

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

3 Aline F. Pedroso PhD^a, Zhenqiu Lin PhD^{a,b}, Joseph S. Ross MD, MHS^{b,c,d},

4 Rohan Khera MD, MS^{a,b,e,f*}

5
6 ^a Section of Cardiovascular Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

7 ^b Center for Outcomes Research and Evaluation, Yale-New Haven Hospital, New Haven, CT, USA

8 ^c Section of General Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

9 ^d Department of Health Policy and Management, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT, USA

10 ^e Section of Biomedical Informatics and Data Science, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

11 ^f Section of Health Informatics, Department of Biostatistics, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT, USA

12

13 **Manuscript type:** Original Research Manuscript

14 **Word count:** 3,236

15 **Brief title:** Remote Monitoring & Readmissions in US Hospitals

16 **Figures:** 5

17 **Tables:** 2

18

19 ***Corresponding author:**

20 Rohan Khera, MD, MS

21 195 Church St, 6th Floor, New Haven, CT 06510

22 203-764-5885; rohan.khera@yale.edu; @rohan_khera

23 **ABSTRACT**

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

29 **Methods:** We used contemporary national data from the American Hospital Association (AHA)
30 Annual Survey to ascertain US hospitals offering RPM services for post-discharge or chronic
31 care and used census-based county-level data to define the characteristics of the communities
32 they serve. We linked these with hospitals' benchmarked risk-standardized relative performance
33 on readmissions (excess readmission ratio [ERR]) from CMS Hospital Quality Reports (2018-
34 2022). We used mixed-effects multivariable regression to examine the association between RPM
35 services at hospitals and hospital characteristics-adjusted ERR for HF and AMI.

36 **Results:** There were 2,754 hospitals with CMS quality report data. Over five years of the study,
37 there was a 38.3% increase in the number of hospitals offering RPM services, rising from 952
38 (42.0%) hospitals in 2018 to 1,237 (58.1%) in 2022. However, the availability of RPM services
39 varied across different hospital groups with smaller, non-teaching hospitals, particularly those
40 serving rural, low-income communities, and those located in the South, were less likely to offer
41 RPM services. There was a consistent association between the availability of RPM services and
42 better risk-standardized readmission performance for HF, with lower ERR for hospitals offering
43 RPM compared with those not offering RPM (absolute difference, -0.016 [-0.023, -0.009],
44 standardized difference, 24.6%, $p < 0.001$). However, no such association was observed for AMI
45 (-0.007 [-0.016, 0.002], standardized difference, 10.3%, $p = 0.19$).

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

50 **Word count:** 325

51 INTRODUCTION

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

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

74 hospitals are emphasizing RPM as an available service and whether current patterns of uptake of
75 RPM services are associated with better patient outcomes.^{12,18,19}

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

80

81 **METHODS**

82 **Data Sources and Study Population**

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

88 Additional information about the AHA Annual Survey can be found in **eMethods**. We
89 used data from the AHA Annual Surveys from 2018 through 2022, representing the most recent
90 5-year period that collected information on RPM services.²⁰ We used the US Cities Database as
91 an up-to-date record of all US cities and towns to link hospitals to their corresponding serving
92 communities' characteristics. All demographic information is derived from the American
93 Community Survey of the US Census Bureau.²¹

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

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

100

101 **RPM service availability**

102 The AHA survey defined RPM as the use of digital technologies to collect medical and other
103 forms of health data from individuals in one location and electronically transmit the information
104 securely to healthcare providers in a different location for assessment and recommendation.²⁰

105 The survey specifically inquired about the availability of RPM in the context of post-discharge
106 care, ongoing care for chronic conditions, and remote monitoring in other clinical scenarios. The
107 primary exposure for the study was the availability of any RPM service to patients at a hospital.

