

Hospital-at-Home: What Healthcare Leaders Say Will Make It Scale

A health-system leadership view of hospital-at-home patient selection, launch capabilities, operational integration, virtual-care scaling, reimbursement, sustainability, and the next generation of home-based acute care.

PATIENT SELECTION • HOME READINESS • MONITORING & CARE DELIVERY • WORKFLOW INTEGRATION • SCALE • SUSTAINABILITY

31 Survey records	3 Countries represented USA, Canada, Italy	83.9% Completion rate	9013595 SGID
-----------------------------	---	---------------------------------	------------------------

Hospital-at-home is no longer only a care innovation question. It is an operating-model question for health-system leadership.

Moving hospital-level care into the home changes the location of care without removing the obligations of acute care. Patients still need selection, observation, treatment, diagnostics, nursing, physician oversight, medication management, escalation, documentation, and a safe transition back to hospital care when home is no longer appropriate.

That makes hospital-at-home fundamentally different from simply extending telehealth. The model asks health systems to reproduce the reliability of an inpatient service across homes that vary in space, support, connectivity, geography, caregiver availability, and access to diagnostics. It also asks clinical and operational teams that may have been built around hospital walls to work as one distributed service line.

The MDForLives findings show where leaders see the pressure points. Chronic disease exacerbations and frail older adults represent the strongest opportunity. Clinical stability leads eligibility. Remote patient monitoring leads launch capability. But once programs move from design to execution, workflow integration and technology interoperability emerge as the most common implementation failures. And when leaders think about long-term viability, reimbursement uncertainty becomes the dominant threat.

These findings suggest that the next stage of hospital-at-home will be decided less by whether the concept can work and more by whether health systems can make it repeatable, integrated, measurable, and financially durable.

External policy and evidence context is included to support interpretation. All respondent percentages in this report come from the MDForLives survey response report.

METHODOLOGY

A multi-market leadership survey focused on the operating realities of hospital-at-home care.

The MDForLives report for SGID 9013595 includes 31 survey records and 26 complete responses, producing an overall completion rate of 83.9%. Respondents represented the USA, Canada, and Italy. The intended professional audience is C-suite leaders, directors, and senior healthcare administrators within the broader allied-health and healthcare-management community.

Executive Summary

Six signals that separate a promising model from a scalable service line.

01 Opportunity is concentrated, not universal 38.5% select chronic disease exacerbations as the strongest hospital-at-home opportunity, followed closely by frail older adults at 34.6%.	02 Eligibility begins with clinical stability 53.8% say clinical stability most determines eligibility, while 30.8% point to home-care infrastructure.
03 Remote monitoring leads the launch stack 42.3% identify remote patient monitoring as the most critical launch capability, ahead of virtual nursing and home diagnostics.	04 Integration is where implementation breaks 34.6% select workflow integration failures and 30.8% select technology interoperability as the leading failure modes.
05 Scale means standardization before volume 61.5% choose standardized virtual-care pathways as their primary scaling strategy.	06 Payment remains the strategic vulnerability 53.8% identify reimbursement uncertainty as the greatest long-term threat to sustainability.

01 TARGET PATIENTS Leaders see the strongest hospital-at-home opportunity in chronic exacerbations and frail older adults 38.5% select chronic disease exacerbations; 34.6% select frail older adults.	Criteria that most determine hospital-at-home eligibility
CONTEXT The first strategic question is not how many beds can move home. It is which patient journeys are clinically appropriate and operationally reproducible outside the hospital. The answer shapes staffing, monitoring intensity, diagnostics, logistics, escalation risk, and the volume a health system can realistically support.	
WHAT THE DATA SHOWS Chronic disease exacerbations are selected by 38.5% of respondents. Frail older adults follow at 34.6%. Postoperative recovery is selected by 15.4%, and acute medical admissions by 11.5%.	
THE INSIGHT The two leading segments both sit at the intersection of medical need and operational complexity. Chronic exacerbations can require repeated reassessment and rapid treatment changes. Frailty can add mobility, cognition, caregiver dependence, medication burden, and environmental risk. The opportunity is therefore substantial precisely where a simplistic home-care model may be least sufficient.	
WHY IT MATTERS Leaders need a service-line view of patient selection. A diagnosis can open the door to eligibility, but it cannot by itself determine whether hospital-level care can be delivered safely in a particular home on a particular day with the resources available.	

