

1 Title

2 Outcomes of a Smartphone-based Application with Live Health-Coaching Post-

3 Percutaneous Coronary Intervention

4

5 Authors

6 Kaavya Paruchuri, MD (1-4), Phoebe Finneran, BS (1), Nicholas A Marston, MD MPH

7 (5), Emma W Healy, BS (1,8), John Andreo Jr, RD RN MPH (5), Ryan Lynch, BS (5),

8 Alexander J Blood, MD (5), Maeve Jones-O'Connor, MB BCh (1,3), Bradley Lander, MD

9 (6), Noreen Kelly, MD (7), Maria T. Vivaldi, MD (2,3), Kate Traynor, RN (2), Stephen

10 Wiviott, MD (5), Pradeep Natarajan, MD MMSc (1-4)

11

12 Affiliations

13 1. Cardiovascular Research Center, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA

14 2. Cardiovascular Disease Prevention Center, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston,

15 MA

16 3. Department of Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA

17 4. Program in Medical and Population Genetics and Cardiovascular Disease Initiative,

18 Broad Institute of Harvard and MIT, Cambridge, MA

19 5. Division of Cardiovascular Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston MA

20 6. Division of Cardiology, Columbia University Irving Medical Center – New York

21 Presbyterian Hospital, New York, NY.

22 7. Sanger Heart and Vascular Institute, Atrium Health, Charlotte, NC.

23 8. Vagelos College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, New York, NY.

1

2 Please address correspondence to:

3 Pradeep Natarajan, MD MMSc

4 185 Cambridge Street, CPZN 3.184, Boston, MA 02114

5 Office: 617-726-1843

6 Email: pnatarajan@mgh.harvard.edu

7 Twitter: @pnatarajanmd

8

9 Total Word Count: 5185

10 *Includes title page, abstract, text, references, tables and figure legends.*

11 Figure Count: 3

12 Table Count: 2

1 **ABSTRACT:**

2 **Background:** The interval between inpatient hospitalization for symptomatic coronary
3 artery disease (CAD) and post-discharge office consultation is a vulnerable period for
4 adverse events.

5
6 **Methods:** Content was customized on a smartphone app-based platform for
7 hospitalized patients receiving PCI which included education, tracking, reminders and
8 live health coaches. We conducted a single-arm open-label pilot study of the app at two
9 academic medical centers in a single health system, with subjects enrolled 02/2018-
10 05/2019 and 1:3 propensity-matched historical controls from 01/2015-12/2017. To
11 evaluate feasibility and efficacy, we assessed 30-day hospital readmission (primary),
12 outpatient cardiovascular follow-up, and cardiac rehabilitation (CR) enrollment as
13 recorded in the health system. Outcomes were assessed by Cox Proportional Hazards
14 model.

15
16 **Findings:** 118 of 324 eligible (36.4%) 21-85 year-old patients who underwent PCI for
17 symptomatic CAD who owned a smartphone or tablet enrolled. Mean age was 62.5
18 (9.7) years, 87 (73.7%) were male, 40 of 118 (33.9%) had type 2 diabetes mellitus, 68
19 (57.6%) enrolled underwent PCI for MI and 59 (50.0%) had previously known CAD;
20 demographics were similar among matched historical controls. No significant difference
21 existed in all-cause readmission within 30 days (8.5% app vs 9.6% control, ARR -1.1%
22 absolute difference, 95% CI -7.1-4.8, p=0.699) or 90 days (16.1% app vs 19.5%
23 control, p=0.394). Rates of both 90-day CR enrollment (HR 1.99, 95% CI 1.30-3.06)

1 and 1-month cardiovascular follow up (HR 1.83, 95% CI 1.43-2.34) were greater with
2 the app. Weekly engagement at 30- and 90-days, as measured by percentage of weeks
3 with at least one day of completion of tasks, was mean (SD) 73.5% (33.9%) and 63.5%
4 (40.3%). Spearman correlation analyses indicated similar engagement across age, sex,
5 and cardiovascular risk factors.

6

7 **Interpretations:** A post-PCI smartphone app with live health coaches yielded similarly
8 high engagement across demographics and safely increased attendance in cardiac
9 rehabilitation. Larger prospective randomized controlled trials are necessary to test
10 whether this app improves cardiovascular outcomes following PCI.

11

12 **Funding:** National Institutes of Health, Boston Scientific.

13

14 **Clinical Trial Registration:** NCT03416920

15 (<https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03416920>).

1 **INTRODUCTION:**

2 Myocardial infarction (MI) is a leading cause of morbidity and mortality in the
3 United States and worldwide.^{1,2} Acute management of MI comprises pharmacological
4 and revascularization strategies to reduce recurrent ischemic events, including
5 cardiovascular death.^{3,4} Secondary prevention measures include adherence to
6 guideline-based pharmacologic strategies, management of cardiovascular risk factors,
7 diet and lifestyle counseling, and participation in cardiac rehabilitation. Both patient- and
8 treatment-specific factors are associated with short-term adverse events.

