieved
(n = 0)
Full-text audit (Phase 4b):
(n = 1,017 assessed)
Records excluded at full-text audit
(n = 699 net):
Pass 1 — registry/tier filters (n = 595)
Pass 2 — cross-tier rules (n = 82)
REVIEW_MANUAL excluded (n = 24)
REVIEW_MANUAL added (+ 2)
ELIGIBILITY
Full-text articles assessed
for eligibility (n = 342)
(Tier A: 60 | Tier B: 21 | Tier C: 187 | Tier D: 1)
Full-text articles excluded (n = 279):
Tier A (n = 48):
Not RCT / no results (n = 26)
Sub-analysis (n = 13)
Review/editorial (n = 4)
Not RPM primary (n = 3)
Other (n = 2)
Tier B (n = 21):
Sub-analysis (n = 8)
Review/editorial (n = 4)
Not HF population (n = 3)
Other (n = 6)
Tier C (n = 136):
Sub-analysis (n = 22)
Mixed population (n = 19)
Not RPM primary (n = 17)
Review/editorial (n = 15)
No RCT design (n = 14)
Feasibility/pilot (n = 11)
Other (n = 38)
Tier D (n = 1)
Audit survivors excl. at FT (n = 73)
INCLUDED
Studies included in review
(n = 65)*:
Tier A — dedicated trials (n = 12)
Tier C — additional RCTs (n = 53)
* Includes 2 records rescued from T/A screening
via post-hoc algorithm sensitivity analysis
Poolable RCTs in meta-analysis
(n = 59):
Structured Telephone Support (STS)
Non-Invasive Telemonitoring (TM)
Invasive (CardioMEMS / ICD-based)
Note: 6 excluded from pool (single-arm,
before/after, no outcome, active comparator)

Study	RPM Events	RPM N	Control Events	Control N	RR (95% CI) − All−Cause Mortality	RR	95% CI	Weight
subgroup_rpm_type = Invasive								
IN−TIME (Hindricks 2014)	10	333	27	331		0.37	[0.18; 0.75]	1.2%
REDUCEhf (Adamson 2011)	7	202	9	198		0.76	[0.29; 2.01]	0.7%
CHAMPION (Abraham 2011)	15	270	20	280		0.78	[0.41; 1.49]	1.5%
EVOLVO (Landolina 2012)	7	99	8	101		0.89	[0.34; 2.37]	0.7%
MONITOR−HF (Brugts 2023)	42	176	45	172		0.91	[0.63; 1.31]	4.7%
OptiLink HF (B"ohm 2016)	59	505	63	497		0.92	[0.66; 1.29]	5.6%
TELECART (Sardu 2016)	7	89	8	94		0.92	[0.35; 2.44]	0.7%
RESULT (Tajstra 2020)	18	299	18	301		1.01	[0.53; 1.90]	1.6%
GUIDE−HF (Lindenfeld 2021)	40	497	37	503		1.09	[0.71; 1.68]	3.4%
MORE−CARE (Boriani 2017)	40	437	34	428		1.15	[0.74; 1.78]	3.3%
CONNECT−OptiVol (L"uthje 2015)	8	87	6	89		1.36	[0.49; 3.77]	0.6%
Common effect model		**2994**		**2994**		**0.92**	**[0.78; 1.08]**	**.**
Random effects model						**0.93**	**[0.78; 1.10]**	**23.8%**
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 0%, τ^2 = 0, p = 0.5223								
subgroup_rpm_type = Non−invasive TM								
ControlVit (Achury−Salda~na 2024)	3	70	11	70		0.27	[0.08; 0.94]	0.4%
MOBITEL (Scherr 2009)	0	66	1	54		0.27	[0.01; 6.57]	0.1%
TEMA−HF 1 (Dendale 2012)	4	80	14	80		0.29	[0.10; 0.83]	0.5%
