



ABSTRACT

Introduction: Congestive heart failure (CHF) remains a major cause of hospital admissions in the United States despite advances guidelinedirected medical therapy and cutting-edge technology. Few interventions have reliably demonstrated a sustained reduction in hospital admission. The Remote Dielectric Sensing (ReDS) vest, known as the Sensivest, is a non-invasive approach to assist in optimizing volemic status in patients with heart failure.

Hypothesis: In this study, we hypothesize that utilizing the ReDS vest in the outpatient setting prevented hospitalization for acute CHF exacerbation in patients with known CHF.

Methods: A retrospective chart review was performed to identify patients over the age of 18 with symptomatic CHF who received an outpatient ReDS vest reading in 2018. A total of 96 patients were entered in the study, and data related to demographics, heart failure variables, and use of guideline-directed medical therapy were collected. Following each ReDS vest reading, subsequent trends were tracked including CHF-related medication changes, ED visits, and hospitalizations. Results were compared to the general system population or to historical control.

Results: Three months after a ReDS vest reading, patients were significantly less likely to be hospitalized for CHF exacerbation compared to the interval prior to ReDS vest utilization (20.8% vs 43.8%, p < 0.001, Cl 0.303-0.748). The overall number of CHF admissions was significantly decreased at 3 months (59 vs 25, p < 0.001). Interestingly, of the 22 patients who had been discharged from an inpatient stay and optimized with the ReDS vest outpatient within 30 days, the readmission rate was only 13.6%.

<u>Conclusions</u>: The ReDS vest offers a non-invasive, user-friendly approach to optimize management of heart failure that could offer the significant benefit of reducing hospital admission rate of these patients. Based on this study, further investigation including prospective randomized trials is warranted to identify how best to maximize the utility of this novel technology.

INTRODUCTION

Heart failure (HF) is one of the most costly and deadly disease states in the United States, being responsible for 1 in 9 deaths in 2009¹, an estimated \$30.7 billion in health care expenses annually, and projected direct medical expenses of \$57.5 billion by 2025.²

Remote telemonitoring holds potential as a method for reducing rehospitalizations through the ability to gain objective fluid status data before the patient experiences symptoms that require hospitalization. One such monitoring device is the ReDS (Remote Dielectric Signaling) device, commonly referred to as the Sensivest. Although there is not currently an abundance of literature on outcomes of Sensivest use in the ambulatory setting, its initial outcomes study showed that HF admissions were reduced by 87% when used daily for fluid status monitoring.³ Another study including use of a nurse-driven diuretic protocol resulted in a reduction in overall hospital HF readmission rate from 25% to 15%.⁴ This study aims to determine if the use of the Sensivest in the ambulatory

setting and subsequent treatment decisions prevented hospitalizations.

Study Patients All patients who received an outpatient Sensivest reading during the study period of January 2018-December 2018 were screened. The electronic medical record was used to create a list of all patients who had had a provider of nurse visit with the heart failure clinic, or office or home visits with the eHealth at Home team during calendar year 2018. The lists were combined for a total of 861 unique patient charts. Institutional Review Board approval was obtained to complete the study.

Patient charts were eligible for this study if the patient was 18 years of age or older, carried a diagnosis of symptomatic heart failure, and a documented use of a Sensivest device with a successful result



Figure 1

Study Outcomes The primary outcome of this study was to assess the efficacy of Sensivestdriven diuretic changes in reducing frequency of hospital admissions.

- Reduction in ED visits
- Type of treatment change
- Percentage of patients with treatment changes without an office visit

Statistical Analysis A convenience sample was used which included all eligible patients. As such, power calculations were not performed prior to study initiation. A twosided alpha of 0.05 was pre-specified as significant.

McNemar's contingency tables were used to yield Chi-squared values for comparing an individual patient's admission status before and after a Sensivest reading. Chi-squared values were then converted to P-values to test for significance.

Wilcoxin-ranked sign test was used to compare number of admissions before and after Sensivest readings.

Descriptive statistics were used for the operational secondary outcomes.

