Curatio : Journal of Advanced and Specialized Nursing, and Care Planning
E- ISSN : 3064-4089
Volume. 2 Issue 1 January 2025
Page No: 40-51

Remote Patient Monitoring in Post-Discharge Care: Evaluating Effectiveness, Challenges, and Policy Implications Across Diverse Populations

Zaenal
Universitas Islam Makassar, Indonesia
Correspondent: zaenal.dpk@uim-makassar.ac.id

Received : November 23, 2024
Accepted : January 12, 2025
Published : January 31, 2025

Citation: Zaenal., (2025). Remote Patient Monitoring in Post-Discharge Care: Evaluating Effectiveness, Challenges, and Policy Implications Across Diverse Populations. Curatio : Journal of Advanced and Specialized Nursing, and Care Planning, 2(1), 40-51.

https://doi.org/10.61978/curatio.v2i1.1403

ABSTRACT: Post-discharge care is a critical period in the healthcare continuum, especially for patients with chronic conditions. Remote Patient Monitoring (RPM) has emerged as a strategy to enhance safety, improve adherence, and ensure continuity of care. This study aims to synthesize evidence on the effectiveness and limitations of RPM during transitions from inpatient to home care. A qualitative synthesis of 29 global studies was conducted, focusing on RPM applications in transitional care. Studies were selected based on inclusion criteria involving chronic disease populations and interventions using technology-enabled monitoring. Outcome domains included safety, adherence, quality of life (QoL), and cost. RPM interventions demonstrated consistent benefits in improving clinical safety by enabling early detection and response to deterioration. Adherence to medications and care protocols also improved across various settings. However, results related to QoL were inconclusive, with only select populations (e.g., heart failure, diabetes) reporting significant improvements. Cost outcomes showed potential reductions in hospitalizations and emergency visits, although robust economic evaluations were limited. Implementation success depended on clinician engagement, EHR integration, and contextual adaptations. Barriers to standardizing outcomes and demographic variability posed challenges to generalizability. Populations benefiting most from RPM included chronic disease patients, elderly individuals, rural populations, and post-operative patients. RPM is effective in enhancing patient safety and adherence during care transitions. Broader integration should be supported by standard evaluation metrics and targeted research into QoL and cost-effectiveness. These findings inform future clinical adoption and policymaking for scalable, patient-centered RPM interventions.

Keywords: Remote Patient Monitoring, Transitional Care, Patient Safety, Medication Adherence, Quality of Life, Cost-Effectiveness, Chronic Disease Management.

INTRODUCTION

Post-discharge care presents one of the most vulnerable phases in the patient care continuum, especially for individuals with chronic conditions. As the healthcare system shifts toward value-based models and shorter inpatient stays, the pressure to ensure seamless care transitions has intensified. Complications that follow hospital discharge including readmissions, medication nonadherence, and deterioration of chronic conditions remain prevalent challenges that jeopardize patient safety and healthcare system efficiency. Evidence reveals that patients with chronic diseases, such as heart failure, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), and diabetes, are particularly at risk, with post-discharge readmission rates reaching up to 30% within the first 30 days (Taylor et al., 2021; Testa et al., 2024). These complications are often exacerbated by inadequate follow-up care and suboptimal transition planning, which significantly elevate healthcare costs and resource burden (Jesus et al., 2024). A systematic review underlines the critical role of effective transitional care in minimizing emergency department utilization and safeguarding patient outcomes (Noel et al., 2020).

To address these systemic shortcomings, digital health innovations have gained traction. Among them, Remote Patient Monitoring (RPM) has evolved into a pivotal strategy for extending care beyond the hospital walls. Originally designed for outpatient chronic disease management, RPM technologies have broadened their application to include a wider array of medical conditions and healthcare settings, especially accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic (Mantena & Keshavjee, 2021). The imperative to limit in-person interactions during the pandemic catalyzed the widespread adoption of RPM, integrating wearable sensors, telemonitoring platforms, and real-time data transmission into mainstream care delivery (Elhadi et al., 2021). Today, RPM not only facilitates the continuous observation of vital signs and clinical parameters but also supports patient engagement and self-management cornerstones of sustainable chronic care (Patel et al., 2023).