Johnson 2022 (Johnson 2022)	0	16	1	14		0.29	[0.01; 6.65]	0.1%
Yanicelli 2021 (Yanicelli 2021)	0	20	1	20		0.33	[0.01; 7.71]	0.1%
Pedone 2015 (Pedone 2015)	3	47	7	43		0.39	[0.11; 1.42]	0.4%
G'amez−L'opez 2012 (G'amez−L'opez 2012)	23	156	17	52		0.45	[0.26; 0.78]	2.1%
TeleMedBot (Zheleznykh 2025)	1	46	2	43		0.47	[0.04; 4.97]	0.1%
M−Cardio (ERICA−HF) (Rustambekova 2025)	5	127	9	117		0.51	[0.18; 1.48]	0.6%
Antonicelli (2008)	3	28	5	29		0.62	[0.16; 2.36]	0.4%
TIM−HF2 (Koehler 2018)	61	765	89	773		0.69	[0.51; 0.94]	6.5%
Vietnam HFrEF RCT (Tran 2025)	6	87	8	83		0.72	[0.26; 1.97]	0.6%
TEN−HMS (Cleland 2005)	28	163	20	85		0.73	[0.44; 1.22]	2.4%
OSICAT (Galinier 2020)	91	482	89	455		0.97	[0.74; 1.26]	9.0%
TIM−HF (Koehler 2011)	54	354	55	356		0.99	[0.70; 1.39]	5.2%
AMULET (Krzesi'nski 2022)	28	298	29	305		0.99	[0.60; 1.62]	2.6%
Kashem 2008 (Kashem 2008)	1	24	1	24		1.00	[0.07; 15.08]	0.1%
Renewing Health (Olivari 2018) (Olivari 2018)	55	229	24	110		1.10	[0.72; 1.68]	3.5%
TEHAF (Boyne 2012)	18	197	12	185		1.41	[0.70; 2.84]	1.3%
Seto 2012 (Seto 2012)	3	50	0	50		7.00	[0.37; 132.07]	0.1%
Common effect model		**3305**		**2948**		**0.82**	**[0.72; 0.93]**	**.**
Random effects model						**0.78**	**[0.64; 0.95]**	**35.9%**
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 26.4%, τ^2 = 0.0458, p = 0.1352								
subgroup_rpm_type = STS								
SPAN−CHF II (Weintraub 2010)	1	95	4	93		0.24	[0.03; 2.15]	0.1%
HFHC (Heart Failure Home Care Trial) (Soran 2008)	11	160	17	155		0.63	[0.30; 1.29]	1.2%
BEAT−HF (Ong 2016)	100	715	114	722		0.89	[0.69; 1.13]	10.1%
Laramee (2003)	13	141	15	146		0.90	[0.44; 1.82]	1.3%
MESSAGE−HF (Rohde 2024)	46	352	49	347		0.93	[0.64; 1.35]	4.5%
VA TeleHF (Wakefield) (Wakefield 2008)	10	47	11	49		0.95	[0.44; 2.02]	1.1%
DIAL (GESICA investigators 2005)	116	760	122	758		0.95	[0.75; 1.20]	11.4%
Ribeiro (2025)	7	70	6	57		0.95	[0.34; 2.67]	0.6%
Tele−HF (Chaudhry 2010)	92	826	94	827		0.98	[0.75; 1.28]	8.5%
CHAT (Krum 2013)	17	126	16	155		1.31	[0.69; 2.48]	1.5%
Common effect model		**3292**		**3309**		**0.93**	**[0.82; 1.05]**	**.**
Random effects model						**0.93**	**[0.85; 1.02]**	**40.3%**
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 0%, τ^2 = 0, p = 0.9113								
Common effect model		**9591**		**9251**		**0.88**	**[0.82; 0.96]**	**.**
Random effects model						**0.89**	**[0.82; 0.97]**	**100.0%**
Prediction interval							**[0.82; 0.96]**	



Heterogeneity: I^2 = 2.3%, τ^2 = 0, p = 0.4282
Test for subgroup differences (common effect): χ^2_2 = 2.11, df = 2 (p = 0.3486)