9 Cardiac rehabilitation (CR) has been demonstrated to reduce both mortality rates
10 and hospital admissions after coronary artery disease (CAD) events, such as MI, by
11 providing a comprehensive secondary prevention framework in randomized controlled
12 trials.⁵⁻⁷ Despite the known benefits, barriers to CR remain, and are highlighted by low
13 referral, enrollment and completion rates.^{8,9} Non-commercial insurance status, non-
14 white race, older age, female gender, distance to facility, medical comorbidities, and
15 geographic socioeconomic factors are correlated with lower CR utilization rates.^{10,11}
16 Among level I guideline recommendations, CR consistently attains the lowest
17 adherence rates.¹²

18 Mobile health platforms have been previously proposed as novel care strategies
19 with recent rapid adoption to minimize SARS-CoV-2 transmission.¹³ Smartphone and
20 internet-based programs may safely deliver elements of CR.^{14,15} Virtual strategies may
21 improve access to care and facilitate lifestyle modification.¹⁶ Smartphone apps
22 concurrent with CR may improve CR adherence.¹⁷ Randomized controlled trials to
23 evaluate the potential synergy of digital health platforms with traditional CR are

1 underway.^{18–20} The Million Hearts Cardiac Rehabilitation Collaborative aims to improve
2 CR enrollment itself, but whether engagement earlier through digital health strategies
3 may support this goal is not presently known.²¹

4 Here, we customized an app to address the inpatient-outpatient transition post-
5 PCI to improve enrollment of CR. Our goals were to assess feasibility of smartphone
6 application (app) deployment during inpatient hospitalization and evaluate efficacy of
7 the app in improving CR enrollment as well as short-term safety of engagement with
8 third-party health coaches compared to matched historical controls.

9

10 **METHODS:**

11 Study Participants

12 The present study is an open-label, single-arm, multi-center clinical trial with
13 stratified enrollment and matched historical controls (NCT03416920). The study
14 protocol was approved by the Massachusetts General Hospital Institutional Review
15 Board (#2017P002582).

16 Between 02/2018 and 05/2019, patients were identified via electronic health
17 records on the day after PCI for either non-MI symptomatic CAD or acute MI at study
18 sites (Massachusetts General Hospital [MGH] and Brigham and Women’s Hospital
19 [BWH]) within the Mass General Brigham (MGB, formerly Partners) healthcare system.
20 Enrollment for symptomatic CAD, in the absence of MI, was capped at 50 participants
21 per prespecified protocol. English-speaking patients aged 21-70 years who owned a
22 smartphone or tablet and had a longitudinal MGB primary care provider were
23 considered for inclusion. Inclusion criteria were later liberalized to include patients aged

1 up to 85 years and without MGB primary care providers due to patient interest. Patients
2 with recent (within 1 month) use of illicit substances or alcohol abuse, in-hospital acute
3 MI, known pregnancy, dementia or cognitive delay or incarceration were excluded.

4 Historical controls were ascertained by query of a centralized clinical data
5 repository to identify a historical patient population who met study eligibility criteria,
6 except smartphone or tablet possession information was not available, who underwent
7 PCI from 01/01/2015 through 12/31/2017 at the two study sites. Historical controls were
8 then identified in a 1:3 manner via propensity matching²² (nearest neighbor method,
9 MatchIt Package v2.0-2, RStudio) on key demographic criteria including age, sex, state
10 of residence (Massachusetts [MA]/non-MA), PCI Type (MI/symptomatic CAD), diabetes
11 mellitus type 2 (DM2), MGB primary care provider (yes/no), insurance type
12 (commercial/Medicaid/Medicare/other) and PCI site (MGH/BWH). Identified controls
13 were then validated for all demographics by physician manual chart review; 1 identified
14 control was removed due to validation failure. Balance diagnostics were verified using
15 standardized mean difference (cobalt package, v4.2-2, RStudio).²³

16

17 Digital Health Platform

18 Content on a digital health platform from a Massachusetts-based health care
19 technology company (Wellframe, Boston, MA) was customized for hospitalized patients
20 receiving percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI).²⁴ The mobile health platform
21 consisted of a patient-facing mobile app, a clinical dashboard and a suite of clinical
22 programs with configurable rules (**Supplementary Figure 1**). The patient mobile app
23 featured a personalized adaptive daily health checklist that included reminders to

1 engage in health behaviors and a series of personalized, interactive surveys, articles
2 and encouragement (**Supplementary Text**). The app was developed using user-
3 experience and design principles to ensure operability by a wide variety of users.
4

5 Trial Procedures

6 Enrolled participants in the intervention arm provided written and verbal consent,
7 and the app was installed on their personal smartphone or tablet prior to hospital
8 discharge. Patients had active accounts on the study app for 90 days, after which each
9 participant was contacted once by a member of the study staff. During this phone call,
10 staff asked a series of standardized questions to determine clinical outcomes.

11 Manual chart review by study physicians was conducted for all participants in
12 both the interventional and historical control arms to harmonize outcome adjudication
13 between both groups. In both groups, hospitalization within an MGB hospital with
14 documentation of date within 30- or 90-days was used for readmission rates.
15 Emergency department (ED) or urgent care (UC) visit with subsequent hospitalization
16 was counted as a single readmission. Admission or presentation with documentation of
17 a chief complaint consistent with cardiac etiology (i.e. CAD, CHF, arrhythmia),
18 admission requiring cardiac consultation or admission to a cardiology ward unit was
19 coded as a cardiovascular hospitalization.