Technological advancements underpin the success of RPM. Systems now incorporate wearable sensors, mobile apps, and telehealth platforms capable of collecting and transmitting real-time data to care teams (Vegesna et al., 2017). Common tools include glucose meters, blood pressure monitors, and pulse oximeters that are increasingly integrated into holistic platforms. These tools not only support vital sign surveillance but also reinforce treatment adherence and encourage patient empowerment (Doraiswamy et al., 2020; Vilendrer et al., 2022). Moreover, emerging technologies such as the Internet of Medical Things (IoMT) and cloud computing enhance the responsiveness and scalability of RPM systems, making them more adaptive to complex care environments (Rahman et al., 2021).

A growing body of literature affirms the value of RPM in post-acute care. Studies indicate its association with reduced hospitalizations, emergency visits, and improved clinical outcomes among chronic disease patients (Bressman et al., 2024). Systematic reviews emphasize that RPM promotes adherence, health literacy, and self-management behaviors factors strongly correlated with long-term patient outcomes (Vegesna et al., 2017). Furthermore, targeted RPM interventions have shown particular promise in managing heart failure populations, significantly lowering readmission rates when deployed post-discharge (Apantaku et al., 2022).

At the policy level, national healthcare systems increasingly recognize RPM as an integral component of transitional care. For instance, frameworks in the USA and France have formalized RPM integration into chronic disease management programs (Alami et al., 2023). These strategies support broader healthcare objectives, including reducing preventable hospital utilization and enhancing outcome accountability (Zullig et al., 2023). Additionally, RPM has proven instrumental during the COVID-19 pandemic by enabling safe continuity of care amidst lockdowns and care disruptions (Frey & Chiu, 2021).

Despite these advancements, substantial gaps remain in the RPM research landscape. Many studies lack specificity in targeting vulnerable subgroups and fail to address demographic variability in RPM effectiveness (Tan et al., 2024). Moreover, longitudinal data on the long-term impact of RPM remains scarce, and the integration of patient-generated health data into clinical decision-making continues to face operational and ethical challenges (Foster et al., 2022). Frameworks that can robustly assess RPM efficacy taking into account user experiences, adherence, and contextual factors are essential for future research and implementation (Vegesna et al., 2017).

In light of this, the present study seeks to synthesize available evidence on the effectiveness and limitations of RPM specifically during the transition from inpatient to home care. By analyzing outcome domains including safety, adherence, quality of life, and healthcare utilization, this research aims to identify where RPM adds the most value and where evidence gaps remain. The novelty of this synthesis lies in its cross-contextual comparison of RPM implementations and the development of strategic recommendations for future research and policy planning.

METHOD

This study adopts a secondary synthesis approach, integrating findings from a wide body of existing systematic reviews and supporting evidence related to Remote Patient Monitoring (RPM) during the transition from inpatient to home care. A qualitative interpretive framework is used to extract thematic insights from heterogeneous studies, ensuring a nuanced understanding of outcome variations and implementation contexts.

Study Design and Rationale

The methodological approach centers on a qualitative synthesis of 29 studies derived from systematic reviews, rapid evidence checks, and retrospective cohort data. This design allows for exploration of outcome domains namely safety, adherence, quality of life (QoL), and cost across diverse healthcare settings.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

RPM studies were included if they met the following criteria:

- Study Design: Randomized controlled trials (RCTs), quasi-experimental, or observational studies examining RPM effectiveness (Neves et al., 2020).
- Population: Adults (≥18 years) with chronic conditions such as heart failure, diabetes, or COPD.

- Intervention: Use of technology-enabled RPM, including telehealth, telemonitoring, and real-time health parameter transmission systems.