Test for subgroup differences (random effects): χ^2_2 = 2.89, df = 2 (p = 0.2354)

Study	RPM Events	RPM N	Control Events	Control N	RR	95% CI	Weight
subgroup_rpm_type = Invasive							
TELECART (Sardu 2016)	14	89	27	94	0.55	[0.31; 0.97]	1.5%
CHAMPION (Abraham 2011)	84	270	120	280	0.73	[0.58; 0.91]	5.2%
RESULT (Tajstra 2020)	89	299	116	301	0.77	[0.62; 0.97]	5.1%
IN−TIME (Hindricks 2014)	27	333	34	331	0.79	[0.49; 1.28]	2.0%
GUIDE−HF (Lindenfeld 2021)	185	497	225	503	0.83	[0.72; 0.97]	6.7%
REDUCEhf (Adamson 2011)	72	202	78	198	0.90	[0.70; 1.17]	4.6%
OptiLink HF (B"ohm 2016)	119	505	128	497	0.91	[0.74; 1.14]	5.3%
CONNECT−OptiVol (L"uthje 2015)	20	87	22	89	0.93	[0.55; 1.58]	1.8%
MORE−CARE (Boriani 2017)	111	437	103	428	1.06	[0.84; 1.33]	5.0%
MONITOR−HF (Brugts 2023)	117	176	212	172			0.0%
EVOLVO (Landolina 2012)	75	99	117	101			0.0%
Common effect model		**2994**		**2994**	**0.85**	**[0.78; 0.92]**	**.**
Random effects model					**0.85**	**[0.76; 0.94]**	**37.1%**
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 12.2%, τ^2 = 0.0017, p = 0.3327							
subgroup_rpm_type = Non−invasive TM							
Dansky 2009 (Health Buddy) (Dansky 2009)	0	64	13	46	0.03	[0.00; 0.44]	0.1%
TeleMedBot (Zheleznykh 2025)	1	46	5	43	0.19	[0.02; 1.54]	0.1%
Kashem 2008 (Kashem 2008)	2	24	10	24	0.20	[0.05; 0.82]	0.3%
Yanicelli 2021 (Yanicelli 2021)	0	15	2	15	0.20	[0.01; 3.84]	0.1%
ControlVit (Achury−Salda~na 2024)	3	70	14	70	0.21	[0.06; 0.71]	0.4%
Antonicelli (2008)	9	28	26	29	0.36	[0.21; 0.62]	1.6%
Delaney 2013 (Delaney 2013)	3	46	7	47	0.44	[0.12; 1.59]	0.4%
Pedone 2015 (Pedone 2015)	5	47	9	43	0.51	[0.18; 1.40]	0.6%
MOBITEL (Scherr 2009)	11	66	17	54	0.53	[0.27; 1.03]	1.2%
Benatar (2003)	13	108	24	108	0.54	[0.29; 1.01]	1.4%
Giordano (2009)	43	230	73	230	0.59	[0.42; 0.82]	3.5%
AMULET (Krzesi'nski 2022)	41	298	66	305	0.64	[0.45; 0.91]	3.1%
TEHAF (Boyne 2012)	18	197	25	185	0.68	[0.38; 1.20]	1.5%
Pekmezaris 2019 (Pekmezaris 2019)	5	46	8	58	0.79	[0.28; 2.25]	0.5%
OSICAT (Galinier 2020)	141	482	160	455	0.83	[0.69; 1.00]	5.9%
TEN−HMS (Cleland 2005)	40	163	24	85	0.87	[0.56; 1.34]	2.4%
TIM−HF (Koehler 2011)	64	354	74	356	0.87	[0.64; 1.17]	3.8%
Renewing Health (Olivari 2018) (Olivari 2018)	79	229	43	110	0.88	[0.66; 1.18]	3.9%
HHH (Mortara 2009)	53	301	28	160	1.01	[0.66; 1.52]	2.5%
Home−HF (Dar 2009)	22	91	16	91	1.38	[0.77; 2.44]	1.5%
Common effect model		**2905**		**2514**	**0.72**	**[0.65; 0.80]**	**.**
Random effects model					**0.69**	**[0.56; 0.85]**	**34.9%**
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 50.8%, τ^2 = 0.0550, p = 0.0049							