Effect of the Remote Dielectric Sensing Vest on Reducing Heart Failure Admissions

¹Sumon Roy, ²Patrick McCabe, ¹Angela Karnes, ²Alexander DeLucenay, ¹Scott Feitell 1 Department of Medicine, Rochester General Hospital, Rochester Regional Health System, 2 St. John Fisher College, Wegmans School of Pharmacy

METHODS

Describes the patient chart screening process.

- Multiple secondary outcomes include:
- Reduction in 30-day readmissions

Simulation Solution							DA	ΤA							
Section 2.1 Product 15 (2.1) Average (arcs)		Domostanh	Ine	W D		-linical	Manauras				Madi	entione			
Ethnicity Characteristic Characterist	Sex Male		Male	57 59.4	Average Eject	tion	weasures	[-	Beta-Blog	ker	cations	75 78.1	Figure	
Average Age body Massion Massion Asso 11 Asso 12 Asso 1	Ethi	nicity	Caucasia	n 63 65.6	Fraction			38.6		ACE			27 28.1	Backgr	
American 1 13 14 14 15 Additional Cases 1 10 12 12 13 10 <th10< th=""> 10 <th10< th=""> <th10< td=""><td colspan="2" rowspan="4">Afri Ame Asi Hisp Nat</td><td>African</td><td>18 18.8</td><td>HF Type</td><td></td><td>Reduced</td><td>49</td><td>51.0</td><td>ARB</td><td></td><td></td><td>8 8.3</td><td>Buokgr</td></th10<></th10<></th10<>	Afri Ame Asi Hisp Nat		African	18 18.8	HF Type		Reduced	49	51.0	ARB			8 8.3	Buokgr	
Bit Market 1 1 <th1< th=""> 1 <th1< th=""> 1 <th1< th=""> <th1<< td=""><td>America</td><td>1 10</td><td></td><td></td><td>Preserved</td><td>35</td><td>36.5</td><td>ARNI</td><td>tana</td><td></td><td>27 28.1</td><td>characi</td></th1<<></th1<></th1<></th1<>			America	1 10			Preserved	35	36.5	ARNI	tana		27 28.1	characi	
Normage date Image			Hisnania	13 13 5	NVHA Euroctiona	d Class	Midrange	12	0.0	Spironolau Hydralazine/Is	.tone osorbida		7 7 3	of the	
American 4 1 4 2 2 3 Soft 3 Function 1 4			Native	10 100			ii ii	25	26.0	Ivabrad	ine		1 1.0		
No change new more start No No Adverage Sensivest No Admission No Admission Sum Su	Amer		America	n 1 1.0				42 -	43.8	SGLT-:	2		1 1.0	populat	
Bedry Number Displayment Displayment <thdisplayment< th=""> <thdisplayment< th=""></thdisplayment<></thdisplayment<>	Average Age 68.0			68.0			IV	2	2.1	Diureti	rs –	Furosemi	ide 40 41.7		
Isomical and the set of	Body Mass Index Ave		Average	30.7	BNP/Pro-BNP*		BNP	20	30.2			Bumetan	de 1 10		
Bit Product Average None Z <thz< th=""> <thz< th=""> Z</thz<></thz<>	1887	(()-2)	>35	23 24.0	0117770 011		NT-Pro BNP	40	41.7			Metolazo	ine 8 8.3		
Intervention in the set of the set			30-34.9	28 29.2	Average		BNP	818				None	7 7.3		
Increase International Internation Internatinternatind International International International In			25-29.9	28 29.2	Carues Creatly		NT-Pro BNP	3895							
Bis R mix/mmy/1 / 28m/2 30 0 3 / 8 / 3 / 8 / 3 / 3 / 8 / 3 / 3 / 3 /		-	17.5-24.	9 17 17.7	(mg/di)	nime	Average	1.4							
Image: Second state of the second state of	eHealth	@ Home	~17.5	28 29.2	eGFR (mL/min/1.	73m^2	>60	37	38.5						
The second seco							45-59	25	26.0						
Implied the second sec							30-44	24	25.0						
Event within 30 days at mession 3 b product 3 Months 3 Months No Sensivest mixed Sensivest No Admission No Admission Sum Admission 13 29 42 No Admission 7 47 54 Sum 20 76 96 • McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4 9 42 • McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4 9 13 29 • McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4 9 13 29 42 • McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4 9 13 29 42 • McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4 9 13 29 42 • McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4 9 10 13 10 13 29 42 10 10 13 10							<15	0	0.0						
admissionAdmissionSensivestNoAdmissionAdmissionNo Admission <th colspa<="" td=""><td colspan="3"></td><td></td><td>Event within 30</td><td colspan="2">event within 30 days</td><td>36</td><td>27 5</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th>	<td colspan="3"></td> <td></td> <td>Event within 30</td> <td colspan="2">event within 30 days</td> <td>36</td> <td>27 5</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					Event within 30	event within 30 days		36	27 5					