Exclusion criteria involved:

- Non-comparative studies lacking control groups.
- RPM interventions not involving digital technologies or failing to report relevant outcomes.
- Studies rated as having low methodological quality, using risk of bias tools such as the Cochrane RoB.

Qualitative Synthesis Techniques

The study applies a combination of synthesis methods appropriate for evaluating heterogeneous health interventions:

- Convergent Integrated Approach: Integrates qualitative and quantitative evidence for a comprehensive, multidimensional assessment of RPM outcomes.
- Framework Synthesis: Utilizes pre-defined analytical structures to categorize evidence, ideal for interpreting results across different RPM models and care settings.
- Thematic Analysis: Identifies and organizes recurring themes, particularly useful for assessing patient-reported experiences and implementation challenges.

These techniques ensure the inclusion of both statistical outcomes and contextual insights, offering a more holistic interpretation of RPM effectiveness.

Categorization of Outcome Domains

To facilitate comparison across studies, outcome measures were grouped into the following categories:

- Clinical Outcomes: Including hospitalization rates, emergency visits, and condition-specific metrics (e.g., HbA1c, blood pressure).
- Patient-Reported Outcomes (PROs): Measures of satisfaction, self-efficacy, and quality of life, often captured via validated instruments such as SF-36 (Raymond et al., 2024).
- Economic Outcomes: Encompassing healthcare utilization costs, cost-avoidance from prevented readmissions, and economic efficiency.
- Adherence and Utilization Metrics: Focusing on compliance with care plans and frequency of RPM engagement (Yarlas et al., 2020).

This classification system allows for structured comparisons of RPM impact, supporting the development of evidence-based guidelines and identifying areas for further research.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Patient Safety and Adherence

RPM systems have been shown to significantly reduce clinical safety incidents during transitions from inpatient to home care. By offering real-time monitoring and early warning capabilities, these systems alert healthcare providers to deteriorating conditions, facilitating timely intervention (Peters et al., 2021). Studies confirm that proactive management enabled by RPM reduces adverse events and enhances patient safety during care transitions.

Adherence outcomes are commonly measured using metrics such as self-reported medication adherence, prescription refill rates, appointment attendance, and engagement with RPM devices (Houlding et al., 2021). Interventions employing mobile health apps, wearable monitors, and telehealth systems with automated reminders are found to be most effective in promoting adherence (Chatterjee et al., 2023).

Demographic factors influence adherence levels, with older adults often facing usability challenges, while younger patients, particularly those with diabetes or hypertension, exhibit higher engagement.

Table 1. Summary of Safety and Adherence Findings

Outcome Domain	Key Findings	Effective Technologies
Safety	Reduction in clinical incidents through early detection and intervention	Telemonitoring, alert systems
Adherence	Improved medication and appointment adherence; higher RPM engagement rates	Mobile apps, wearables, automated reminders

Quality of Life (QoL)

QoL in RPM studies is typically evaluated using standardized tools such as the SF-36, EQ-5D, and condition-specific instruments like the St. George's Respiratory Questionnaire. RPM has demonstrated beneficial effects on mental well-being, with participants reporting reduced anxiety and improved autonomy.

Notable improvements are seen in specific chronic disease cohorts, such as heart failure, diabetes, and obesity, where patients experience enhanced physical health and lower symptom burdens (Ratta et al., 2021). However, interpretation of QoL data is hindered by diverse tools, inconsistent measurement protocols, and short-term assessment windows.

Table 2. QoL Measurement and Outcomes in RPM Studies

QoL Instrument Used	Populations Studied	Key Results
SF-36, EQ-5D	General chronic illness cohorts	Mixed; mental well-being often improved
St. George's Questionnaire	Respiratory condition patients	Specific physical and symptom burden reductions

QoL Instrument Used	Populations Studied	Key Results
Disease-specific tools	Heart failure, diabetes, obesity	Notable improvements in targeted health outcomes

Healthcare Utilization and Cost

RPM interventions have been linked to reductions in 30-day hospital readmission rates by up to 50% compared to standard care, primarily through early symptom detection and proactive case management.