subgroup_rpm_type = STS							
DAA/Feij'o Brazil (Feij'o 2021)	4	99	14	107	0.31	[0.11; 0.91]	0.5%
SPAN−CHF II (Weintraub 2010)	12	95	30	93	0.39	[0.21; 0.72]	1.4%
Ribeiro (2025)	18	70	26	57	0.56	[0.35; 0.92]	2.0%
VA TeleHF (Wakefield) (Wakefield 2008)	20	47	29	49	0.72	[0.48; 1.08]	2.6%
DIAL (GESICA investigators 2005)	128	760	169	758	0.76	[0.61; 0.93]	5.5%
HFHC (Heart Failure Home Care Trial) (Soran 2008)	30	160	37	155	0.79	[0.51; 1.20]	2.4%
Laramee (2003)	18	131	21	125	0.82	[0.46; 1.46]	1.5%
CHAT (Krum 2013)	23	119	35	151	0.83	[0.52; 1.33]	2.1%
MESSAGE−HF (Rohde 2024)	57	352	57	347	0.99	[0.70; 1.38]	3.4%
Tele−HF (Chaudhry 2010)	227	826	223	827	1.02	[0.87; 1.19]	6.5%
Common effect model		**2659**		**2669**	**0.84**	**[0.76; 0.93]**	**.**
Random effects model					**0.77**	**[0.62; 0.95]**	**28.0%**
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 55.7%, τ^2 = 0.0329, p = 0.0162							
Common effect model		**8558**		**8177**	**0.81**	**[0.76; 0.85]**	**.**
Random effects model					**0.78**	**[0.71; 0.86]**	**100.0%**
Prediction interval						**[0.59; 1.04]**	



Heterogeneity: I^2 = 47.2%, τ^2 = 0.0180, p = 0.0007
Test for subgroup differences (common effect): χ^2_2 = 6.82, df = 2 (p = 0.0330)
Test for subgroup differences (random effects): χ^2_2 = 3.85, df = 2 (p = 0.1462)

Study	RPM Events	RPM N	Control Events	Control N	RR (95% CI) − All−Cause Hospitalization	RR	95% CI	Weight
subgroup_rpm_type = Invasive								
OptiLink HF (B"ohm 2016)	286	505	292	497		0.96	[0.87; 1.07]	7.9%
MORE−CARE (Boriani 2017)	337	437	312	428		1.06	[0.98; 1.14]	9.2%
EVOLVO (Landolina 2012)	57	99	49	101		1.19	[0.91; 1.54]	3.1%
Common effect model		**1041**		**1026**		**1.03**	**[0.96; 1.09]**	**.**
Random effects model						**1.03**	**[0.86; 1.25]**	**20.3%**
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 34.9%, τ^2 = 0.0017, p = 0.2151								
subgroup_rpm_type = STS								
Ribeiro (2025)	19	70	26	57		0.60	[0.37; 0.96]	1.2%
VA TeleHF (Wakefield) (Wakefield 2008)	41	99	29	49		0.70	[0.50; 0.97]	2.2%
CHAT (Krum 2013)	74	119	114	151		0.82	[0.70; 0.97]	5.5%
DIAL (GESICA investigators 2005)	261	760	296	758		0.88	[0.77; 1.00]	6.8%
MESSAGE−HF (Rohde 2024)	60	352	64	347		0.92	[0.67; 1.27]	2.3%
Laramee (2003)	49	131	46	125		1.02	[0.74; 1.40]	2.3%
SPAN−CHF II (Weintraub 2010)	51	95	49	93		1.02	[0.78; 1.33]	3.0%
BEAT−HF (Ong 2016)	363	715	355	722		1.03	[0.93; 1.15]	8.1%
Tele−HF (Chaudhry 2010)	407	826	392	827		1.04	[0.94; 1.15]	8.2%
HFHC (Heart Failure Home Care Trial) (Soran 2008)	75	160	66	155		1.10	[0.86; 1.41]	3.4%
