

1 ORIGINAL RESEARCH

2 Yadav et al

3 **The impact of a hybrid hospital at home program in**
4 **reducing subacute rehabilitation referrals**

5 Ravi R Yadav¹, Mohammed A Mahyoub^{1,2}, Michael W Capriotti¹, Raul L Berio-Dorta¹, Kacie
6 Dougherty¹, Ajit Shukla¹

7

8 ¹ Virtua Health, Marlton, NJ, USA; ² Systems Science and Industrial Engineering Department,
9 Binghamton University, Binghamton, NY, USA

10

11 Correspondence:

12 Ajit Shukla

13 301 Lippincott Dr., Marlton NJ USA 08053

14 Email: ashukla@virtua.org

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 **Abstract:**

27 **Purpose:** The purpose of this study was to validate Hospital at Home as an appropriate care
28 option for patients of certain diagnostic-related groups and acuity levels.

29 **Patients and methods:** We compared outcomes for patients in a Hospital at Home program at
30 Virtua Health in 2022 (N = 272) to traditional inpatients at Virtua hospitals during the same year
31 who did not participate in the Hospital at Home program (N = 13879). We defined outcomes as
32 recommendations for subacute rehabilitation (SAR) and final disposition upon inpatient discharge.
33 Specifically, we searched electronic medical records for terms related to recommendation for
34 SAR and discharge to SAR using text mining algorithms and a natural language processing
35 (NLP) model to confirm these recommendations.

36 **Results:** We observed that the proportion of patients in the Hospital at Home program that were
37 recommended for SAR (0.147) was significantly different from the proportion of patients who
38 remained in the hospital (0.361). Further, of those patients who received a recommendation, only
39 1 patient in the Hospital at Home group was discharged to SAR, while nearly half of those in the
40 control group (proportion = 0.499) were transferred to SAR.

41 **Conclusion:** The Hospital at Home program is a promising alternative to traditional inpatient care
42 for patients with certain diagnoses and who meet certain clinical criteria.

43 **Keywords:** managed care, NLP, text mining, short-term rehab, telemedicine

44

45 **Introduction**

46 Healthcare digital transformation and telemedicine have noticeably increased during the past few
47 years, especially with the COVID-19 pandemic¹⁻⁴. Hospital at Home services, inpatient level of
48 care in the home, began at Johns Hopkins University in the mid-1990s as a way to avoid the
49 decline that many seniors experience as a component of care within hospital walls^{5,6}. Throughout
50 the years, several health systems adopted the model, but a broad payment structure did not exist
51 making it financially challenging for more systems across the United States to fully implement
52 similar programs⁷. In November 2020, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS)

53 launched the Acute Hospital Care at Home program to provide hospitals expanded flexibility to
54 care for patients in their homes⁸. This unique waiver program was an expansion of the CMS
55 Hospitals Without Walls legislation, as an effort to provide health systems with avenues to assist
56 in treating the impending COVID-19 surges⁹. The result of this program was the first example of
57 payment for this level of care at home in the United States¹⁰.

58

59 While the adoption of Hospital at Home programs across the United States had been slow prior to
60 the CMS waiver program, the concept is not new internationally. For example, in Victoria,
61 Australia upwards of six percent of all hospital bed-days are provided in the home⁷. In general,
62 Hospital at Home programs have shown significant improvements in the quality of care including
63 reduction in total length of stay, reduction in 30 day readmissions, reduced hospital infections and
64 hospital induced delirium¹¹⁻¹³(but see ^{14,15}), as well as a lower total cost of care^{13,16-19}(but see ²⁰)
65 and greatly improved patient satisfaction^{11,15,16}.

66

67 Healthcare systems interested in starting virtual hospital programs are tasked with developing
68 and deploying a model of care to meet patient needs, often involving frequent telehealth calls, at-
69 home monitoring tools, and some in-home clinical care. Atrium Health, in the southeastern United
70 States, described how they engaged multiple departments (hospital medicine, primary care,
71 nursing, care management, research, administration, etc.) to develop a workflow that mimicked
72 traditional patient care²¹. Patients in the program who qualified for traditional inpatient care
73 received daily telehealth calls with a physician and twice daily telehealth calls from a nurse.
74 Atrium Health also expanded community care to meet the higher demand for clinicians entering
75 homes and delivered in-home monitoring kits to Hospital at Home patients.

