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Unidentified Speaker 1. Do we have our invited speaker, Dr Kilic? Discussant, I mean.

Dr Arman Kilic (Charleston, SC). Is this on? Thank you to the American Association for Thoracic Surgery for the invitation to comment on this paper. Dr Williams, excellent presentation. We’re entering an era in which digital health, telemedicine, and remote monitoring will have an increasing role in health care. Of interest, we will now have a pipeline from which patient data from wearable technology can be directly accessed and analyzed by external parties without necessarily the input or interpretation of relevant clinical providers. This is a point that is likely outside the scope of this discussion, but I think it is an important point to consider, as big tech has an expanding footprint in the health care domain. Clinicians must drive the conversation and framework for how the patient-facing technologies are incorporated in the decision-making and quality improvement. With that preface, I applaud the authors for their work. I have 2 questions. Number one, patients can have different risks for readmission based on baseline preoperative factors, intraoperative course, and postoperative complications. Did you adjust for these differences? And number 2, for surgeons or programs interested in implementing these types of programs, do you have any more granular comments on overall cost of the wearables and staffing required, and perhaps some insight into the financial implications and bottom line for hospital finances? In other words, how do we sell this to hospital administration from a fiscal perspective? Thank you.

Dr Judson Williams (Raleigh, NC). Thank you. Three great points. I’ll start with the first one with data collection and third-party vendors. We actually, across our service line, we have 9 cardiothoracic surgeons, and not all were excited initially about the remote monitoring. And that was one of the advantages of starting with the trial—the externally funded Perfect Care trial. Many of our surgeons were more comfortable wi. Dr Rakesh Arora, University Hospitals in Cleveland. Judson,
yet again, is really leading the way for all of us in how to do this better. And at a much earlier stage than we’ve even conceptualized a lot of this work. For these patients, how do you start this process? Is it done whilst they are in hospital, or do you start this study in the stage of what’s going to look like the discharge before? And two, leveraging other processes such as hospital-at-home that we’ve learned through coronavirus disease 2019, where do you see the intersection of those two different kinds of in-person versus tele-remote monitoring for patients to improve upon the success you’ve already shown?

Dr Williams. Yeah, great question, Rakesh. We engaged with our marketing team actually, to really promote the program. We learned from the Perfect Care trial that, contrary to what you might think, not everyone was really eager to send data through apps and have all this real-time collection and you know everything about me, throughout the day and what I’m doing and what’s going on in these spikes at different times. Not every patient was on board with that. But we really branded it out. We started with for outpatients in their preoperative heart center clinic appointment. They were given a handout, a one-page sheet about what this program is, and that they’re going to be in it. Brandon and I even have a pen, a Tele-heart Care pen that the patients get in their packet, and really tried to drum it up.

Unidentified Speaker 1. Thank you.
Dr Williams. Thank you.
[applause].
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