108

109 **Covariates**

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

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

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

122

123 **Outcomes**

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

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

133

134 **Statistical analysis**

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

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

153 We then assessed the association of a hospital's availability of RPM services in the full
154 window over which the readmission performance of a hospital was aggregated to compute their
155 corresponding ERR for HF and AMI. We performed this analysis for the two most recent time
156 windows for which we had complete data on RPM availability (June 2018 to July 2021 and June
157 2019 to July 2022), with RPM availability defined across all years from 2018 through 2021 for
158 the first period, and 2019 through 2022 for the second. We categorized hospitals in each period
159 as those with RPM in all years and those not offering RPM in any of the years. We also
160 compared the yearly association of RPM service availability with corresponding ERRs for HF
161 and AMI. Here, the ERR was assigned to the final year of the 3-year window with RPM service
162 status defined for that year.

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

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

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

176

177 **RESULTS**

178 **Hospital Characteristics**

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

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

189 42.8%). Hospitals in the Northeast had the highest RPM service availability across study years
190 (58.5% in 2018 to 75.5% in 2022), with those in the South with the lowest availability (32.7% in
191 2018 and 47.2% in 2022). Similarly, teaching hospitals, those located in urban areas, and
192 privately-owned hospitals had higher RPM service availability than rural, non-teaching, and
193 government-owned hospitals, respectively (**Table 1** and **Figure 1**).

194

195 **Community Characteristics**

196 A median of 15.9% (IQR 13.3-19.0) of the population in the counties served by these hospitals
197 were 65 years or older, and 51.1% (IQR 50.0-52.3) were female. The proportion of Black and
198 Hispanic individuals in these areas represented a median 8.1% (IQR 2.7-23.1) and 9.9% (IQR
199 4.5-22.2) of the population, respectively. The proportion of individuals with less than a high
200 school education was a median 10.9% (IQR 7.1-14.8) across counties, and the median annual
201 household income was \$60,440.0 (IQR \$49,049.0-\$77,633.2). The median age, gender, and
202 race/ethnicity distributions were similar between neighborhoods with and without hospitals
203 offering RPM services to their patients. However, hospitals offering RPM services were in
204 counties with higher median household incomes and lower percentages of individuals with less
205 than a high school education (**Table 2**).

206

207 **Factors associated with RPM service availability**

208 In adjusted analyses, hospital bed size, teaching status, rural/urban location, and geographic
209 region were significantly associated with the availability of RPM services (**Figure 2**). Hospitals
210 with fewer than 100 beds had lower odds of RPM service availability than those with more than
211 300 beds (adjusted OR [aOR] 0.41, 95% CI 0.30-0.56). Non-teaching hospitals had over 70%

212 lower odds of offering RPM services than teaching hospitals (aOR 0.28, 95% CI 0.17-0.46), and
213 rural hospitals had 50% lower odds of RPM availability compared with hospitals in urban
214 metropolitan areas. Additionally, hospitals in the South and West were less likely to have RPM
215 services than those in the Northeast (aOR 0.24, 95% CI 0.25-0.46, and aOR 0.32, 95% CI 0.32-
216 0.67, respectively).

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

226

227 **Association between RPM availability and ERR for HF and AMI**

228 Among hospitals offering RPM services across years 2018-2021 and 2019-2022, the mean ERRs
229 for HF were 0.987 (SD 0.073) and 0.988 (SD 0.071) compared with 1.005 (SD 0.065) and 1.004
230 (SD 0.057) among hospitals without RPM, which were significantly lower for RPM vs no-RPM
231 hospitals during these periods (absolute difference: -0.018 [95% CI -0.025, -0.010] for 2018-
232 2021, and -0.016 [95% CI -0.023, -0.009] for 2019-2022, $p < 0.001$ for both). In contrast, for
233 AMI, there were no significant differences in ERR between hospitals with and without RPM
234 services in both 2018-2021 (absolute difference -0.005 [95% CI -0.013, 0.003] $p = 0.19$), and

235 2019-2022 (absolute difference -0.007 [95% CI -0.016, 0.002], $p=0.12$) (**Figure 3**). This pattern
236 was replicated in calendar-year cross-sectional analyses across the five years (**eTable 2** and
237 **Figure 4**).