76

77 Virtua Health applied for and was approved for the CMS waiver in September 2021 and launched
78 its Hospital at Home program in January 2022 in response to a significant surge in hospital
79 patients following the spread of the Omicron COVID-19 variant. Virtua's Hospital at Home
80 program began in one of its five hospitals and focused on transferring patients diagnosed with

81 COVID-19 from a hospital floor to complete their care in a home bed. Today, Virtua's Hospital at
82 Home Program is available at all five hospitals with patients being transferred into the program
83 from a hospital floor or directly from the emergency room after meeting admission criteria. The
84 program includes more than 60 DRGs across several main DRG category codes including
85 community acquired pneumonia, congestive obstructive pulmonary disease, congestive heart
86 failure, COVID-19, cellulitis, and urinary tract infections. In 2022, Virtua's Hospital at Home
87 program treated more than 270 patients, with nearly 1,000 total inpatient days completed in a
88 home bed.

89

90 Patients in Virtua's Hospital at Home program receive support in the home from a well-integrated
91 care team including physicians, nurses, and paramedics. Every Virtua Health Hospital at Home
92 patient receives a remote patient monitoring kit which includes a tablet for virtual care visits via
93 video as well as an armband continuously measuring heart rate, respiratory rate, body
94 temperature, pulse oximetry, and step count. Patients also receive integrated peripheral devices
95 depending on the diagnosis, such as a spirometer and weight scale. Patients are monitored and
96 supported by Virtua's 24/7 command center staffed by registered nurses. In addition, every
97 patient receives two in-person nursing visits per day, a virtual physician visit from the attending
98 hospitalists as well as six additional virtual rounding sessions with the command center registered
99 nurses. Virtua's program can support patients at home with virtual specialist consultations,
100 oxygen concentrators, physical and occupational therapy, daily blood work and laboratory testing,
101 mobile imaging including x-ray and ultrasound, oral and IV medications and fluids, as well as
102 easy to heat nutritious meals.

103

104 The objective of this study was to validate the home as an appropriate care option for patients
105 within certain DRGs and acuity levels. We wondered if care in the home would lead to overall
106 improved health outcomes, possibly due to increased mobility and comfort in the home. We
107 observed a significant difference in subacute rehabilitation (SAR) referrals between in-hospital

108 and at-home patients, and suggest that this result supports future investigations into this
109 alternative care model.

110

111 **Material and methods**

112 ***Study framework***

113 In this study, we aimed to compare outcomes for patients who participated in Virtua's Hospital at
114 Home program to patients with the same DRGs who were not in the program. Specifically, we
115 compared the number of patients recommended for SAR and the number of patients discharged
116 to SAR in each group. Ethics approval was obtained from the Virtua Health IRB.

117

118 ***Patient population***

119 We limited the population in this study to patients who received inpatient-level hospital care at
120 Virtua Health in 2022. To be admitted to the Hospital at Home program, patients needed to be on
121 Medicare. We compared patients in Virtua's Hospital at Home program (N = 272) to those
122 patients who did not participate in the program (control, N = 13879). The control group was
123 further limited to patients with a DRG that matched a DRG in the Hospital at Home patient group.

124 ***Data collection***

125 Patient data was recorded in an electronic medical record (EMR) using Epic (Epic, Epic Systems
126 Corporation, Verona, Wisconsin, USA). To collect EMRs, we first queried Epic for patients in the
127 Hospital at Home program using SQL. We then queried the database for EMRs for patients who
128 did not participate in the program and with a DRG matching one of the DRGs in the Hospital at
129 Home group. The following variables were extracted from the EMRs and saved in Excel files for
130 use in further analysis: clinical note contents, discharge disposition, diagnosis related group, date
131 of service, age (years) at admission, sex, and insurance payor. Information from clinical notes

132 was extracted using natural language processing (NLP) and combined with tabular (structured)
133 data for further analysis (**Figure 1**).