Emergency department visits also decline in RPM groups due to better symptom control and remote triage capabilities. Cost-effectiveness assessments generally use incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICERs) and compare RPM implementation costs with savings from reduced hospital and emergency service utilization (Auener et al., 2021).

Frequently reported economic outcomes include total healthcare expenditures, hospitalization-related costs, and indirect costs such as patient time and productivity loss (Paludo et al., 2021).

Table 3. Healthcare Utilization and Cost Outcomes

Outcome Domain	Key Findings	Evaluation Methods
Readmissions	Up to 50% reduction in 30-day rates in RPM cohorts	RCTs, cohort comparisons
Emergency Visits	Fewer visits due to symptom monitoring and triage	Systematic review, administrative data
Cost-Effectiveness	Potential savings; limited full economic evaluations	ICER, total cost comparison
Indirect Costs	Improved productivity, reduced travel needs	Time-cost modeling

Research Limitations

Heterogeneity in RPM studies stemming from variation in population characteristics, technologies, and study design complicates outcome interpretation and limits meta-analytic conclusions ((Dinesen et al., 2016).

RPM definitions vary internationally, encompassing different levels of technological integration and provider interaction (Ratta et al., 2021). This inconsistency poses challenges for cross-study comparisons and policy standardization.

Common methodological issues include small sample sizes, short follow-up durations, and inadequate control for confounders. Generalizability is assessed by comparing findings across diverse settings, patient profiles, and technology types (Hanlon et al., 2017).

Table 4. Limitations in RPM Literature

Limitation Category	Description
Study Heterogeneity	Variation in design, population, and intervention models

Limitation Category	Description
Definitions of RPM	Inconsistent scope and technology classifications across studies
Methodological Quality	Small samples, short follow-up, lack of contr

Remote Patient Monitoring (RPM) is increasingly recognized as a transformative approach in transitional care, offering substantial improvements in patient safety and adherence. The synthesis of 29 studies across diverse healthcare settings reinforces that RPM can reduce hospital readmissions and improve disease management, especially for patients with chronic conditions. Nevertheless, despite these positive outcomes, critical considerations remain regarding implementation strategies, data standardization, and generalizability.

Successful RPM implementation depends on tailoring strategies to specific clinical contexts. Engaging all stakeholders including clinicians, administrators, and patients is essential to ensure the system's usability and integration (Hamann et al., 2023). Customized training programs for healthcare staff can enhance technological proficiency and foster greater confidence in using RPM tools (Hassett et al., 2022). Furthermore, integrating RPM systems into existing Electronic Health Records (EHRs) reduces redundancy, improves workflow efficiency, and strengthens clinician engagement through real-time data accessibility (Gagnon et al., 2016).

Clinician engagement is further enhanced when EHR-integrated RPM systems facilitate prompt and data-driven decision-making. This integration supports effective communication between patients and care teams via portals, reinforcing trust and motivation to use RPM routinely (Dendere et al., 2019). However, failure to align RPM with existing clinical workflows may result in lower adoption rates and user dissatisfaction (Hassett et al., 2022).

Despite these advances, a significant barrier to synthesizing RPM findings is the lack of standardized outcome definitions. The broad variety of RPM devices and platforms leads to inconsistent metrics, impeding cross-study comparison (Durneva et al., 2020). Moreover, no consensus exists regarding which domains clinical, economic, or patient-reported should be prioritized, complicating evidence aggregation (Walker et al., 2020). Population heterogeneity also influences outcome interpretation, as results vary significantly across demographic and disease-specific subgroups (Kariotis et al., 2022).