Improve the second seco				Ļ	prior		. A dayle days t								
Figure 3 West Sum No Admission No Admission The sensivest No Admission 13 29 42 No Admission 7 47 Sum 20 76 96 • McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4 N-203 Readings # % (Of all changes) No Change # % (Of all changes) N-203 Readings # % (Of all changes) N-203 Readings # % (Of all changes) No Change # % (Of all changes) N-203 Readings # % (Of all changes) No Change % % (Of all changes) <th colspa<="" td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>+</td><td></td><td></td><td>ED/OBS</td><td>6</td><td>6.3</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th>	<td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>+</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>ED/OBS</td> <td>6</td> <td>6.3</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				+			ED/OBS	6	6.3					
No Admission No Admission Sum No Admission 13 29 42 No Admission 13 29 42 No Admission 7 47 54 Sum 20 76 96 • McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4 34 34 No Change 141 69.5 No Change 44 54 Acute Change 4 54 IV Furosemide 85 60.3 Iv Furosemide 85 60.3 Iv Furosemide 85 60.3 Increase Maintenance Diuretic 5.0 3.5 Change to BOH 10.0 7.1	3 Months							Fig Wh like	gure ien ely t	e 3 used as o be adm	their of the	own co ^f or HF	ontrols, pa after a Se	tients we nsivest r	
No Sensi- vestAdmissionNo AdmissionSum 132942Admission132942No Admission74754Sum207696• McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4Figure 4 Describes the of treatment of based on 20• McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4Figure 4 Describes the of treatment of based on 20 Sensivest• McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4Figure 4 Describes the of treatment of based on 20 Sensivest• McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4Figure 4 Describes the of treatment of based on 20 Sensivest• McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4Figure 4 Describes the of treatment of based on 20 Sensivest• McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4Figure 4 Describes the of treatment of based on 20 Sensivest Average S reading resu 38.7%; 153 Change to GDMT Change to BOMT Change to BOMT Change to BOMT 10.010.0• Chronic Change # % (of all changes) Decrease Maintenance Diuretic 5.0 Change to BOMT Change to BOMT 10.0• Mage to BOMT • Table to Both • Table to Both• Mage to Both • Table to Both • Table to Both• Mage to Both • Table		Sensiv			t			Thi	s ef	ffect was	sianifi	cant (F	P<0.001) a	it 3 mont	
No Admission No Admission Sum Sum Huministic (P=0.099) at 1 Huministic (P=0.099) Huministic (P=0.099) </td <td></td> <td colspan="2"></td> <td>Adveloptor</td> <td colspan="2"></td> <td>C</td> <td></td> <td>nin/</td> <td></td> <td>0000</td> <td>ot 1</td> <td>month (</td> <td>oftor Sc</td>				Adveloptor			C		nin/		0000	ot 1	month (oftor Sc	
Sensi- vest Admission 13 29 42 No Admission 7 47 54 Sum 20 76 96 • McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4 • Change Type # % • Acute 68 48.2 No Change 62 30.5 • Chronic Change # % (Of all changes) <	No			Admission	n No Admission		Sum	nor		ai (P=0.	099)		month	aller Se	
Admission 13 29 42 No Admission 7 47 54 No Admission 7 47 54 Sum 20 76 96 • McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4 97 • McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4 96 • McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4 97 • Mchange 141 69.5 No Change 141 69.5 No Change 62 30.5 • Monge 141 69.5 No Change <	Conci	Adminster		12	20		42	rea	din	g. In the	3 mc	onth pe	eriod, 42 (4	43.8%)	