134

135 ***NLP-based automatic referral extractor***

136 All analyses were completed on the extracted data using Python (version 3.9). To identify
137 whether a patient was recommended for SAR, we mined the text in each clinical note using the
138 regular expression (re) library. We first standardized the text by replacing all characters that were
139 not letters with a space. Then, we searched each clinical note with a length of at least 5
140 characters for the keywords “SAR” or “subacute rehabilitation.” We also searched for an
141 indication that SAR was recommended by searching each note for “rec” (recommended) or
142 “anticip” (anticipated). If a match was found for both the SAR and recommendation keywords, we
143 calculated the minimum distance between their starting indices in the string. To account for
144 negations (eg, SAR was not recommended), we implemented the Clinical Assertion/Negation
145 Classification BERT model with the use of the transformers library²². This model takes text as
146 input and classifies whether medical conditions are present, absent, or possible. Specifically, we
147 passed the text in the note between the starting index for the first of the recommendation or SAR
148 keyword through 5 characters past the starting index of the other keyword. We marked each
149 clinical note as a recommendation for SAR if i) a match in the note was found for both the
150 recommendation and SAR key terms, ii) the minimum distance between those terms was less
151 than or equal to 40 characters, and iii) the Clinical Assertion/Negation Classification BERT model
152 indicated an assertion, or recommendation. To identify patients that were eventually discharged
153 to SAR, we searched the Discharge Disposition note for each patient and labeled those with the
154 following note as transferred to SAR: “Discharged/transferred To Skilled Nursing Facility (snf)
155 With Medicare Certification.”

156

157 **Statistical analysis**

158 Our aim was to determine if there was a difference in outcomes for Hospital at Home patients and
159 the control group, patients who did not participate in the Hospital at Home program. Towards this
160 goal, we considered recommendations for SAR as well as discharges to SAR. Specifically, we
161 summed the total number of patients who were recommended for SAR for the Hospital at Home
162 patient group and control group. We also summed the number of patients that were
163 recommended for SAR that were eventually discharged to SAR. For the recommendation
164 comparison, we tested whether the proportion of patients recommended for SAR was different
165 between the two groups using a two-tailed two proportion Z-test. We calculated the test statistic,

$$Z = \frac{(\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2) - 0}{\sqrt{\hat{p}(1 - \hat{p}) \left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} \right)}}$$

166 where \hat{p} , \hat{p}_1 , \hat{p}_2 is the proportion recommended for SAR across both groups, the proportion
167 recommended for SAR for the Hospital at Home group, and the proportion recommended for SAR
168 for the control group, respectively, and n_1 and n_2 are the total number of patients in each group,
169 respectively. We did not run this statistical test for the discharge comparison because this test
170 requires that there are at least 10 patients who are discharged to SAR (and not discharged to
171 SAR) for each group. Our results indicate that this requirement was not met.

172

173 **Results**

174 We aimed to determine if outcomes for patients in Virtua's Hospital at Home program were
175 different from patients who did not participate in the program and remained in the hospital.
176 Towards this goal, we extracted EMRs from patients who participated in the Hospital at Home
177 program in 2022 (N = 272; 114 male, 158 female; age (years), m: 77.82, std: 9.95). We found that
178 there were 43 observed unique diagnoses within this group, based on the MS_DRG codes in the
179 records. In order to compare the Hospital at Home group to a comparable population, we limited
180 the control group to inpatients at a Virtua hospital in 2022 who had a diagnosis (MS_DRG) that

181 matched one of the unique diagnoses in the Hospital at Home group (N = 13879; 6366 male,
182 7513 female; age (years), m: 68.16, std: 20.29).