238 In analyses that examined the longitudinal association of RPM availability in the first
239 year of the study and subsequent readmission performance, we noted that hospitals with vs.
240 without RPM services in 2018 had a lower ERR after HF hospitalization from 2019 through
241 2022, even after accounting for their readmission performance in the base year as well as the
242 structural characteristics of the hospital. The relative ERR for RPM was lower than for non-RPM
243 hospitals by 0.010 (95% CI -0.015, -0.005) in 2019 and 0.012 (95% CI -0.018, -0.006) in 2022.
244 A similar association was observed when analyzing RPM services targeted at post-discharge and
245 chronic care and hospital readmission performance after HF hospitalization (**Figure 5**).^{18,19}
246 However, such an association was not observed for AMI for either the overall availability of
247 RPM services or those specifically targeted at post-discharge or ongoing chronic care services
248 (**Figure 5**).

249

250 **DISCUSSION**

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

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

262 Patient-level studies have suggested a substantial recent increase in claims for RPM
263 service in fee-for-service Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries in the US between 2019 and
264 2021.^{12,24} This increase in the use of these services has occurred despite the lack of robust
265 evidence on the clinical benefits of RPM or clarity on patients or conditions that benefit most
266 from these services. Our findings complement the findings presented in these selected patient
267 populations to provide evidence of the national landscape and describe the rapidly increasing
268 proportion of US hospitals adopting RPM. We also note that, in our hospital-level analyses, risk-
269 standardized readmission performance for HF, a condition with substantial post-discharge care
270 needs, was significantly better at hospitals where these services were available. However, we
271 note that this uptake has varied widely across hospitals, with hospitals serving predominantly
272 disadvantaged communities - that also consistently experience worse readmission outcomes¹⁹ –
273 also have the lowest availability of RPM services.

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

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

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

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

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

314

315 **CONCLUSION**

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

320

321 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

322 **Funding**

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

326

327 **Disclosures**

328 Dr. Khera is an Associate Editor of JAMA. He receives support from the National Heart, Lung,
329 and Blood Institute of the National Institutes of Health (under awards R01HL167858 and
330 K23HL153775), the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation (under award 2022060), and the
331 Blavatnik Family Foundation. He also receives research support, through Yale, from Bristol-
332 Myers Squibb, Novo Nordisk, and BridgeBio. He is a coinventor of U.S. Pending Patent
333 Applications WO2023230345A1, US20220336048A1, 63/346,610, 63/484,426, 63/508,315,
334 63/580,137, 63/606,203, 63/619,241, 63/562,335 and 18/813,882. He is a co-founder of Ensign-
335 AI, Inc. and Evidence2Health, health platforms to improve cardiovascular diagnosis and
336 evidence-based cardiovascular care. Dr Ross reported grants from the Agency for Healthcare
337 Research and Quality (AHRQ, R01HS022882) during the conduct of the study; grants from the
338 US Food and Drug Administration, Johnson & Johnson, Medical Devices Innovation
339 Consortium, grants from the National Institutes of Health/National Heart, Lung, and Blood
340 Institute (NIH/NHLBI), and Arnold Ventures outside the submitted work; and serving as an
341 expert witness at the request of Relator's attorneys, the Greene Law Firm, in a qui tam suit
342 alleging violations of the False Claims Act and Anti-Kickback Statute against Biogen Inc that

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

345

346 **Author Contributions**

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

350 *Study concept and design:* Pedroso and Khera.

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

352 *Drafting of the manuscript:* Pedroso and Khera.

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

354 *Statistical analysis:* Pedroso and Khera.

355 *Obtained funding:* Khera.

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

357 *Study supervision:* Khera.