Vest No Admission 7 47 54 Sum 20 76 96 • McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4 admitted after (RR: 0.476 (95% CI: 0.303-0.7 total number of HF admissions was also sig decreased from 59 prior to reading to (P=0.0007) at 3 months. Of 22 patients who h discharged from a heart failure admission was also sig decreased from 59 prior to reading, 3 (13.6%) were readmited after (RR: 0.476 (95% CI: 0.303-0.7 total number of HF admissions was also sig decreased from 59 prior to reading to (P=0.0007) at 3 months. Of 22 patients who h discharged from a heart failure admission was also sig decreased from 59 prior to reading, 3 (13.6%) were readmited after (RR: 0.476 (95% CI: 0.303-0.7 total number of HF admissions was also sig decreased from 59 prior to reading to (P=0.0007) at 3 months. Of 22 patients who h discharged from a heart failure admission was also sig decreased from 59 prior to reading. 3 (13.6%) were readmited after (RR: 0.476 (95% CI: 0.303-0.7 total number of HF admissions was also sig decreased from 59 prior to reading to (P=0.0007) at 3 months. Of 22 patients who h discharged from a heart failure admission was also sig decreased from 59 prior to reading. 3 (13.6%) were readmited after (RR: 0.476 (95% CI: 0.303-0.7 total number of HF admissions was also sig decreased from 59 prior to reading. 3 (13.6%) were readmited after (RR: 0.476 (95% CI: 0.303-0.7 total number of HF admissions was also sig decreased from 59 prior to reading. 3 (13.6%) were readmited after (RR: 0.476 (95% CI: 0.303-0.7 total number of HF admissions was also sig decreased from 59 prior to reading. 3 (13.6%) were readmited after (RR: 0.476 (95% CI: 0.303-0.7 total number of HF admissions was also sig decreased from 59 prior to reading. 3 (13.6%) were readmited after (RR: 0.476 (95% CI: 0.300-0.7 toterease Maintenance Diur	Sensi-	Admission		15	29		42	we	re a	admitted b	before	readir	na. while 2	20 (20.8%	
No Admission 7 47 54 Sum 20 76 96 • McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4 total number of HF admissions was also sig decreased from 59 prior to reading to (P=0.0007) at 3 months. Of 22 patients who h discharged from a heart failure admission was prior to reading, 3 (13.6%) were readmit No Change 141 69.5 Acute 68 48.2 Figure 4 No Change 141 69.5 Acute 68 48.2 Figure 4 No Change 141 69.5 Acute 68 48.2 Figure 4 No Change 141 69.5 Acute 68 48.2 Sensivest No Change 142 142 16.0 17.0 16.0 No Change 143 24.1 16.0 17.0 17.0 No Change 143 20.0 17.0 17.0 25.5 16.0 25.5 16.0 </td <td>vest</td> <td colspan="2">No Administra</td> <td>7</td> <td colspan="2">47</td> <td>EA</td> <td>adr</td> <td>mitte</td> <td>od aftar (</td> <td></td> <td>176 (C</td> <td>35% CI 0 4</td> <td>303-0 7V</td>	vest	No Administra		7	47		EA	adr	mitte	od aftar (176 (C	35% CI 0 4	303-0 7V	
Sum 20 76 96 • McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4 • Mage Type # % • Change Type # % • Chronic 39 27.7 Both 34 24.1 • Chronic Change # % (Of all changes) Iv Furosemide 85 60.3 Increase Maintenance Diuretic 24.0 17.0 Decrease Maintenance Diuretic 5.0 3.5 Change to GDMT 36.0 25.5 Change to Both 10.0 7.1		NO Admission		/	47		54	aur				.470 (3			
 McNemar's Chi-squared: 13.4 McNemar's Chi-squared: 14.4 McNemar's Chi-squared: 1	Su		m	20	76		96	tota	ai n	umper of	HF a	amissi	ons was a	also sign	
N= 203 Readings # % Change Type # % Change 141 69.5 Acute 68 48.2 Describes the of treatment of based on 20 Sensivest No Change 62 30.5 Chronic 39 27.7 Both 34 24.1 Acute Change # % (Of all changes) Chronic Change # % (Of all changes) Reading Reading Reading Reading Sensivest Acute Change # % (Of all changes) Increase Maintenance Diuretic 24.0 17.0 0verload. In addreadings (41.9)		• McN	lema	r's Chi-s	quared:	13	.4	dec (P= diso day	cha s p	ased from 0007) at 3 rged from orior to rea	n 59 mont n a h ading,	prior hs. Of eart fa 3 (13.6	22 patient ilure admi 6%) were i	ng to 2 s who ha ission w readmitte	