Common effect model		**3327**		**3284**		**0.97**	**[0.92; 1.02]**	**.**
Random effects model						**0.94**	**[0.85; 1.05]**	**43.0%**
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 50.3%, τ^2 = 0.0077, p = 0.0337								
subgroup_rpm_type = Non−invasive TM								
Dansky 2009 (Health Buddy) (Dansky 2009)	0	64	13	46		0.03	[0.00; 0.44]	0.0%
Pedone 2015 (Pedone 2015)	8	47	20	43		0.37	[0.18; 0.74]	0.6%
Delaney 2013 (Delaney 2013)	9	46	18	47		0.51	[0.26; 1.02]	0.6%
Giordano (2009)	55	230	83	230		0.66	[0.50; 0.88]	2.7%
Arnar 2025 (Arnar 2025)	16	86	23	89		0.72	[0.41; 1.27]	0.9%
AMULET (Krzesi'nski 2022)	69	298	90	305		0.78	[0.60; 1.03]	3.0%
TEN−HMS (Cleland 2005)	80	163	46	85		0.91	[0.71; 1.17]	3.3%
OSICAT (Galinier 2020)	242	482	241	455		0.95	[0.84; 1.07]	7.1%
TEHAF (Boyne 2012)	117	197	109	185		1.01	[0.85; 1.19]	5.5%
TIM−HF (Koehler 2011)	192	354	179	356		1.08	[0.94; 1.24]	6.5%
Pekmezaris 2019 (Pekmezaris 2019)	19	46	22	58		1.09	[0.68; 1.75]	1.2%
Home−HF (Dar 2009)	44	91	39	91		1.13	[0.82; 1.55]	2.3%
HHH (Mortara 2009)	106	301	48	160		1.17	[0.89; 1.56]	2.8%
Johnson 2022 (Johnson 2022)	3	16	2	15		1.41	[0.27; 7.28]	0.1%
Kashem 2008 (Kashem 2008)	24	24	40	24				0.0%
Common effect model		**2445**		**2189**		**0.92**	**[0.86; 0.99]**	**.**
Random effects model						**0.91**	**[0.76; 1.08]**	**36.7%**
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 60.3%, τ^2 = 0.0231, p = 0.0018								
Common effect model		**6813**		**6499**		**0.97**	**[0.93; 1.00]**	**.**
Random effects model						**0.96**	**[0.89; 1.03]**	**100.0%**
Prediction interval							**[0.80; 1.15]**	



Heterogeneity: I^2 = 54.8%, τ^2 = 0.0068, p = 0.0004
Test for subgroup differences (common effect): χ^2_2 = 5.16, df = 2 (p = 0.0757)
Test for subgroup differences (random effects): χ^2_2 = 3.02, df = 2 (p = 0.2209)

Study	logHR	SE(logHR)	HR	95% CI	Weight
ControlVit (Achury−Salda~na 2024)	−1.7148	0.7642	0.18	[0.04; 0.80]	0.2%
TeleMedBot (Zheleznykh 2025)	−1.4697	0.8590	0.23	[0.04; 1.24]	0.2%
MOBITEL (Scherr 2009)	−0.6931	0.3359	0.50	[0.26; 0.97]	1.0%
Pedone 2015 (Pedone 2015)	−0.6733	0.3385	0.51	[0.26; 0.99]	1.0%
MONITOR−HF (Brugts 2023)	−0.4620	0.1826	0.63	[0.44; 0.90]	3.0%
IN−TIME (Hindricks 2014)	−0.4620	0.1884	0.63	[0.44; 0.91]	2.9%
Ribeiro (2025)	−0.4620	0.2312	0.63	[0.40; 0.99]	2.0%
AMULET (Krzesi'nski 2022)	−0.3711	0.1847	0.69	[0.48; 0.99]	3.0%
CHAT (Krum 2013)	−0.3567	0.1407	0.70	[0.53; 0.92]	4.5%
HFHC (Heart Failure Home Care Trial) (Soran 2008)	−0.3285	0.2293	0.72	[0.46; 1.13]	2.1%
CHAMPION (Abraham 2011)	−0.3147	0.1276	0.73	[0.57; 0.94]	5.1%