21 Trial Outcomes

22 We primarily assessed the safety of the app, as assessed by 30-day all-cause
23 hospital readmission, and secondarily 90-day all-cause hospital readmission. We also

1 secondarily assessed enrollment in CR at an MGB site within 90 days and follow up
2 with an MGB cardiologist within 1 month of hospitalization (to harmonize outcome
3 ascertainment between the intervention group and the historical control group). We
4 evaluated feasibility metrics including conversion rate, or the study enrollment rate
5 among the total number of eligible patients. Among the participants in the intervention
6 group, we evaluated various engagement metrics (**Supplementary Table 1**).

7 8 Statistical Analyses

9 Differences in baseline characteristics between study groups were first assessed
10 by Fisher's exact tests or two-sample t-tests (if variables were continuous). Clinical
11 outcome risks, including 30- and 90-day all cause and CV readmission, 90-day CR
12 enrollment, and 1-month outpatient cardiology follow-up were estimated between study
13 groups by Cox proportional hazards models. Models were adjusted for age, sex,
14 insurance type, state of residence, DM2, and primary care provider practice location.
15 Baseline was set at date of PCI, and if the aforementioned events did not occur, last
16 follow-up was established at date of death or last follow-up within 90 days (data were
17 right censored at 90 days if events did not occur). The proportional hazards assumption
18 was evaluated by examining Schoenfeld residuals and was met.

19 Spearman correlation analysis was used to correlate engagement metrics with
20 age, sex, reason for PCI (MI, non-MI symptomatic CAD) or known cardiovascular risk
21 factors (hypertension, hyperlipidemia, DM2, peripheral arterial disease and known
22 CAD). Mean daily engagement was then dichotomized into top 25th percentile and
23 bottom 75th percentile. Multivariate ANOVA was used to correlate quartiles of

1 engagement with 90-day CR enrollment, 90-day all cause readmission and 1-month
2 outpatient follow up.

3 Statistical significance was assigned at two-sided $\alpha=0.05$. Analyses were
4 performed in RStudio (v1.2.5001, RStudio Inc, Boston MA; R version 3.6.1, R
5 Foundation, Vienna, Austria).

6

7 **RESULTS:**

8 Baseline Characteristics

9 1,994 patients were screened at time of PCI at two study sites. 1,676 patients
10 were excluded primarily due to lack of consent (650), elective PCI after cap attained
11 (370), advanced age (209), or deemed not suitable by the treating team (208)
12 (**Supplementary Figure 2**). The remaining 324 were eligible and approached, 118 of
13 whom (36.4%) were enrolled in the study. 68 of 118 (57.6%) underwent PCI for MI, and
14 29 of 118 (24.6%) were for ST elevation MI. Mean (standard deviation [SD]) age was
15 62.5 (9.7) years, 87 (73.7%) were male, 40 (33.9%) had DM2, and 59 (50.0%) had
16 previously known CAD. Demographics were similar between enrolled participants and
17 historical controls (**Table 1**). Adjusted standard mean differences for covariates were <
18 0.25 (**Supplementary Figure 3**).

19

20 Study App Engagement

21 Engagement with the app, as defined by completion of at least one task either
22 daily or weekly, fell in a parabolic distribution (**Supplementary Figure 4**). Patients set
23 up a mean (SD) of 3.45 (6.23) medication reminders per day. Patients sent a median

1 [IQR] of 1 [9] message and the clinical care team sent a median [IQR] of 12 (11)
2 messages per participant. The number of messages sent by health coaches was highly
3 correlated with the number of messages sent by individual participants (Spearman
4 $r^2=0.82$, $p<2.2\times 10^{-16}$, **Supplementary Figure 5**). Spearman correlation analyses
5 revealed no significant associations between number of messages per participant and
6 age, sex or known cardiovascular risk factors or PCI indication.

7 Engagement rates were durable across 30- and 90-day periods (**Table 2**). 30-
8 and 90-day content completion rates, as measured by percentage of articles opened by
9 participants, were mean (SD) 57.8% (36.5%) and 52.9% (36.1%), respectively.
10 Medication adherence rates at 30- and 90-days, as measured by percentage of
11 medication reminder tasks completed by participants, were mean (SD) 76.3% (31.3%)
12 and 69.9% (30.7%) respectively. Survey completion rates at 30- and 90-days, as
13 measured by percentage of survey tasks completed, were mean (SD) 52.4% (39.8%)
14 and 46.0% (37.9%). The percentage of days participants met their physical activity goal
15 was mean (SD) 53.3% (41.4%) at 30 days and 52.3% (40.3%) at 90 days. Daily
16 engagement rates at 30- and 90-days, as measured by percentage of days with at least
17 one task completion, were mean (SD) 55.4% (40.5%) and 48.2% (40.6%). Weekly
18 engagement at 30- and 90-days, as measured by percentage of weeks with at least one
19 day of completion of tasks, was mean (SD) 73.5% (33.9%) and 63.5% (40.3%)
20 respectively (**Figure 1**). Spearman correlation analyses revealed no significant
21 correlations between engagement metrics and age, sex or known cardiovascular risk
22 factors (**Supplementary Figure 6**).