183

184 We used recommendation for SAR and discharge to SAR as metrics for outcomes following
185 discharge from inpatient care. These metrics were chosen because they can be tracked within
186 the Virtua Health system (for example, it would be more difficult to track re-admissions if a patient
187 was re-admitted to a hospital outside the Virtua Health system). For each clinical note and for
188 each patient, we used text mining and Clinical Assertion/Negation Classification BERT model²²
189 (see **Methods**). After labeling each note as a recommendation to SAR (or not), we summed the
190 number of patients for which there was at least one mention of a SAR recommendation. For the
191 Hospital at Home group, only 40 of the 272 patients (14.7%) were recommended for SAR (**Table**
192 **1**). In contrast, 5012 of 13879 patients (36.1%) in the control group were recommended for SAR.
193 This difference in the proportion of patients recommended for SAR across the two groups was
194 significantly different (**Figure 2**; $p < 0.001$, $Z = -7.30$, two-tailed two proportion Z-test), with
195 relatively far fewer Hospital at Home patients recommended for SAR.

196

197 We were interested in knowing whether there was a significant difference in the final disposition
198 of patients who had a recommendation for SAR between the Hospital at Home and control
199 groups. To address this question, we searched the Discharge Disposition note for indication that
200 the patient was transferred to SAR. Of the 40 patients in the Hospital at Home group who had a
201 recommendation for SAR in their EMR, only 1 (proportion = 0.025) was eventually discharged to
202 SAR (**Table 2**). In contrast, 2499 of the 5012 patients (proportion = 0.499) recommended for SAR
203 were eventually discharged to SAR (**Figure 3**). Because only 1 patient in the Hospital at Home
204 group was discharged to SAR, we did not perform a statistical test (N too low). However, the
205 striking difference in the proportions of patients transferred to SAR between the groups suggests
206 that Hospital at Home patients fared better than their in-hospital counterparts.

207

208 **Discussion**

209 Virtua's Hospital at Home program admits patients from a variety of DRGs, with the most
210 common diagnoses being pneumonia, congestive heart failure (CHF), chronic obstructive
211 pulmonary disease (COPD), asthma, cellulitis, urinary tract infection (UTI), and COVID.
212 Currently, all patients admitted to the Hospital at Home program are Medicare patients. Prior to
213 being transferred home, all patients have a baseline physical therapy evaluation.
214 Recommendations following this evaluation range from no needs to home with assistive devices,
215 home physical therapy, or transfer to a rehabilitation facility. Of the Hospital at Home patients
216 included in this study, 14.7% had a baseline recommendation for SAR on discharge and only 1
217 patient was eventually discharged to SAR. In contrast, 36.1% of patients treated in the brick-and-
218 mortar hospital setting had a baseline recommendation for SAR, and 49% of those patients with a
219 recommendation went to SAR on discharge.

220

221 One possible reason for the lower rate of patients going to SAR in the Hospital at Home group
222 compared to the brick-and-mortar inpatient group may be due to differences in mobility. We
223 notice that patients in the Hospital at Home program benefit from increased and early mobility, as
224 assessed from remote monitoring kits tracking step counts. While at home, patients can liberalize
225 their ambulation. They are not restricted to the hospital setting, which in most cases means
226 staying in a semi-private room. Being at home also correlates with decreased hospital-acquired
227 delirium as the patients are familiar with the layout and nuances of their home. Furthermore, at
228 home, patients can be with their loved ones and pets, and sleep in their own beds. In addition to
229 these liberties, patients likely feel more secure knowing that we are monitoring them 24/7 with
230 remote monitoring kits, providing us with valuable information.

231

232 We believe that patients in the Hospital at Home program experience early mobility, better sleep
233 cycles and decreased delirium, all of which translate to less deconditioning and subsequently no
234 need for SAR on discharge.

235

236 Currently we are limited to admitting only Medicare patients to our program. We have no reason
237 to believe that these outcomes are specific to Medicare patients and predict that these outcomes
238 would hold if expanded to a broader patient population.

239

240 **Conclusion**

241 We observed that patients in Virtua's Hospital at Home program were recommended for SAR
242 (14.7%) at less than half of the rate of inpatients in the traditional brick-and-mortar hospital
243 (36.1%). This reduced need for SAR for the Hospital at Home patients is likely due to relatively
244 increased mobility, better sleep, and decreased rate of delirium in the home compared to the
245 brick-and-mortar hospital. The results from this study suggest that the Hospital at Home program
246 is an attractive alternative to traditional inpatient care for patients who meet certain clinical
247 criteria.