02 ELIGIBILITY Clinical stability is the dominant gate, but the home has to be ready for the care plan 53.8% say clinical stability most determines eligibility; 30.8% select home-care infrastructure.	Criteria that most determine hospital-at-home eligibility
CONTEXT Hospital-at-home eligibility is a risk decision made before it is a logistics decision. Programs need enough confidence that the patient can remain safely outside the hospital while receiving inpatient-level treatment, but they also need a home environment that can support what the clinical plan requires.	
WHAT THE DATA SHOWS Clinical stability leads at 53.8%. Home-care infrastructure is selected by 30.8%, caregiver availability by 11.5%, and digital connectivity by 3.8%.	
THE INSIGHT The low stakes for connectivity does not mean connectivity is irrelevant. It means leaders place it downstream of a more fundamental assessment: Is this patient clinically appropriate, and can the home support hospital-level care? CMS has similarly described patient selection under its Acute Hospital Care at Home initiative as requiring clinical and psychosocial appropriateness plus a home and community environment conducive to safe care.	
WHY IT MATTERS Eligibility needs to be operationalized into referral rules that clinicians can apply quickly. If criteria are too broad, the program creates avoidable escalations and workarounds. If they are too restrictive, the model struggles to reach meaningful volume and demonstrate value.	

03 PROGRAM LAUNCH Remote patient monitoring is the visible launch capability, but it works only inside a response system 42.3% identify remote patient monitoring as the most critical capability for launch.	Most critical capability for program launch
CONTEXT In a hospital ward, observation and escalation are built into the environment. In the home, those functions have to be deliberately recreated across people, devices, communication channels, transport, and response protocols. Leaders therefore have to decide which capability is most foundational at launch.	
WHAT THE DATA SHOWS Remote patient monitoring leads at 42.3%. 24/7 virtual nursing and home-based diagnostics each receive 26.9%. EHR interoperability is selected by 3.8%.	
THE INSIGHT Monitoring stands out because it helps bridge the distance between scheduled encounters. But a monitor is not a care model. Data have to reach the right team, thresholds have to be clinically meaningful, false alarms need management, and deterioration needs a response path that can move from virtual contact to an urgent home visit or hospital transfer.	
WHY IT MATTERS Leadership should treat remote monitoring as a workflow with service-level expectations, not as an equipment deployment. The operating design needs explicit ownership of alerts, escalation times, device failure, missing data, and patient troubleshooting.	

04 IMPLEMENTATION FAILURE Workflow integration and interoperability account for the two largest implementation failure signals 34.6% select workflow integration failures; 30.8% select technology interoperability issues.	Most common cause of implementation failure
CONTEXT A distributed acute-care model touches more interfaces than a conventional inpatient stay. Hospital clinicians, home teams, virtual nurses, pharmacy, diagnostics, equipment vendors, transport, caregivers, and the patient all need a common understanding of what happens next.	
WHAT THE DATA SHOWS Workflow integration failures lead at 34.6%, followed closely by technology interoperability issues at 30.8%. Patient safety concerns account for 19.2%, and workforce capacity gaps for 15.4%.	
THE INSIGHT Implementation failure is concentrated at the seams. A technically functional platform can still create operational failure if documentation does not move cleanly, responsibilities are split across teams, or escalation requires manual coordination. Conversely, a well-designed pathway can still be slowed by incompatible systems and duplicate data entry.	
WHY IT MATTERS Programs should test cross-functional workflows before optimizing any single component. A failure-mode review should follow the patient journey from referral through discharge and ask who owns every transition, what information they need, and how the next person knows the handoff is complete.	

05 SCALING STRATEGY Scale is being defined as repeatability before it is defined as census growth 61.5% say standardizing virtual-care pathways is their primary strategy for scale.	Primary strategy for scaling virtual care
CONTEXT Early programs can often rely on highly committed teams, workarounds, and close executive attention. Those conditions become harder to sustain as the service expands across more patients, diagnoses, clinicians, sites, and hours of operation.	
WHAT THE DATA SHOWS Standardizing virtual-care pathways is selected by 61.5%, far ahead of integrating hospital and home teams at 26.9% and expanding eligible patient volume at 11.5%.	
THE INSIGHT The response is a strong argument against volume-first growth. Leaders appear to see a repeatable pathway as the prerequisite for scaling. Standardization can define who qualifies, what is ordered, how patients are monitored, who responds, when diagnostics are triggered, how deterioration is escalated, and how discharge is coordinated.	
WHY IT MATTERS Without pathway standardization, every additional patient can add disproportionate coordination work. With it, the program can reserve leadership attention and clinical judgment for exceptions rather than reconstructing the service for every admission.	