DAA/Feij'o Brazil (Feij'o 2021)	−0.2231	0.0994	0.80	[0.66; 0.97]	7.0%
TIM−HF2 (Koehler 2018)	−0.2231	0.1099	0.80	[0.64; 0.99]	6.2%
DIAL (GESICA investigators 2005)	−0.2231	0.0982	0.80	[0.66; 0.97]	7.0%
RESULT (Tajstra 2020)	−0.2107	0.1099	0.81	[0.65; 1.00]	6.2%
OptiLink HF (B"ohm 2016)	−0.1393	0.0938	0.87	[0.72; 1.05]	7.4%
GUIDE−HF (Lindenfeld 2021)	−0.1278	0.0893	0.88	[0.74; 1.05]	7.8%
TEHAF (Boyne 2012)	−0.1165	0.2488	0.89	[0.55; 1.45]	1.8%
TIM−HF (Koehler 2011)	−0.1165	0.1465	0.89	[0.67; 1.19]	4.2%
MESSAGE−HF (Rohde 2024)	−0.0619	0.1556	0.94	[0.69; 1.28]	3.9%
OSICAT (Galinier 2020)	−0.0305	0.1195	0.97	[0.77; 1.23]	5.6%
REDUCEhf (Adamson 2011)	−0.0101	0.2476	0.99	[0.61; 1.61]	1.8%
MORE−CARE (Boriani 2017)	0.0198	0.1239	1.02	[0.80; 1.30]	5.3%
Tele−HF (Chaudhry 2010)	0.0392	0.0684	1.04	[0.91; 1.19]	9.8%
G'amez−L'opez 2012 (G'amez−L'opez 2012)	0.1044	0.3127	1.11	[0.60; 2.05]	1.2%
Common effect model			**0.85**	**[0.80; 0.89]**	**.**
Random effects model (HK)			**0.83**	**[0.77; 0.89]**	**100.0%**
Prediction interval				**[0.68; 1.01]**	



Heterogeneity: I^2 = 37.5%, τ^2 = 0.0081, p = 0.0313


Trim−and−Fill Funnel − ACM
Adjusted RR = 0.903 [0.829−0.984] | k0 (filled) = 6
Standard Error (SE)
0.0
0.5
1.0
1.5
−4
−2
0
2
log(RR)
RPM Type
Invasive
Non−invasive TM
STS
Open triangles: imputed studies. Filled circles: observed studies.

Study	Experimental Events	Experimental Total	Control Events	Control Total	RR	95%−CI	Weight
subgroup = Invasive							
IN−TIME (Hindricks 2014)	10	333	27	331	0.37	[0.18; 0.75]	1.2%
REDUCEhf (Adamson 2011)	7	202	9	198	0.76	[0.29; 2.01]	0.7%
CHAMPION (Abraham 2011)	15	270	20	280	0.78	[0.41; 1.49]	1.5%
EVOLVO (Landolina 2012)	7	99	8	101	0.89	[0.34; 2.37]	0.7%
MONITOR−HF (Brugts 2023)	42	176	45	172	0.91	[0.63; 1.31]	4.7%
OptiLink HF (B"ohm 2016)	59	505	63	497	0.92	[0.66; 1.29]	5.6%
TELECART (Sardu 2016)	7	89	8	94	0.92	[0.35; 2.44]	0.7%
RESULT (Tajstra 2020)	18	299	18	301	1.01	[0.53; 1.90]	1.6%
GUIDE−HF (Lindenfeld 2021)	40	497	37	503	1.09	[0.71; 1.68]	3.4%
MORE−CARE (Boriani 2017)	40	437	34	428	1.15	[0.74; 1.78]	3.3%
CONNECT−OptiVol (L"uthje 2015)	8	87	6	89	1.36	[0.49; 3.77]	0.6%
Random effects model		**2994**		**2994**	**0.93**	**[0.78; 1.10]**	**23.8%**
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 0%, p = 0.5223							
subgroup = Non−invasive TM							
ControlVit (Achury−Salda~na 2024)	3	70	11	70	0.27	[0.08; 0.94]	0.4%
MOBITEL (Scherr 2009)	0	66	1	54	0.27	[0.01; 6.57]	0.1%
TEMA−HF 1 (Dendale 2012)	4	80	14	80	0.29	[0.10; 0.83]	0.5%