23

1 Study Intervention Outcomes

2 There was an increased rate in 90-day enrollment in CR at an MGB site (29.7%
3 vs 16.3%, $p=1.5 \times 10^{-3}$) (**Figure 2A**) for the intervention group versus historical controls.
4 Among those who enrolled in CR, we observed that 21/35 (60.0%) in the intervention
5 group and 23/56 (41.1%) in the historical control group completed CR ($p=0.09$). We
6 observed consistent relationships within both sites (**Supplementary Figure 7**). Among
7 those who enrolled in CR, demographics were largely similar between the intervention
8 and historical control groups (**Supplementary Table 2**).

9 For the intervention arm, phone follow-up was also performed and successful for
10 75 (63.5%) participants. Of those in the intervention group who were successfully
11 contacted by phone, 46 (61.3%) enrolled in CR at any site within 90 days. In this group,
12 22 (29.3%) specifically participated in CR at an MGB site.

13 66 (55.9%) participants in the intervention group attended 1-month outpatient
14 MGB cardiology follow-up compared to 96 (28.0%) among historical controls ($p=1.9 \times 10^{-8}$)
15 **(Figure 2B)**. For those who attended a 1-month outpatient MGB cardiology follow-up,
16 the mean number of days from PCI date to first outpatient MGB cardiology follow-up
17 was mean (SD) 18.1 (7.43) in the intervention group and 19.1 (7.61) in the historical
18 control group ($p=0.39$). Of those in the intervention group who were successfully
19 contacted by phone, 73 of 75 (97.3%) followed up with a cardiologist at any site. In this
20 group, 58 (77.3%) followed up at an MGB cardiology site.

21 We observed no significant difference in all-cause readmission rates within 30 or
22 90 days at an MGB hospital between the historical control and intervention groups (33
23 [9.6%] vs 10 [8.5%], $p=0.699$; 67 [19.5%] vs 19 [16.1%], $p=0.394$) (**Figure 3A**). We

1 also observed no significant difference in 30- or 90-day cardiovascular-related
2 readmission rates between the historical control and intervention groups (28 [8·2%] vs
3 10 [8·5%], $p=0\cdot930$; 46 [13·4%] vs 18 [15·3%], $p=0\cdot191$ respectively) (**Figure 3B**). In
4 the intervention arm, daily engagement rate did not predict 90-day all cause
5 readmission ($p=0\cdot289$), 90-day CR enrollment ($p=0\cdot969$) nor 1-month outpatient
6 cardiology follow-up ($p=0\cdot803$) at MGB facilities (**Supplementary Figure 8**).

7

8 **DISCUSSION:**

9 The present smartphone app including third-party health coaches helped bridge
10 a care gap shortly after hospital discharge for PCI and facilitated participation in CR. 1
11 in 3 individuals approached accepted the app and 52% of individuals surveyed were still
12 using the app daily at 90 days. For every 8 individuals who used the app, 1 additional
13 individual enrolled in CR compared to historical controls. Importantly, use of an app with
14 third-party health coaches did not lead to excess short-term readmissions in the studied
15 population.

16 Our results may permit several conclusions regarding the prevention of
17 cardiovascular disease using digital health strategies. First, onboarding patients for
18 digital health care solutions during inpatient hospitalization is feasible. Prior digital
19 health initiatives have largely targeted patients in the ambulatory setting or at time of
20 enrollment at CR with the aim of promoting preventive activities and promoting long-
21 term maintenance.¹⁸ However, the weeks to months between hospital discharge and
22 outpatient CR or cardiovascular follow-up after the index event represents a missed
23 opportunity.²⁵ Our study indicates an opportunity to initiate comprehensive

1 cardiovascular disease prevention earlier and facilitate CR enrollment.^{9,19} Use of EHR-
2 integrated digital health tools to engage patients and clinicians in discharge planning
3 tasks has been shown to be feasible, acceptable and valuable.²⁶ Therefore, creating
4 standardized clinical workflows to incorporate onboarding with patient-facing digital
5 health tools at time of discharge may enhance usability of patient discharge paperwork
6 and potentially clinical outcomes.

7 Second, our study shows that patients are willing to engage both with an app
8 targeting cardiovascular disease as well as third-party health coaches. Previous digital
9 health interventions involving automated one-way texting/messaging and structured
10 questionnaires have had mixed success in promoting durable lifestyle changes.²⁷
11 Although behavioral modification studies and patient opinions have suggested that
12 personalized virtual feedback is felt to be the most effective means for enacting change,
13 very few studies have been able to create individualized interventions as they require
14 human guidance.^{28,29} The use of physicians or physician extenders in the role of virtual
15 health coaches within prior studies of digital health interventions in cardiology has
16 allowed for personalization at the cost of limited scalability.³⁰ Our study is novel in its
17 utilization of third-party health coaches external to the health system to support patient
18 engagement with minimal burden to clinical staff. Engagement with our framework was
19 markedly greater compared to population-based preventive cardiovascular interventions
20 to-date using apps. In a study of nearly 50,000 individuals in the community, surveys
21 and study procedures over 7 days were only completed by 3-10% of participants.^{31,32}
22 Apps aligned with the healthcare teams that provide passive and active engagement
23 designed for patients with cardiovascular disease may provide more durable effects.