248 **Disclosure**

249 All authors work for a healthcare system.

250

251 **References**

- 252 1. Malouff TD, TerKonda SP, Knight D, et al. Physician Satisfaction With Telemedicine During
253 the COVID-19 Pandemic: The Mayo Clinic Florida Experience. *Mayo Clin Proc Innov Qual*
254 *Outcomes*. 2021;5(4):771-782.
- 255 2. Miner H, Fatehi A, Ring D, Reichenberg JS. Clinician Telemedicine Perceptions During the
256 COVID-19 Pandemic. *Telemed E-Health*. 2021;27(5):508-512. doi:10.1089/tmj.2020.0295

- 257 3. Haider Z, Aweid B, Subramanian P, Iranpour F. Telemedicine in orthopaedics during COVID-
258 19 and beyond: A systematic review. doi:10.1177/1357633X20938241
- 259 4. Webster P. Virtual health care in the era of COVID-19. *The Lancet*. 2020;395(10231):1180-
260 1181. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30818-7
- 261 5. Leff B, Burton JR. Acute Medical Care in the Home. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 1996;44(5):603-605.
262 doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.1996.tb01452.x
- 263 6. Leff B, Burton JR. Future Directions: Alternative Approaches to Traditional Hospital Care—
264 Home Hospital. *Clin Geriatr Med*. 1998;14(4):851-862. doi:10.1016/S0749-0690(18)30095-8
- 265 7. “Hospital at Home” Programs Improve Outcomes, Lower Costs But Face Resistance from
266 Providers and Payers. Accessed March 23, 2023.
267 [https://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/newsletter-article/hospital-home-programs-](https://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/newsletter-article/hospital-home-programs-improve-outcomes-lower-costs-face-resistance)
268 [improve-outcomes-lower-costs-face-resistance](https://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/newsletter-article/hospital-home-programs-improve-outcomes-lower-costs-face-resistance)
- 269 8. Hospital-at-Home | AHA. Accessed March 23, 2023. <https://www.aha.org/hospitalathome>
- 270 9. Additional Background:Sweeping Regulatory Changes to Help U.S. Healthcare System
271 Address COVID-19 Patient Surge | CMS. Accessed March 23, 2023.
272 [https://www.cms.gov/newsroom/fact-sheets/additional-backgroundsweeping-regulatory-](https://www.cms.gov/newsroom/fact-sheets/additional-backgroundsweeping-regulatory-changes-help-us-healthcare-system-address-covid-19-patient)
273 [changes-help-us-healthcare-system-address-covid-19-patient](https://www.cms.gov/newsroom/fact-sheets/additional-backgroundsweeping-regulatory-changes-help-us-healthcare-system-address-covid-19-patient)
- 274 10. Clarke DV, Newsam J, Olson DP, Adams D, Wolfe AJ, Fleisher LA. Acute Hospital Care at
275 Home: The CMS Waiver Experience. *NEJM Catal*. Published online 2021.
276 doi:10.1056/CAT.21.0338
- 277 11. Federman AD, Soones T, DeCherrie LV, Leff B, Siu AL. Association of a Bundled Hospital-at-
278 Home and 30-Day Postacute Transitional Care Program With Clinical Outcomes and Patient
279 Experiences. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2018;178(8):1033-1040.
280 doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2018.2562
- 281 12. Paulson MR, Shulman EP, Dunn AN, et al. Implementation of a virtual and in-person hybrid
282 hospital-at-home model in two geographically separate regions utilizing a single command
283 center: a descriptive cohort study. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2023;23(1):139.
284 doi:10.1186/s12913-023-09144-w