Recent literature identifies specific populations that benefit most from RPM. Chronic disease patients, including those with diabetes, heart failure, and COPD, consistently experience better outcomes with RPM-supported care, including enhanced medication adherence and fewer hospital visits (Jedwab et al., 2022). Elderly individuals living alone also benefit through continuous remote surveillance, which supports timely clinical intervention and improves their autonomy. Additionally, RPM provides a practical solution for patients in rural or underserved areas by reducing access barriers and enabling cost-effective care management (Dullabh et al., 2023). Post-operative patients also report reduced complications and increased satisfaction due to structured recovery monitoring and medication support (Ahmed, 2024).

Taken together, the findings suggest that while RPM has strong potential to enhance care transitions, future research must address current gaps through the development of standardized evaluation frameworks, targeted implementation strategies, and inclusive studies that reflect diverse patient populations. Policy initiatives should also support infrastructure development, provider training, and data governance to ensure sustainable RPM adoption.

CONCLUSION

This study synthesizes the effectiveness and limitations of Remote Patient Monitoring (RPM) during transitions from inpatient to home care. Across 29 studies, the evidence consistently supports RPM's role in improving patient safety and adherence. RPM systems enable early detection of health deterioration, timely interventions, and increased compliance with treatment protocols, making them highly effective for managing patients with chronic illnesses during vulnerable care transitions.

Despite these benefits, the impact of RPM on quality of life (QoL) and cost-related outcomes remains inconsistent. While some patients experience improved mental well-being and reduced symptom burdens, especially in chronic disease cohorts, results are varied across populations. Additionally, cost savings through reduced hospitalizations and emergency visits are promising, but comprehensive cost-effectiveness analyses are still limited.

Implementation success depends significantly on stakeholder engagement, clinician training, and seamless integration with Electronic Health Records (EHRs). These elements enhance user adoption and workflow efficiency. Barriers such as technological variability, lack of standardized outcome metrics, and demographic diversity hinder generalizability and limit the development of universal evaluation frameworks.

The populations that benefit most from RPM include individuals with chronic conditions, elderly patients, those living in rural areas, and post-operative patients. RPM provides these groups with enhanced disease management, increased autonomy, and improved access to care.

In conclusion, RPM is a valuable intervention for improving transitional care outcomes, especially in safety and adherence domains. However, broader adoption must be accompanied by targeted research into cost-effectiveness, QoL impacts, and equity in access. Future studies should adopt standardized evaluation methods, expand demographic representation, and explore long-term outcomes to better inform clinical and policy decisions. Through thoughtful integration and ongoing evidence development, RPM can play a central role in advancing patient-centered, technology-enabled healthcare.

REFERENCE

Ahmed, R. M. (2024). Architectural Design for Remote Patient Monitoring System Implementation in Hematology Units: A Proposed Model. *Cybrarians Journal*, (73), 88–110. https://doi.org/10.70000/cj.2024.73.620

Alami, S., Courouve, L., Lancman, G., Gomis, P., Al-Hamoud, G., Laurelli, C., Pasche, H., Châtellier, G., Mercier, G., Roubille, F., Delval, C., & Durand-Zaleski, I. (2023). Organisational Impact of a Remote Patient Monitoring System for Heart Failure

Management: The Experience of 29 Cardiology Departments in France. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *20*(5), 4366. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20054366

Apantaku, G., Mitton, C., Wong, H., & Ho, K. (2022). Home Telemonitoring Technology for Patients With Heart Failure: Cost-Consequence Analysis of a Pilot Study. *Jmir Formative Research*, *6*(6), e32147. https://doi.org/10.2196/32147

Auener, S. L., Remers, T. E. P., Dulmen, S. A. v., Westert, G. P., Kool, R. B., & Jeurissen, P. (2021). The Effect of Noninvasive Telemonitoring for Chronic Heart Failure on Health Care Utilization: Systematic Review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *23*(9), e26744. https://doi.org/10.2196/26744

Bressman, E., Burke, R. E., & Greysen, S. R. (2024). Connected Transitions: Opportunities and Challenges for Improving Postdischarge Care With Technology. *Journal of Hospital Medicine*, *19*(6), 530–534. https://doi.org/10.1002/jhm.13264