Johnson 2022 (Johnson 2022)	0	16	1	14	0.29	[0.01; 6.65]	0.1%
Yanicelli 2021 (Yanicelli 2021)	0	20	1	20	0.33	[0.01; 7.71]	0.1%
Pedone 2015 (Pedone 2015)	3	47	7	43	0.39	[0.11; 1.42]	0.4%
G'amez−L'opez 2012 (G'amez−L'opez 2012)	23	156	17	52	0.45	[0.26; 0.78]	2.1%
TeleMedBot (Zheleznykh 2025)	1	46	2	43	0.47	[0.04; 4.97]	0.1%
M−Cardio (ERICA−HF) (Rustambekova 2025)	5	127	9	117	0.51	[0.18; 1.48]	0.6%
Antonicelli (2008)	3	28	5	29	0.62	[0.16; 2.36]	0.4%
TIM−HF2 (Koehler 2018)	61	765	89	773	0.69	[0.51; 0.94]	6.5%
Vietnam HFrEF RCT (Tran 2025)	6	87	8	83	0.72	[0.26; 1.97]	0.6%
TEN−HMS (Cleland 2005)	28	163	20	85	0.73	[0.44; 1.22]	2.4%
OSICAT (Galinier 2020)	91	482	89	455	0.97	[0.74; 1.26]	9.0%
TIM−HF (Koehler 2011)	54	354	55	356	0.99	[0.70; 1.39]	5.2%
AMULET (Krzesi'nski 2022)	28	298	29	305	0.99	[0.60; 1.62]	2.6%
Kashem 2008 (Kashem 2008)	1	24	1	24	1.00	[0.07; 15.08]	0.1%
Renewing Health (Olivari 2018) (Olivari 2018)	55	229	24	110	1.10	[0.72; 1.68]	3.5%
TEHAF (Boyne 2012)	18	197	12	185	1.41	[0.70; 2.84]	1.3%
Seto 2012 (Seto 2012)	3	50	0	50	7.00	[0.37; 132.07]	0.1%
Random effects model		**3305**		**2948**	**0.78**	**[0.64; 0.95]**	**35.9%**
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 26.4%, p = 0.1352							
subgroup = STS							
SPAN−CHF II (Weintraub 2010)	1	95	4	93	0.24	[0.03; 2.15]	0.1%
HFHC (Heart Failure Home Care Trial) (Soran 2008)	11	160	17	155	0.63	[0.30; 1.29]	1.2%
BEAT−HF (Ong 2016)	100	715	114	722	0.89	[0.69; 1.13]	10.1%
Laramee (2003)	13	141	15	146	0.90	[0.44; 1.82]	1.3%
MESSAGE−HF (Rohde 2024)	46	352	49	347	0.93	[0.64; 1.35]	4.5%
VA TeleHF (Wakefield) (Wakefield 2008)	10	47	11	49	0.95	[0.44; 2.02]	1.1%
DIAL (GESICA investigators 2005)	116	760	122	758	0.95	[0.75; 1.20]	11.4%
Ribeiro (2025)	7	70	6	57	0.95	[0.34; 2.67]	0.6%
Tele−HF (Chaudhry 2010)	92	826	94	827	0.98	[0.75; 1.28]	8.5%
CHAT (Krum 2013)	17	126	16	155	1.31	[0.69; 2.48]	1.5%
Random effects model		**3292**		**3309**	**0.93**	**[0.85; 1.02]**	**40.3%**
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 0%, p = 0.9113							
Random effects model		**9591**		**9251**	**0.89**	**[0.82; 0.97]**	**100.0%**
Prediction interval						**[0.82; 0.96]**	
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 2.3%, p = 0.4282							
Test for subgroup differences: χ^2_2 = 2.89, df = 2 (p = 0.2354)							



tau2 0.00, I2 2.3%, D2 6.2%, Heterogeneity p−value 0.4285



Retrospective TSA with: pc 12.1%, RRR 15.0%, alpha 5.0%, beta 20%. Sample size is adjusted by tau2 and assuming 2 additional trials.
Methods: Random−effects, DL_HKSJ; Weight MH, alpha spending esOF.