



Extended Research Article

Algorithm-based remote monitoring of heart failure risk data in people with cardiac implantable electronic devices: a systematic review and cost-effectiveness analysis

Ryan Kenny,¹ Nawaraj Bhattarai,² Nicole O'Connor,¹
Sonia Garcia Gonzalez-Moral,¹ Hannah O'Keefe,¹ Sedighe Hosseini-Jebeli,²
Nick Meader¹ and Stephen Rice^{2*}

¹Evidence Synthesis Group, Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

²Health Economics Group, Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

*Corresponding author stephen.rice@newcastle.ac.uk

Published October 2025
DOI: 10.3310/PPOH2916

Plain language summary

Algorithm-based remote monitoring of heart failure risk data in people with cardiac implantable electronic devices: a systematic review and cost-effectiveness analysis

Health Technology Assessment 2025; Vol. 29: No. 50
DOI: 10.3310/PPOH2916

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Plain language summary

Developments can help hospital staff track heart failure in patients. CorVue, HeartInsight, HeartLogic and TriageHF are such devices. Researchers checked if these technologies work well, improve patient health and are worth the cost.

We looked for studies from medical databases and company websites. We used this information to see how well each technology predicts heart failure, to see if they may help patients live better.

HeartLogic and TriageHF showed good results. Both of them may detect heart failure, but more research is needed to be sure. TriageHF results were varied. CorVue's results were unclear, because the results across studies were very different. HeartInsight only had one study, and it was not clear how good it was.

HeartLogic and TriageHF might help to identify heart failure early and reduce the risk of death. CorVue and HeartInsight did not have enough good information to understand if they could help patients. Only one study looked at how TriageHF affects quality of life.

The economic analysis looked at whether these technologies provide good value for the money. There is not much evidence yet, but these devices could be cost-effective if they lower hospital visits compared to regular care.

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 4

A list of Journals Library editors can be found on the [NIHR Journals Library website](#)

Launched in 1997, *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) has an impact factor of 4 and is ranked 30th (out of 174 titles) in the 'Health Care Sciences & Services' category of the Clarivate 2022 Journal Citation Reports (Science Edition). It is also indexed by MEDLINE, CINAHL (EBSCO Information Services, Ipswich, MA, USA), EMBASE (Elsevier, Amsterdam, the Netherlands), NCBI Bookshelf, DOAJ, Europe PMC, the Cochrane Library (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA), INAHTA, the British Nursing Index (ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, USA), Ulrichsweb™ (ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, USA) and the Science Citation Index Expanded™ (Clarivate™, Philadelphia, PA, USA).

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta.

Criteria for inclusion in the *Health Technology Assessment* journal

Manuscripts are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

HTA programme

Health Technology Assessment (HTA) research is undertaken where some evidence already exists to show that a technology can be effective and this needs to be compared to the current standard intervention to see which works best. Research can evaluate any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease, provided the study outcomes lead to findings that have the potential to be of direct benefit to NHS patients. Technologies in this context mean any method used to promote health; prevent and treat disease; and improve rehabilitation or long-term care. They are not confined to new drugs and include any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

This article

The research reported in this issue of the journal was commissioned and funded by the Evidence Synthesis Programme on behalf of NICE as award number NIHR135894. The protocol was agreed in June 2023. The draft manuscript began editorial review in February 2024 and was accepted for publication in July 2024. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' manuscript and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this article.

This article presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

This article was published based on current knowledge at the time and date of publication. NIHR is committed to being inclusive and will continually monitor best practice and guidance in relation to terminology and language to ensure that we remain relevant to our stakeholders.

Copyright © 2025 Kenny *et al.* This work was produced by Kenny *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This is an Open Access publication distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0 licence, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, reproduction and adaptation in any medium and for any purpose provided that it is properly attributed. See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. For attribution the title, original author(s), the publication source – NIHR Journals Library, and the DOI of the publication must be cited.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Newgen Digitalworks Pvt Ltd, Chennai, India (www.newgen.co).