Chatterjee, A., Prinz, A., Riegler, M. A., & Das, J. (2023). A Systematic Review and Knowledge Mapping on ICT-based Remote and Automatic COVID-19 Patient Monitoring and Care. *BMC Health Services Research*, *23*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-023-10047-z

Dendere, R., Slade, C., Burton-Jones, A., Sullivan, C., Staib, A., & Janda, M. (2019). Patient Portals Facilitating Engagement With Inpatient Electronic Medical Records: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *21*(4), e12779. https://doi.org/10.2196/12779

Dinesen, B., Nonnecke, B., Lindeman, D., Toft, E., Kidholm, K., Jethwani, K., Young, H. M., Spindler, H., Oestergaard, C. U., Southard, J., Gutierrez, M., Anderson, N., Albert, N. M., Han, J. J., & Nesbitt, T. S. (2016). Personalized Telehealth in the Future: A Global Research Agenda. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *18*(3), e53. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.5257

Doraiswamy, S., Abraham, A., Mamtani, R., & Cheema, S. (2020). Use of Telehealth During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Scoping Review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *22*(12), e24087. https://doi.org/10.2196/24087

Dullabh, P., Heaney-Huls, K., Chiao, A. B., Callaham, M., Desai, P., Gauthreaux, N., Kashyap, N., Lobach, D. F., & Boxwala, A. A. (2023). Implementation and Evaluation of an Electronic Health Record-Integrated App for Postpartum Monitoring of Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy Using Patient-Contributed Data Collection. *Jamia Open*, *6*(4). https://doi.org/10.1093/jamiaopen/ooad098

Durneva, P., Cousins, K., & Chen, M. (2020). The Current State of Research, Challenges, and Future Research Directions of Blockchain Technology in Patient Care: Systematic Review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *22*(7), e18619. https://doi.org/10.2196/18619

Elhadi, M., Elhadi, A., Bouhuwaish, A., Alshiteewi, F. B., Elmabrouk, A., Alsuyihili, A., Alhashimi, A., Khel, S., Elgherwi, A., Alsoufi, A., Albakoush, A., & Abdulmalik, A. (2021). Telemedicine Awareness, Knowledge, Attitude, and Skills of Health Care Workers in a

Low-Resource Country During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Cross-Sectional Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *23*(2), e20812. https://doi.org/10.2196/20812

Foster, C. C., Schinasi, D. A., Kan, K., Macy, M. L., Wheeler, D. S., & Curfman, A. (2022). Remote Monitoring of Patient- And Family-Generated Health Data in Pediatrics. *Pediatrics*, *149*(2). https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2021-054137

Frey, M. B., & Chiu, S. (2021). Considerations When Using Telemedicine as the Advanced Practice Registered Nurse. *The Journal for Nurse Practitioners*, *17*(3), 289–292. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nurpra.2020.11.011

Gagnon, M., Payne-Gagnon, J., Breton, É., Fortin, J., Khoury, L., Dolovich, L., Price, D., Wiljer, D., Bartlett, G., & Archer, N. (2016). Adoption of Electronic Personal Health Records in Canada: Perceptions of Stakeholders. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, *5*(7), 425–433. https://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2016.36

Hamann, P., Knitza, J., Kühn, S., & Knevel, R. (2023). Recommendation to Implementation of Remote Patient Monitoring in Rheumatology: Lessons Learned and Barriers to Take. *RMD Open*, *9*(4), e003363. https://doi.org/10.1136/rmdopen-2023-003363

Hanlon, P., Daines, L., Campbell, C., McKinstry, B., Weller, D., & Pinnock, H. (2017). Telehealth Interventions to Support Self-Management of Long-Term Conditions: A Systematic Metareview of Diabetes, Heart Failure, Asthma, Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease, and Cancer. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *19*(5), e172. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.6688