Change14169.5Acute6848.2Describes the of treatment of based on 20No Change6230.5Chronic3927.7Describes the of treatment of based on 20Acute Change#% (Of all changes)Chronic Change#% (Of all changes)IV Furosemide8560.3Increase Maintenance Diuretic24.017.0Decrease Maintenance Diuretic5.03.5readings(41.9)Performed with provider visit.Change to Both10.07.1	N= 203 R	teadings	# %	C	hange Type	#	%						Figure 4	4	
No Change 62 30.5 Chronic 39 27.7 of treatment of based on 20 Both 34 24.1 Acute Change # % (Of all changes) Average Sensivest Acute Change # % (Of all changes) Chronic Change # % (Of all changes) 38.7%; 153 38.7%; 153 IV Furosemide 85 60.3 Increase Maintenance Diuretic 24.0 17.0 overload. In addressing (41.9%) Change to GDMT 36.0 25.5 performed with provider visit. performed with provider visit.	Change		141 69.	5	Acute	68 4	48.2						- Joserika	Na tha a	
No change 62 30.3 Chronic Change # % (Of all changes) of treatment of based on 20 Sensivest Acute Change # % (Of all changes) Chronic Change # % (Of all changes) Average Sensivest IV Furosemide 85 60.3 Increase Maintenance Diuretic 24.0 17.0 38.7%; 153 (75.4%) indicator Decrease Maintenance Diuretic 5.0 3.5 3.5 readings (41.9) Change to GDMT 36.0 25.5 performed with provider visit. performed with provider visit.	No Change		62 201	5	Chronic	20 1	77						Describe		
Both3424.1based on 20Acute Change# % (Of all changes)Chronic Change# % (Of all changes)IV Furosemide8560.3Temporary PO Increase2014.2Change to GDMT36.025.5Change to Both10.07.1	Noch	lange	02 50.	,	chronic	39 4	27.7						of treat	ment d	
Acute Change # % (Of all changes) Chronic Change # % (Of all changes) Sensivest IV Furosemide 85 60.3 Increase Maintenance Diuretic 24.0 17.0 38.7%; 153 Temporary PO Increase 20 14.2 Decrease Maintenance Diuretic 5.0 3.5 readings (41.9) Change to GDMT 36.0 25.5 performed with provider visit.					Both	34 2	24.1						based	on 20	
Acute Change#% (Of all changes)IV Furosemide8560.3Temporary PO Increase2014.2Chronic Change to GDMT36.025.5Change to Both10.07.1													Sensives	st ri	
Acute Change # % (Of all changes) IV Furosemide 85 60.3 Increase Maintenance Diuretic 24.0 17.0 Decrease Maintenance Diuretic 5.0 3.5 Change to GDMT 36.0 25.5 performed with provider visit.															
Acute Change#% (Of all changes)IV Furosemide8560.3Temporary PO Increase2014.2Change to GDMT36.025.5Performed wit Change to Both10.07.1				/									Average	3	
Acute Change#% (Of all changes)38.7%; 153IV Furosemide8560.3Increase Maintenance Diuretic24.017.00verload. In addeed overload. In a			/						1				reading	result	
IV Furosemide8560.3Increase Maintenance Diuretic24.017.0Overload.In add overload.In add overload.Temporary PO Increase2014.2Change to GDMT36.025.5performedwith provider visit.	Acus	to Change	4	% lof all tha	Incard		Chronic C			# %	Of all of	hanger	38.7%	153 r	
IV Furosemide8560.3Increase Maintenance Diuretic24.017.0(75.4%)Indica overload. In add overload. In add readings (41.9%)Temporary PO Increase2014.2Decrease Maintenance Diuretic5.03.5readings (41.9%)Change to GDMT36.025.5performed with provider visit.	Acu	te change		% (Of all cha	ingesj		Chronic C	nange		# 70	UT all C	nanges)	(75.40/)	indicat	
Temporary PO Increase 20 14.2 Decrease Maintenance Diuretic 5.0 3.5 readings (41.9) Change to GDMT 36.0 25.5 performed with provider visit.	IV Fu	urosemide	85	60.3	Incr		ase Maintenance Diure			tic 24.0	17 ()	(13.4%)		
Temporary PO Increase 20 14.2 Decrease Maintenance Diuretic 5.0 3.5 readings (41.9) Change to GDMT 36.0 25.5 performed with provider visit.					14.2								overload	In add	
Change to GDMT36.025.5performed with provider visit.	rempora	ry PO Incre	ase 20	14.2		Decr	ease Mainter	nance	Diur	etic 5.0	3.5	0	readings	(41.9%	
Change to Both 10.0 7.1 performed with provider visit.							Change to	GDM	r	26.0	25	5	norforma	d vith	
Change to Both 10.0 7.1 Provider visit.						change to G			•	50.0	25.				
							Change to	Both		10.0	7.1		provider	VISIT.	