06 CARE COMPLEXITY Complex chronic care creates the largest home-care complexity signal 38.5% select complex chronic care; 26.9% select high-acuity nursing.	Service presenting the greatest home-care complexity
CONTEXT The patient segments with the strongest opportunity are also among the hardest to operationalize. Chronic disease management can involve medication changes, oxygen or infusion needs, laboratory monitoring, symptom fluctuation, comorbidities, and escalation decisions. Nursing intensity can rise quickly when the patient becomes less stable.	
WHAT THE DATA SHOWS Complex chronic care is selected as the greatest home-care complexity by 38.5%. High-acuity nursing follows at 26.9%, acute medical management at 19.2%, and postoperative monitoring at 15.4%.	
THE INSIGHT The growth opportunity and the complexity problem overlap. Chronic exacerbations lead the opportunity question, while complex chronic care leads the complexity question. This does not invalidate the model. It means the operating design has to be strongest where the growth case is strongest.	
WHY IT MATTERS Capacity planning cannot be based on patient count alone. Leaders need to understand the intensity mix: how many home visits, virtual contacts, diagnostics, medication interventions, and escalation resources different patient types consume.	

07 BUSINESS CASE Leaders build the hospital-at-home business case around outcomes and utilization, not cost alone 50.0% select improved patient outcomes and 50.0% select reduced inpatient utilization.	Outcomes that most strengthen the hospital-at-home business case
CONTEXT A hospital-at-home business case can be framed around cost, bed capacity, utilization, patient experience, or clinical outcomes. The weighting matters because it influences how leaders judge program performance and which stakeholders are expected to benefit.	
WHAT THE DATA SHOWS Improved patient outcomes and reduced inpatient utilization are each selected by 50.0%. Lower cost per episode is selected by 38.5%, while increased hospital capacity is selected by 34.6%. Respondents could select up to two outcomes.	
THE INSIGHT The business case is multi-dimensional. Leaders do not reduce value to a cheaper episode. The two most frequently selected outcomes are clinical and utilization-oriented. This is directionally consistent with published randomized evidence showing that selected hospital-at-home patients can achieve favorable utilization and cost outcomes, although study populations and program designs vary.	
WHY IT MATTERS Executives should define success before launch. A program optimized for bed relief may make different trade-offs from one optimized for episode economics or patient outcomes. A balanced scorecard can prevent one objective from obscuring another.	

08 SUSTAINABILITY Reimbursement uncertainty is the largest long-term threat by a wide margin 53.8% identify reimbursement uncertainty as the greatest threat to sustainability.	Biggest threat to long-term program sustainability
CONTEXT Hospital-at-home requires ongoing investment in people, logistics, technology, diagnostics, and cross-setting operations. A program can demonstrate clinical promise and still remain vulnerable if the revenue model is temporary, payer-specific, or difficult to forecast.	
WHAT THE DATA SHOWS Reimbursement uncertainty leads at 53.8%. Workforce shortages are selected by 19.2%, technology investment costs by 15.4%, and regulatory constraints by 11.5%.	
THE INSIGHT Payment is the dominant strategic anxiety in this respondent group. In the United States, the federal policy horizon has become clearer: The Medicare Acute Hospital Care at Home initiative is extended through September 30, 2030. That matters for program planning, but it does not eliminate variation in commercial contracting, state payment policy, local cost structures, or the economics of specific patient populations.	
WHY IT MATTERS A sustainable model needs payer strategy to develop in parallel with clinical operations. Leaders should understand which patients are economically viable under current contracts, where value-based arrangements change the calculation, and how fixed program costs behave at different census levels.	