1 Third, patient engagement with digital health tools may not be predicted by
2 traditional cardiovascular risk factors including comorbidities. There was notably no
3 difference in engagement with the app by age despite preconceived notions of
4 technologic proficiency in older patients. There are few reports of older adults (age >65
5 years) reporting difficulty with digital health technology but this may reflect their lack of
6 inclusion in clinical studies.^{33,34} Further study is needed to determine whether newer
7 mobile technologies can be adopted into populations previously not represented, such
8 as the elderly and medically complex, who have historic disparities in CR enrollment.¹¹

9 Fourth, despite the resource-rich environment of the app, there was still
10 increased patient engagement with healthcare teams as measured by outpatient follow-
11 up rate and increased adherence to guideline-supported care plans, such as CR
12 enrollment, compared with historic controls. There was no evidence of excess
13 cardiovascular risk, as measured by short-term readmissions, suggesting that
14 participants did not use the app as a surrogate for care. Whether this ‘bridging’ strategy
15 may optimize long-term risk reduction through facilitating CR enrollment, cardiovascular
16 follow-up, patient education, and motivational coaching requires longer term study in
17 randomized controlled trials.

18 While our study has several strengths, it also has limitations. First, participants
19 who opt to enroll in this novel study may be more engaged in health maintenance
20 compared to those who decline. Second, reliance on historical controls with propensity
21 matching may lead to imbalance of unavailable phenotypes or systematic healthcare
22 changes. We focused on relatively short duration, contemporary time periods at two
23 sites, and matched used several clinical features related to health-related behaviors.¹⁰

1 Persistently low rates of readmission for the two groups indicate the lack of major new
2 systematic endeavors in addressing readmission rates between the two periods.
3 Additionally, there were no other formal systemic endeavors targeting CR enrollment
4 rates within the healthcare system studied. Third, use of historical controls permitted us
5 to only ascertain clinical events from the electronic health record and thus, from within
6 our health system. Power is maximized since the studied health system is the largest in
7 New England, but this may have led to reduced absolute rates observed. If similar
8 trends were observed outside of the healthcare system, then greater absolute risk
9 differences may be truly present with the current data thus biasing our results to the
10 null. Finally, given the small sample size and short-term follow up, we cannot exclude
11 the possibility of reduced power in the assessment of clinical cardiovascular outcomes.

12 In conclusion, a post-PCI smartphone app, with live health coaches, deployed
13 upon discharge yields similarly high engagement across demographics. Compared to
14 historical controls, use of the app did not reduce short-term hospital readmission but
15 was associated with two-fold higher attendance in CR. Prospective randomized
16 controlled trials are necessary to test whether this digital health platform improves
17 cardiovascular outcomes following PCI.

18

19 Data Access, Responsibility and Analysis:

20 P.N and K.P. had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the
21 integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

22

23 Data Sharing:

1 A data dictionary defining types of data collected during this study will be made
2 available to others in supplementary text with publication. Individual level participant
3 data will not be made available to others due to privacy concerns. Study protocol and
4 statistical analysis plan will be made available to any academic researchers who
5 request it from corresponding author.

6

7 Sources of Funding:

8 K.P. is supported by a grant from the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (5-
9 T32HL007208-43). P.N. is supported by grants from the National Heart, Lung, and
10 Blood Institute (R01HL142711, R01HL148565, R01HL148050) and a Hassenfeld Award
11 from Massachusetts General Hospital. The present study was primarily supported by an
12 investigator-initiated grant to P.N. from Boston Scientific and a grant from the National
13 Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (5-T32HL007208-43) supporting K.P.

14

15 Disclosures:

16 The study was supported by an investigator-initiated grant to P.N. from Boston
17 Scientific. The sponsor had no role in the design of this study, and did not have a role in
18 the execution, analyses, interpretation of the data, or decision to submit results for
19 publication; however, company representatives were permitted to review and comment
20 on the manuscript prior to submission. P.N. also reports investigator-initiated grants
21 from Apple and Amgen, is a scientific advisor to Apple, Genentech, Novartis, and
22 Blackstone Life Sciences, and spousal employment and equity in Vertex.

23

1 **Research in context**

2

3 *Evidence before this study:* Although mobile health platforms have been proposed as
4 novel health care strategies, evidence to indicate feasibility and safety in transitional
5 care is limited. Smartphone apps with third-party health coaches to improve the
6 inpatient to outpatient care transition for cardiovascular disease within existing clinical
7 workflows have not been well described. Whether such apps can bridge high risk care
8 gaps and improve adoption of guideline-supported therapies is unclear.