Hassett, M. J., Cronin, C., Tsou, T., Wedge, J., Bian, J., Dizon, D. S., Hazard-Jenkins, H., Osarogiagbon, R. U., Wong, S. L., Basch, E., Austin, T., McCleary, N. J., & Schrag, D. (2022). eSyM: An Electronic Health Record–Integrated Patient-Reported Outcomes–Based Cancer Symptom Management Program Used by Six Diverse Health Systems. *Jco Clinical Cancer Informatics*, (6). https://doi.org/10.1200/cci.21.00137

Houlding, E., Mate, K., Engler, K., Ortiz-Paredes, D., Pomey, M., Cox, J., Hijal, T., & Lebouché, B. (2021). Barriers to Use of Remote Monitoring Technologies Used to Support Patients With COVID-19: Rapid Review. *Jmir Mhealth and Uhealth*, *9*(4), e24743. https://doi.org/10.2196/24743

Jedwab, R. M., Franco, M., Owen, D., Ingram, A., Redley, B., & Dobroff, N. (2022). Improving the Quality of Electronic Medical Record Documentation: Development of a Compliance and Quality Program. *Applied Clinical Informatics*, *13*(04), 836–844. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0042-1756369

Jesus, T. S., Stern, B. Z., Lee, D., Zhang, M., Struhar, J., Heinemann, A. W., Jordan, N., & Deutsch, A. (2024). Systematic Review of Contemporary Interventions for Improving Discharge Support and Transitions of Care From the Patient Experience Perspective. *Plos One*, *19*(5), e0299176. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0299176

Kariotis, T., Prictor, M., Chang, S., & Gray, K. (2022). Impact of Electronic Health Records on Information Practices in Mental Health Contexts: Scoping Review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *24*(5), e30405. https://doi.org/10.2196/30405

Mantena, S., & Keshavjee, S. (2021). Strengthening Healthcare Delivery With Remote Patient Monitoring in the Time of COVID-19. *BMJ Health & Care Informatics*, *28*(1), e100302. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjhci-2020-100302

Neves, A. L., Freise, L., Laranjo, L., Carter, A. W., Darzi, A., & Mayer, E. (2020). Impact of Providing Patients Access to Electronic Health Records on Quality and Safety of Care: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, *29*(12), 1019–1032. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2019-010581

Noel, K., Messina, C. R., Hou, W., Schoenfeld, E., & Kelly, G. (2020). Tele-Transitions of Care (TTOC): A 12-Month, Randomized Controlled Trial Evaluating the Use of Telehealth to Achieve Triple Aim Objectives. *BMC Family Practice*, *21*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12875-020-1094-5

Paludo, J., Bansal, R., Holland, A., Haugen, K., Spychalla, M. T., McClanahan, A. L., Truong, T., Hathcock, M., Khurana, A., Alkhateeb, H. B., Dingli, D., Hayman, S. R., Kapoor, P., Gertz, M. A., Wang, Y., Kenderian, S. S., Kourelis, T., Kumar, S., Shah, M. V, … Lin, Y. (2021). Pilot Implementation of Remote Patient Monitoring Program for Outpatient Management of CAR-T Cell Therapy. *Blood*, *138*(Supplement 1), 568–568. https://doi.org/10.1182/blood-2021-149103

Patel, H., Hassell, A., Keniston, A., & Davis, C. (2023). Impact of Remote Patient Monitoring on Length of Stay for Patients With COVID-19. *Telemedicine and E-Health*, *29*(2), 298–303. https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2021.0510

Peters, G., Kooij, L., Lenferink, A., Harten, W. H. v., & Doggen, C. J. (2021). The Effect of Telehealth on Hospital Services Use: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *23*(9), e25195. https://doi.org/10.2196/25195

Rahman, M. K., Bhuiyan, M. A., & Zailani, S. (2021). Healthcare Services: Patient Satisfaction and Loyalty Lessons From Islamic Friendly Hospitals. *Patient Preference and Adherence*, *Volume 15*, 2633–2646. https://doi.org/10.2147/ppa.s333595