09 NEXT 3-5 YEARS The future signal splits between smarter monitoring and a more scalable payment model AI-enabled remote monitoring and value-based home-care reimbursement each receive 30.8%.	Development most likely to transform care delivery within 3-5 years
CONTEXT The next phase of hospital-at-home depends on both care-delivery capability and economic structure. Better technology can reduce blind spots and support larger distributed populations, but a stronger payment model may determine whether organizations are willing to make the investment required for that technology and workforce.	
WHAT THE DATA SHOWS AI-enabled remote monitoring and value-based home-care reimbursement are tied at 30.8%. Scalable virtual nursing follows at 26.9%, and hospital-grade home diagnostics at 11.5%.	
THE INSIGHT The tie is revealing. Leaders do not see transformation as purely technical. They place a payment innovation alongside an AI-enabled monitoring innovation. That reinforces the broader survey pattern: technology can improve the model, but payment and operating design determine whether it becomes durable.	
WHY IT MATTERS The strongest future-state strategy may combine automation with human capacity rather than substituting one for the other. AI-assisted monitoring could help prioritize attention, virtual nursing could expand reach, and value-based reimbursement could reward avoided utilization and outcomes. Each still requires governance, integration, and clinical accountability.	

Workflow and care-pathway standardization Several responses described unclear or inconsistent workflows across hospital and home teams. Changes included clearer eligibility criteria, stronger clinical pathways, standardized processes, and more explicit coordination.	Workforce stability and training Respondents described shortages of trained nurses, dependence on agency or locum staffing, caregiver burden, and the need for additional education or team support. Workforce instability remained unresolved in multiple accounts.
Technology integration and connectivity Examples included difficulty onboarding hospital EHR systems into home-care workflows, incompatible legacy systems, unreliable connectivity, and concern that some older or disabled patients were uncomfortable with technology.	Reimbursement and payer uncertainty Some respondents explicitly described uncertainty in long-term fee structures and reimbursement as an unresolved issue even when clinical operations were improving.
Referral and stakeholder buy-in One response highlighted physician behavior and concern about lost revenue or patient ownership. Another described the need to address patient, safety-group perceptions that home care could be viewed as denial of hospital access.	Home variation, social risk and caregiver support Responses noted that different home environments complicate consistent delivery. Social risk, caregiver availability, patient comfort, and the ability to provide adequate monitoring can change the viability of the model from patient to patient.
The qualitative responses reinforce the quantitative pattern: the hardest problems are rarely isolated. Staffing, technology, workflow, reimbursement, referral behavior, patient acceptance, and the home environment can interact in the same case.	

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Frequently asked questions about hospital-at-home care.

What is a hospital-at-home program? Hospital-at-home is a care model that provides hospital-level acute services in a patient's home for carefully selected patients who would otherwise require inpatient care. Programs typically combine medical oversight, nursing, diagnostics, medication management, remote monitoring, escalation protocols, and the ability to transfer the patient to a hospital when needed.
Which patients are suitable for hospital-at-home care? Suitability depends on more than diagnosis. Programs generally assess clinical stability, risk of deterioration, the home environment, psychosocial factors, caregiver or support needs, geographic reach, and whether the required monitoring, treatment, diagnostics, and escalation can be delivered safely at home.
What technology is needed for hospital-at-home programs? Technology necessarily includes continuous remote monitoring, reliable communication, virtual clinical access, documentation workflows, and integration with hospital information systems. Technology is most useful when it is embedded into clear clinical pathways rather than operated as a separate layer of work.
How does remote patient monitoring support hospital-at-home care? Remote patient monitoring can extend clinical observation beyond scheduled home visits by transmitting selected physiological or symptom data to care teams. Its value depends on patient selection, device reliability, alert thresholds, staff response workflows, and clear escalation rules for deterioration.
How is hospital-at-home care reimbursed in the United States? For Medicare, the Acute Hospital Care at Home initiative allows approved hospitals to use specific waivers to provide inpatient-level services in the home. Federal authority for the initiative has been extended through September 30, 2030. Payment arrangements outside Medicare, including commercial and state programs, can differ, so health systems still need payer-specific contracting and financial planning.
What makes hospital-at-home programs difficult to scale? Scaling usually requires more than adding eligible patients. Health systems need repeatable eligibility rules, standardized pathways, integrated hospital and home teams, dependable staffing, diagnostics and logistics, interoperable technology, escalation processes, and a sustainable reimbursement model. Weakness in any of these can limit safe growth.