9

10 *Added value of this study:* This study reports the results of a pilot study utilizing a
11 smartphone app with live health coaching provided at hospital discharge in 118 patients
12 post-percutaneous coronary intervention. The app delivers customized education
13 content, allows medication and step tracking, and provides personalized feedback from
14 non-clinician live health coaches. This study shows that an app improves hospital
15 discharge with a high degree of engagement and improved transition to outpatient care
16 and therapies, such as increased cardiac rehabilitation enrollment, compared with
17 historical controls. There was no evidence of excess cardiovascular risk with use of the
18 app, as measured by short-term readmissions.

19

20 *Implications of all the available evidence:* Patients are willing to engage both with an
21 app targeting cardiovascular disease as well as third-party health coaches with resultant
22 improved outpatient care transition linked to improved long-term outcomes.
23 Engagement was similar across demographics and socioeconomic indices. With recent
24 digital health infrastructure expansion, similar smartphone apps may be feasible tools to
25 optimize long-term risk reduction after hospital discharge.

1 **REFERENCES:**

- 2 1. Benjamin EJ, Blaha MJ, Chiuve SE, et al. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics-2017 Update: A Report
3 From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2017;135(10):e146-e603.
4 doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000000485
- 5 2. Lozano R, Naghavi M, Foreman K, et al. Global and regional mortality from 235 causes of death for 20
6 age groups in 1990 and 2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010.
7 *The Lancet*. 2012;380(9859):2095-2128. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61728-0
- 8 3. O’Gara Patrick T., Kushner Frederick G., Ascheim Deborah D., et al. 2013 ACCF/AHA Guideline for
9 the Management of ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction: Executive Summary. *Circulation*.
10 2013;127(4):529-555. doi:10.1161/CIR.0b013e3182742c84
- 11 4. Amsterdam EA, Wenger NK, Brindis RG, et al. 2014 AHA/ACC Guideline for the Management of
12 Patients With Non–ST-Elevation Acute Coronary Syndromes: A Report of the American College of
13 Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *Circulation*.
14 2014;130(25). doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000000134
- 15 5. Heran BS, Chen JM, Ebrahim S, et al. Exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation for coronary heart
16 disease. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2011;(7):CD001800. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD001800.pub2
- 17 6. Lawler PR, Filion KB, Eisenberg MJ. Efficacy of exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation post–myocardial
18 infarction: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Am Heart J*.
19 2011;162(4):571-584.e2. doi:10.1016/j.ahj.2011.07.017
- 20 7. Anderson L, Oldridge N, Thompson DR, et al. Exercise-Based Cardiac Rehabilitation for Coronary
21 Heart Disease: Cochrane Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2016;67(1):1-12.
22 doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2015.10.044
- 23 8. Johnson N, Fisher J, Nagle A, Inder K, Wiggers J. Factors associated with referral to outpatient
24 cardiac rehabilitation services. *J Cardpulm Rehabil*. 2004;24(3):165-170. doi:10.1097/00008483-
25 200405000-00005
- 26 9. Aragam KG, Dai D, Neely ML, et al. Gaps in Referral to Cardiac Rehabilitation of Patients Undergoing
27 Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in the United States. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2015;65(19):2079-2088.
28 doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2015.02.063
- 29 10. Sukul D, Seth M, Barnes GD, et al. Cardiac Rehabilitation Use After Percutaneous Coronary
30 Intervention. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2019;73(24):3148-3152. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2019.03.515
- 31 11. Sérvio TC, Britto RR, de Melo Ghisi GL, et al. Barriers to cardiac rehabilitation delivery in a low-
32 resource setting from the perspective of healthcare administrators, rehabilitation providers, and
33 cardiac patients. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2019;19. doi:10.1186/s12913-019-4463-9
- 34 12. Dahhan A, Maddox WR, Sharma GK. The Gaps in Cardiac Rehabilitation Referral: The Elephant in
35 the Room. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2015;66(22):2574. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2015.06.1359
- 36 13. Keesara S, Jonas A, Schulman K. Covid-19 and Health Care’s Digital Revolution. *N Engl J Med*.
37 2020;382(23):e82. doi:10.1056/NEJMp2005835
- 38 14. Aspary K, Wu W-C, Salmoirago-Blotcher E. Cardiac Rehabilitation in Patients with Established
39 Atherosclerotic Vascular Disease: New Directions in the Era of Value-Based Healthcare. *Curr*
40 *Atheroscler Rep*. 2016;18(2):10. doi:10.1007/s11883-016-0561-x