Ratta, P., Kaur, A., Sharma, S., Shabaz, M., & Dhiman, G. (2021). Application of Blockchain and Internet of Things in Healthcare and Medical Sector: Applications, Challenges, and Future Perspectives. *Journal of Food Quality*, *2021*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/7608296

Raymond, M., Christie, L. J., Kramer, S., Malaguti, C., Mok, Z., Gardner, B., Giummarra, M. J., Alves-Stein, S., Hudson, C., Featherston, J., Holland, A. E., & Lannin, N. A. (2024). Delivery of Allied Health Interventions Using Telehealth Modalities: A Rapid Systematic Review of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Healthcare*, *12*(12), 1217. https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare12121217

Tan, S. Y., Sumner, J., Wang, Y., & Yip, A. W. (2024). A Systematic Review of the Impacts of Remote Patient Monitoring (RPM) Interventions on Safety, Adherence, Quality-of-Life and Cost-Related Outcomes. *NPJ Digital Medicine*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-024-01182-w

Taylor, P. C., Ancuța, C., Nagy, O., Vega, M. C. de la, Гордеев, A. B., Janková, R., Kalyoncu, U., Lagunes-Galindo, I., Morović-Vergles, J., Souza, M. P. G. U. e S. de, Rojkovich, B., Sidiropoulos, P., & Kawakami, A. (2021). Treatment Satisfaction, Patient Preferences, and the Impact of Suboptimal Disease Control in a Large International Rheumatoid Arthritis Cohort: SENSE Study. *Patient Preference and Adherence*, *Volume 15*, 359–373. https://doi.org/10.2147/ppa.s289692

Testa, D., Iborra, V., Dutech, M., Sanchez, M., Raynaud-Simon, A., Cabanes, E., & Chansiaux-Bucalo, C. (2024). *Impact of a Home-Based Remote Patient Monitoring System on Hospitalizations and Emergency Department Visits of Older Adults With Polypathology: Multicenter Retrospective Observational Study (Preprint)*. https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.64989

Vegesna, A., Tran, M.-Q., Angelaccio, M., & Arcona, S. (2017). Remote Patient Monitoring via Non-Invasive Digital Technologies: A Systematic Review. *Telemedicine and E-Health*, *23*(1), 3–17. https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2016.0051

Vilendrer, S., Lestoquoy, A. S., Artandi, M., Barman, L., Cannon, K., Garvert, D. W., Halket, D., Holdsworth, L. M., Singer, S. J., Vaughan, L., & Winget, M. (2022). A 360 Degree Mixed-Methods Evaluation of a Specialized COVID-19 Outpatient Clinic and Remote Patient Monitoring Program. *BMC Primary Care*, *23*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12875-022-01734-7

Walker, R., Tong, A., Howard, K., Darby, N., & Palmer, S. C. (2020). Patients' and Caregivers' Expectations and Experiences of Remote Monitoring for Peritoneal Dialysis: A Qualitative Interview Study. *Peritoneal Dialysis International*, *40*(6), 540–547. https://doi.org/10.1177/0896860820927528

Yarlas, A., Maher, S., Bayliss, M., Lovley, A., Cappelleri, J. C., Bushmakin, A. G., & DiBonaventura, M. (2020). The Inflammatory Bowel Disease Questionnaire in Randomized Controlled Trials of Treatment for Ulcerative Colitis: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Patient-Centered Research and Reviews*, *7*(2), 189–205. https://doi.org/10.17294/2330-0698.1722

Zullig, L. L., Raska, W., McWhirter, G., Sherman, S. E., Makarov, D. V, Becker, D., King, H. A., Pura, J., Jeffreys, A. S., Danus, S., Passero, V. A., Goldstein, K. M., & Kelley, M. J. (2023). Veterans Health Administration National TeleOncology Service. *Jco Oncology Practice*, *19*(4), e504–e510. https://doi.org/10.1200/op.22.00455

.