round teristics study tion.

ere less reading. ths, and ensivest patients %) were 48). The nificantly 25 after ad been vithin 30 ed





summary decisions 3 total readings. Sensivest was readings ted fluid dition, 85 b) were hout

CONCLUSION

- In a small sample size outpatient clinical practice we demonstrated significant reduction in unexpected hospitalizations for heart failure (23% ARR)
- Despite a low number of patients, the overall 30 day readmission rate with the use of the vest was 13.6% which is comparable to what other trials have found with use of the vest (4)
- Approximately 70% of patients managed with the vest had a change made in medical management for heart failure based purely on an elevated vest reading
- 41.9% of vest reading and management decisions were made via protocol with nursing interactions, no provider was present

DISCUSSION

- There are very few clinical trials exploring the use of external monitoring devices to manage heart failure in the outpatient setting
- This is only the 2nd reported use to our knowledge of the Sensible Medical Vest in an outpatient/nursing visit protocol to manage heart failure
- This data demonstrates both the feasibility and benefits of incorporating an algorithm based approach with nursing visits to drive down admissions to the hospital environment Limitations of this trial include the retrospective nature of the data,
- using patients as their own controls and the small sample size and single center experience

Certainly a randomized blinded trial should be done to validate this

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to David Hutchison, PharmD and Kelly Conn, PhD. at the Wegmans School of Pharmacy for assistance with statistical analysis, as well as the Sands-Constellation Heart Institute Heart Failure and eHealth at Home team for participation in this study.

REFERENCES

. Mozaffarian D, Benjamin EJ, Go AS et al. Circulation 2016; 133: e38-360. 2. Heidenreich PA, Trogdon JG, Khavjou OA et al. Circulation. 2011; 123 (8): 933–44.

3. Abraham WT, Amir O, Weinstein JM et al. Jour of Card Failure. 2015. 21 (8): S77.

4. Curran L, Peck, K, Carter K et.al. Jour of Card Failure. 2018. 24(8): S48.

DISCLOSURES

Sumon Roy: none. Scott Feitell: Consultant, Sensible Medical Technologies; Consultant, Abbott. Remaining authors do not have relevant disclosures.