- 1 15. Dalal HM, Zawada A, Jolly K, Moxham T, Taylor RS. Home based versus centre based cardiac
2 rehabilitation: Cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2010;340.
3 doi:10.1136/bmj.b5631
- 4 16. Hamilton SJ, Mills B, Birch EM, Thompson SC. Smartphones in the secondary prevention of
5 cardiovascular disease: a systematic review. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord*. 2018;18(1):25.
6 doi:10.1186/s12872-018-0764-x
- 7 17. Xu L, Li F, Zhou C, Li J, Hong C, Tong Q. The effect of mobile applications for improving adherence
8 in cardiac rehabilitation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord*. 2019;19.
9 doi:10.1186/s12872-019-1149-5
- 10 18. Lunde P, Bye A, Bergland A, Nilsson BB. Effects of individualized follow-up with a smartphone-
11 application after cardiac rehabilitation: protocol of a randomized controlled trial. *BMC Sports Sci Med*
12 *Rehabil*. 2019;11. doi:10.1186/s13102-019-0148-2
- 13 19. Yudi MB, Clark DJ, Tsang D, et al. SMARTphone-based, early cardiac REHABilitation in patients with
14 acute coronary syndromes [SMART-REHAB Trial]: a randomized controlled trial protocol. *BMC*
15 *Cardiovasc Disord*. 2016;16(1). doi:10.1186/s12872-016-0356-6
- 16 20. Gonzalez M, Sjölin I, Bäck M, et al. Effect of a lifestyle-focused electronic patient support application
17 for improving risk factor management, self-rated health, and prognosis in post-myocardial infarction
18 patients: study protocol for a multi-center randomized controlled trial. *Trials*. 2019;20.
19 doi:10.1186/s13063-018-3118-1
- 20 21. Pirruccello James P., Traynor Kathleen, Aragam Krishna G. "Road Map" to Improving Enrollment in
21 Cardiac Rehabilitation: Identifying Barriers and Evaluating Alternatives. *J Am Heart Assoc*.
22 6(10):e007468. doi:10.1161/JAHA.117.007468
- 23 22. Ho DE, Imai K, King G, Stuart EA. Matching as Nonparametric Preprocessing for Reducing Model
24 Dependence in Parametric Causal Inference. *Polit Anal*. 2007;15(3):199-236.
25 doi:10.1093/pan/mpi013
- 26 23. Zhang Z, Kim HJ, Lonjon G, Zhu Y. Balance diagnostics after propensity score matching. *Ann Transl*
27 *Med*. 2019;7(1). doi:10.21037/atm.2018.12.10
- 28 24. Forman DE, LaFond K, Panch T, Allsup K, Manning K, Sattelmair J. Utility and efficacy of a
29 smartphone application to enhance the learning and behavior goals of traditional cardiac
30 rehabilitation: a feasibility study. *J Cardiopulm Rehabil Prev*. 2014;34(5):327-334.
31 doi:10.1097/HCR.000000000000058
- 32 25. Varnfield M, Karunanithi M, Lee C-K, et al. Smartphone-based home care model improved use of
33 cardiac rehabilitation in postmyocardial infarction patients: results from a randomised controlled trial.
34 *Heart*. 2014;100(22):1770-1779. doi:10.1136/heartjnl-2014-305783
- 35 26. Fuller TE, Pong DD, Piniella N, et al. Interactive Digital Health Tools to Engage Patients and
36 Caregivers in Discharge Preparation: Implementation Study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2020;22(4).
37 doi:10.2196/15573
- 38 27. Williamson C, Kelly P, Niven A, Baker P, Graham, Mutrie N. Get the message? A scoping review of
39 physical activity messaging. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2020;17. doi:10.1186/s12966-020-00954-3
- 40 28. Salvi D, Ottaviano M, Muuraiskangas S, et al. An m-Health system for education and motivation in
41 cardiac rehabilitation: the experience of HeartCycle guided exercise. *J Telemed Telecare*.
42 2018;24(4):303-316. doi:10.1177/1357633X17697501

- 1 29. DeSmet A, De Bourdeaudhuij I, Chastin S, Crombez G, Maddison R, Cardon G. Adults' Preferences
2 for Behavior Change Techniques and Engagement Features in a Mobile App to Promote 24-Hour
3 Movement Behaviors: Cross-Sectional Survey Study. *JMIR MHealth UHealth*. 2019;7(12):e15707.
4 doi:10.2196/15707
- 5 30. Harzand A, Witbrodt B, Davis-Watts ML, et al. Feasibility of a Smartphone-Enabled Cardiac
6 Rehabilitation Program in Male Veterans With Previous Clinical Evidence of Coronary Heart Disease.
7 *Am J Cardiol*. 2018;122(9):1471-1476. doi:10.1016/j.amjcard.2018.07.028
- 8 31. McConnell MV, Shcherbina A, Pavlovic A, et al. Feasibility of Obtaining Measures of Lifestyle From a
9 Smartphone App: The MyHeart Counts Cardiovascular Health Study. *JAMA Cardiol*. 2017;2(1):67-76.
10 doi:10.1001/jamacardio.2016.4395
- 11 32. Shcherbina A, Hershman SG, Lazzeroni L, et al. The effect of digital physical activity interventions on
12 daily step count: a randomised controlled crossover substudy of the MyHeart Counts Cardiovascular
13 Health Study. *Lancet Digit Health*. 2019;1(7):e344-e352. doi:10.1016/S2589-7500(19)30129-3
- 14 33. Bostrom J, Sweeney G, Whiteson J, Dodson JA. Mobile health and cardiac rehabilitation in older
15 adults. *Clin Cardiol*. 2019;43(2):118-126. doi:10.1002/clc.23306
- 16 34. Kumar KR, Pina IL. Cardiac rehabilitation in older adults: New options. *Clin Cardiol*. 2019;43(2):163-
17 170. doi:10.1002/clc.23296
- 18
19