358

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

362

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

365 REFERENCES

- 366 1. Khera R, Krumholz HM. Effects of the Hospital Readmissions Reduction Program. *Circ*
367 *Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes*. 2018;11(12):e005083.
- 368 2. Khan MS, Sreenivasan J, Lateef N, et al. Trends in 30- and 90-Day Readmission Rates for
369 Heart Failure. *Circ Heart Fail*. 2021;14(4):e008335.
- 370 3. Virani SS, Alonso A, Benjamin EJ, et al. Heart disease and stroke statistics-2020 update: A
371 report from the American Heart Association: A report from the American Heart
372 Association. *Circulation*. 2020;141(9):e139-e596.
- 373 4. Wadhera RK, Joynt Maddox KE, Kazi DS, Shen C, Yeh RW. Hospital revisits within 30
374 days after discharge for medical conditions targeted by the Hospital Readmissions
375 Reduction Program in the United States: national retrospective analysis. *BMJ*.
376 2019;366:l4563.
- 377 5. Khera R, Wang Y, Bernheim SM, Lin Z, Krumholz HM. Post-discharge acute care and
378 outcomes following readmission reduction initiatives: national retrospective cohort study of
379 Medicare beneficiaries in the United States. *BMJ*. 2020;368:l6831.
- 380 6. Oikonomou EK, Khera R. Artificial intelligence-enhanced patient evaluation: bridging art
381 and science. *Eur Heart J*. Published online July 8, 2024. doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehae415
- 382 7. Stevenson LW, Ross HJ, Rathman LD, Boehmer JP. Remote Monitoring for Heart Failure
383 Management at Home. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2023;81(23):2272-2291.
- 384 8. Takahashi EA, Schwamm LH, Adeoye OM, et al. An Overview of Telehealth in the
385 Management of Cardiovascular Disease: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart
386 Association. *Circulation*. 2022;146(25):e558-e568.
- 387 9. Feldman DI, Babikian S, Feldman T, Curnow R, Fudim M. Leveraging remote patient
388 monitoring to effectively put the heart failure guidelines to practice. *J Card Fail*. Published
389 online May 11, 2024. doi:10.1016/j.cardfail.2024.04.018
- 390 10. Taylor ML, Thomas EE, Snoswell CL, Smith AC, Caffery LJ. Does remote patient
391 monitoring reduce acute care use? A systematic review. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11(3):e040232.
- 392 11. Tucker KL, Sheppard JP, Stevens R, et al. Self-monitoring of blood pressure in
393 hypertension: A systematic review and individual patient data meta-analysis. *PLoS Med*.
394 2017;14(9):e1002389.
- 395 12. Tang M, Nakamoto CH, Stern AD, Mehrotra A. Trends in Remote Patient Monitoring Use
396 in Traditional Medicare. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2022;182(9):1005-1006.
- 397 13. Coffey JD, Christopherson LA, Williams RD, et al. Development and implementation of a
398 nurse-based remote patient monitoring program for ambulatory disease management. *Front*
399 *Digit Health*. 2022;4:1052408.