- 285 13. Levine DM, Ouchi K, Blanchfield B, et al. Hospital-Level Care at Home for Acutely Ill Adults.
286 *Ann Intern Med.* 2020;172(2):77-85. doi:10.7326/M19-0600
- 287 14. Cai S, Intrator O, Chan C, et al. Association of Costs and Days at Home With Transfer
288 Hospital in Home. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2021;4(6):e2114920.
289 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.14920
- 290 15. Shepperd S, Iliffe S, Doll HA, et al. Admission avoidance hospital at home. *Cochrane*
291 *Database Syst Rev.* 2016;(9). doi:10.1002/14651858.CD007491.pub2
- 292 16. Cryer L, Shannon SB, Van Amsterdam M, Leff B. Costs For 'Hospital At Home' Patients Were
293 19 Percent Lower, With Equal Or Better Outcomes Compared To Similar Inpatients. *Health*
294 *Aff (Millwood).* 2012;31(6):1237-1243. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2011.1132
- 295 17. A meta-analysis of "hospital in the home" - Caplan - 2012 - Medical Journal of Australia -
296 Wiley Online Library. Accessed March 27, 2023.
297 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.5694/mja12.10480>
- 298 18. Cai S, Laurel PA, Makineni R, Marks ML. Evaluation of a hospital-in-home program
299 implemented among veterans. *Am J Manag Care.* 2017;23(8):482-487.
- 300 19. Cai S, Grubbs A, Makineni R, Kinosian B, Phibbs CS, Intrator O. Evaluation of the Cincinnati
301 Veterans Affairs Medical Center Hospital-in-Home Program. *J Am Geriatr Soc.*
302 2018;66(7):1392-1398. doi:10.1111/jgs.15382
- 303 20. Goossens LMA, Vemer P, Rutten-van Mólken MPMH. The risk of overestimating cost savings
304 from hospital-at-home schemes: A literature review. *Int J Nurs Stud.* 2020;109:103652.
305 doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2020.103652
- 306 21. Sitamagari K, Murphy S, Kowalkowski M, et al. Insights From Rapid Deployment of a
307 "Virtual Hospital" as Standard Care During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Ann Intern Med.*
308 2021;174(2):192-199. doi:10.7326/M20-4076
- 309 22. van Aken B, Trajanovska I, Siu A, Mayrdorfer M, Budde K, Loeser A. Assertion Detection in
310 Clinical Notes: Medical Language Models to the Rescue? In: *Proceedings of the Second*
311 *Workshop on Natural Language Processing for Medical Conversations.* Association for
312 Computational Linguistics; 2021:35-40. doi:10.18653/v1/2021.nlpmc-1.5

313

314 **Table 1** Number of patients in the Hospital at Home and control groups recommended for SAR

	Hospital at Home	Control
SAR recommendation	40	5012
No SAR recommendation	232	8867

315

316 **Table 2** Number of patients in the Hospital at Home and control groups discharged to SAR

	Hospital at Home	Control
SAR discharge following SAR recommendation	1	2499
No SAR discharge following SAR recommendation	39	2513

317

318 **Abbreviations:** CMS, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services; DRG, diagnosis related group;
319 NLP, natural language processing; SAR, subacute rehabilitation.

320


321 **Figure 1** Flow diagram depicting the combination of clinical notes (unstructured data) and tabular
322 (structured) data from EMRs used for analysis in this study. Clinical notes for each patient were
323 collected from the EMR. The free text in the notes was processed (uniform capitalization, special
324 characters removed) before each note was searched for keywords (see **Methods**). In the final
325 stage of language processing, a clinical BERT model was used to extract the sentiment in the
326 note eg, identify if the note asserts SAR recommendation or negates SAR recommendation. This
327 information was converted to structured data and combined with other structured data from the
328 patient for further analysis and interpretation.

329


330 **Figure 2** Proportion of patients in the Hospital at Home program that were recommended for SAR
331 (0.147; N = 40 of 272) was significantly different from that in the control group (0.361; N = 5012 of
332 13879) ($p < 0.001$, $Z = -7.30$, two-tailed two proportion Z-test).

333

334 **Figure 3** The proportion of patients in the Hospital at Home program that were both
335 recommended and discharged for SAR (0.026; N = 1 of 40) was lower than that in the control
336 group (0.499; N = 2499 of 5012). Because only one patient was discharged to SAR from the
337 Hospital at Home group, this comparison did not meet the requirements for the two proportions Z-
338 test.



recommended for SAR



discharged to SAR