1 **Table 1: Baseline characteristics of all subjects.** Demographics across both
 2 historical controls and participants enrolled in the study app were similar. Fisher's exact
 3 testing was used to evaluate differences across groups (†Two-sample t-testing was
 4 used for continuous variables). (SD = Standard Deviation, Min = Minimum, Max =
 5 Maximum, MI = PCI for Acute Myocardial Infarction, Elective = PCI for Symptomatic
 6 Coronary Artery Disease without Acute Myocardial Infarction, MGH = Massachusetts
 7 General Hospital, BWH = Brigham and Women's Hospital, MA = Massachusetts)

	Historical Control Group (n=343)	Intervention Group (n=118)	p-value (Fisher's exact test)
Age, years			
Mean (SD)	63.4 (10.3)	62.5 (9.72)	0.396†
Median [Min, Max]	64.0 [35.0, 84.0]	63.5 [38.0, 80.0]	
Sex			
Male	247 (72.0%)	87 (73.7%)	0.811
Female	96 (28.0%)	31 (26.3%)	
PCI Type			
MI	217 (63.3%)	68 (57.6%)	0.322
Elective	126 (36.7%)	50 (42.4%)	
Site			
MGH	267 (77.8%)	93 (78.8%)	0.898
BWH	76 (22.2%)	25 (21.2%)	
Ethnicity			
White	273 (79.6%)	102 (86.4%)	0.649
Black	14 (4.1%)	3 (2.5%)	
Hispanic	11 (3.2%)	1 (0.8%)	
Asian	10 (2.9%)	3 (2.5%)	
Other	19 (5.5%)	6 (5.1%)	
Unknown	16 (4.7%)	3 (2.5%)	
Insurance Type			
Commercial	204 (59.5%)	72 (61.0%)	0.995
Medicaid	24 (7.0%)	8 (6.8%)	
Medicare	110 (32.1%)	37 (31.4%)	
Other	5 (1.5%)	1 (0.8%)	


	Historical Control Group (n=343)	Intervention Group (n=118)	p-value (Fisher's exact test)
State			
MA	279 (81.3%)	99 (83.9%)	0.581
Non-MA	64 (18.7%)	19 (16.1%)	
MGB Primary Care Provider			
Yes	160 (46.6%)	54 (45.8%)	0.915
No	183 (53.4%)	64 (54.2%)	
Diabetes Mellitus Type 2			
Yes	128 (37.3%)	40 (33.9%)	0.579
No	215 (62.7%)	78 (66.1%)	
Hypertension			
Yes	244 (71.1%)	81 (68.6%)	0.640
No	99 (28.9%)	37 (31.4%)	
Hyperlipidemia			
Yes	266 (77.6%)	88 (74.6%)	0.528
No	77 (22.4%)	30 (25.4%)	
Peripheral Arterial Disease			
Yes	31 (9.0%)	7 (5.9%)	0.337
No	312 (91.0%)	111 (94.1%)	
Known Coronary Artery Disease			
Yes	156 (45.5%)	59 (50.0%)	0.649
No	187 (54.5%)	59 (50.0%)	

1 **Table 2: Engagement with app.** Engagement metrics were similar over the entire
 2 study period suggesting stable usage of the app amongst users who were engaged
 3 early. (SD = Standard Deviation)

ENGAGEMENT METRIC	0-30 DAYS MEAN (SD)	0-90 DAYS MEAN (SD)
Content Completion <i>(Percentage of articles opened)</i>	57.8% (36.5%)	52.9% (36.1%)
Medication Adherence <i>(Percentage of medication reminder tasks completed)</i>	76.3% (31.3%)	69.9% (30.7%)
Survey Completion <i>(Percentage of survey tasks completed)</i>	52.4% (39.8%)	46.0% (37.9%)
Physical Activity Completion <i>(Percentage of self-reported days physical activity goal was met)</i>	53.3% (41.4%)	52.3% (40.3%)
Daily Engagement <i>(Percentage of days with completion of at least one task)</i>	55.4% (40.5%)	48.2% (40.6%)
Weekly Engagement <i>(Percentage of weeks with at least one day of completion of one task)</i>	73.5% (33.9%)	63.5% (40.3%)


4

- 1 **Figure 1: Weekly app engagement.** Patients' interaction with the app decreased
- 2 gradually over time but the overall rate was stable amongst patients who engaged early.
- 3 Engagement peaked at 4.35 days in the first week and gradually decreased to 2.73
- 4 days by the last week of the study period. (Engagement = a day with completion of at
- 5 least one task; Week = 7-day period starting from enrollment).




6

1 **Figure 2: A smartphone app and longitudinal cardiovascular care.** (A) Two-fold
2 increase in attendance of cardiac rehabilitation intake and (B) two-fold increase in 1-
3 month outpatient cardiovascular follow up in the intervention group. Error bars
4 represent confidence intervals. (MGB = Mass General Brigham)



5
6
7

1 **Figure 3: Use of a smartphone app and readmission rates post-PCI.** No significant
2 difference in (A) all-cause readmissions or (B) cardiovascular readmission to MGB
3 facilities at either 30- or 90-days post-PCI. Error bars represent confidence interval.



4