- 400 14. Coffey JD, Christopherson LA, Glasgow AE, et al. Implementation of a multisite,
401 interdisciplinary remote patient monitoring program for ambulatory management of patients
402 with COVID-19. *NPJ Digit Med*. 2021;4(1):123.
- 403 15. Thomas EE, Taylor ML, Banbury A, et al. Factors influencing the effectiveness of remote
404 patient monitoring interventions: a realist review. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11(8):e051844.
- 405 16. Zakeri R, Morgan JM, Phillips P, et al. Impact of remote monitoring on clinical outcomes
406 for patients with heart failure and atrial fibrillation: results from the REM-HF trial. *Eur J*
407 *Heart Fail*. 2020;22(3):543-553.
- 408 17. 2023 Focused Update of the 2021 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute
409 and chronic heart failure. Accessed July 11, 2024.
410 [https://www.escardio.org/Guidelines/Clinical-Practice-Guidelines/Focused-Update-on-](https://www.escardio.org/Guidelines/Clinical-Practice-Guidelines/Focused-Update-on-Heart-Failure-Guidelines)
411 [Heart-Failure-Guidelines](https://www.escardio.org/Guidelines/Clinical-Practice-Guidelines/Focused-Update-on-Heart-Failure-Guidelines)
- 412 18. Mecklai K, Smith N, Stern AD, Kramer DB. Remote patient monitoring - overdue or
413 overused? *N Engl J Med*. 2021;384(15):1384-1386.
- 414 19. Tang M, Nakamoto CH, Stern AD, et al. Effects of remote patient monitoring use on care
415 outcomes among medicare patients with hypertension : An observational study: An
416 observational study. *Ann Intern Med*. 2023;176(11):1465-1475.
- 417 20. AHA Annual Survey Database™. AHA Data. Accessed July 14, 2024.
418 <https://www.ahadata.com/aha-annual-survey-database>
- 419 21. U.S. Census Bureau. Explore Census Data. Accessed July 21, 2024. <https://data.census.gov/>
- 420 22. QualityNet Home. Accessed July 14, 2024.
421 <https://qualitynet.cms.gov/inpatient/measures/readmission/methodology>
- 422 23. Hospital Quality Initiative Public Reporting. Accessed August 5, 2024.
423 [https://www.cms.gov/medicare/quality/initiatives/hospital-quality-initiative/hospital-](https://www.cms.gov/medicare/quality/initiatives/hospital-quality-initiative/hospital-compare)
424 [compare](https://www.cms.gov/medicare/quality/initiatives/hospital-quality-initiative/hospital-compare)
- 425 24. Pauly N, Nair P, Augenstein J. Remote physiologic monitoring use among medicaid
426 population increased, 2019-21: Study examines remote physiologic monitoring trends
427 among the Medicaid population. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2024;43(5):701-706.
- 428 25. Ong MK, Romano PS, Edgington S, et al. Effectiveness of Remote Patient Monitoring
429 After Discharge of Hospitalized Patients With Heart Failure: The Better Effectiveness After
430 Transition -- Heart Failure (BEAT-HF) Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Intern Med*.
431 2016;176(3):310-318.
- 432 26. Jaarsma T, van der Wal MHL, Lesman-Leegte I, et al. Effect of moderate or intensive
433 disease management program on outcome in patients with heart failure: Coordinating Study
434 Evaluating Outcomes of Advising and Counseling in Heart Failure (COACH). *Arch Intern*
435 *Med*. 2008;168(3):316-324.

- 436 27. Dar O, Riley J, Chapman C, et al. A randomized trial of home telemonitoring in a typical
437 elderly heart failure population in North West London: results of the Home-HF study. *Eur J*
438 *Heart Fail.* 2009;11(3):319-325.
- 439 28. Koehler F, Koehler K, Deckwart O, et al. Efficacy of telemedical interventional
440 management in patients with heart failure (TIM-HF2): a randomised, controlled, parallel-
441 group, unmasked trial. *Lancet.* 2018;392(10152):1047-1057.
- 442 29. Li Y, Zhang D, Li W, et al. The health and economic impact of expanding home blood
443 pressure monitoring. *Am J Prev Med.* 2023;65(5):775-782.
- 444 30. Lynch KA, Ganz DA, Saliba D, Chang DS, de Peralta SS. Improving heart failure care and
445 guideline-directed medical therapy through proactive remote patient monitoring-home
446 telehealth and pharmacy integration. *BMJ Open Qual.* 2022;11(3):e001901.
- 447 31. Bashi N, Karunanithi M, Fatehi F, Ding H, Walters D. Remote monitoring of patients with
448 heart failure: An overview of systematic reviews. *J Med Internet Res.* 2017;19(1):e18.
- 449 32. Alshahrani NS, Hartley A, Howard J, et al. Randomized Trial of Remote Assessment of
450 Patients After an Acute Coronary Syndrome. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2024;83(23):2250-2259.
- 451 33. Accountable Care Organizations-Pathways to Success.
452 [https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2018/08/17/2018-17101/medicare-program-](https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2018/08/17/2018-17101/medicare-program-medicare-shared-savings-program-accountable-care-organizations-pathways-to-success)
453 [medicare-shared-savings-program-accountable-care-organizations-pathways-to-success](https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2018/08/17/2018-17101/medicare-program-medicare-shared-savings-program-accountable-care-organizations-pathways-to-success)
454

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

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

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

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

FIGURES

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




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




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




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




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