1. Referral and selection Make clinical selection explicit. Build eligibility logic that also checks home readiness, service availability, geography, caregiver needs, and escalation risk. Avoid criteria that work only when the original program team is present to interpret them.	2. Daily care delivery Treat monitoring as a response workflow. Define who watches, who acts, what triggers escalation, how diagnostics are ordered, and how hospital and home teams share a single current plan.
3. Scaling Standardize the pathway before expanding volume. Measure variation, document workarounds, eliminate duplicate documentation, and make ownership visible across teams and systems.	4. Sustainability Build the financial case around the full value proposition. Model reimbursement, episode cost, utilization, capacity, outcomes, staffing intensity, and technology costs together rather than relying on one savings assumption.

CLOSING PERSPECTIVE

The next hospital-at-home challenge is not proving that care can move home. It is making the model reliable enough to operate at health-system scale.

The survey describes a care model whose opportunity, complexity, and sustainability are tightly linked. Leaders see chronic disease exacerbations and frail older adults as the strongest opportunities, yet complex chronic care and high-acuity nursing are also the services most associated with home-care complexity. That means the patients who can create the strongest strategic case may also demand the most mature operating model.

Clinical stability is, therefore, the first boundary. It determines who can safely enter the pathway. But it is not enough. Home-care infrastructure, caregiver support, diagnostics, monitoring, and escalation capability determine whether the care plan can actually be executed outside the hospital. Remote patient monitoring is the leading launch capability, but the implementation findings show what happens next: workflow integration and technology interoperability become the dominant friction points.

This is why the scaling result matters so much. Nearly two-thirds of respondents choose standardized virtual-care pathways rather than expanded patient volume as the primary strategy for scale. The message is not that hospital-at-home should become rigid. It is that distributed care needs a reliable default. Eligibility, orders, monitoring, response times, home visits, documentation, diagnostics, escalation, transfer, and discharge all need to be designed as a coherent service before census can grow without adding disproportionate coordination burden.

The business case is similarly broader than cost. Leaders give equal weight to improved patient outcomes and reduced inpatient utilization, with lower episode cost and capacity also important. Published randomized evidence has shown that carefully selected patients can experience lower acute-care cost and favorable utilization outcomes under hospital-level care at home, but such evidence does not remove the need for local operational discipline or appropriate patient selection.

Payment remains the unresolved strategic question. In the United States, the Medicare Acute Hospital Care at Home initiative now has federal authority through September 30, 2030, giving organizations a longer planning horizon. Yet the survey's emphasis on reimbursement uncertainty is still rational. Commercial payer arrangements, value-based contracts, state policy, cost structures, staffing markets, and patient mix can all determine whether a program that works clinically is sustainable financially.

The future may bring smarter monitoring, more scalable virtual nursing, better home diagnostics, and stronger value-based payment. But none of these will replace the core executive task: integrate the model into the health system so that the patient experiences one hospital-level service, even when the care team is distributed across a hospital, a virtual command layer, and the patient's home.

Make patient selection reproducible Turn clinical stability and home readiness into clear referral and escalation rules.	Design the seams Test handoffs across hospital, home, virtual, diagnostic, pharmacy, and logistics teams.
Reduce variation before expanding Standardize before volume so growth does not multiply coordination burden.	Link payment to operating reality Model the financial case using actual staffing intensity, technology, utilization, and payer terms.

Help future care-delivery insights reflect what happens beyond the hospital walls.

Join MDForLives to share your professional perspective on virtual care, hospital operations, patient access, workforce, and the models reshaping healthcare delivery.

Join the Panel

REFERENCES

Sources used for this report

- MDForLives. C-Suite / Director Hospital-at-Home Insight Survey. SGID 9013595. Survey response report supplied for this report.
- Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. 2028 Medicare Trustees Report. Notes extension of the Acute Hospital Care at Home Initiative. September 30, 2030.
- Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Fact Sheet: Progress on the Study of the Acute Hospital Care at Home Initiative. September 30, 2024.
- Levine DM, Ouch R, Blanchfield B, et al. Hospital-Level Care at Home for Acutely Ill Adults: A Randomized Controlled Trial. Ann Intern Med. 2020;172(2):77-85. PMID: 31484232.
- American Hospital Association. 4 Providers Turning Hospital-at-Home into a Care Delivery Transformation. Jaggenstat. March 10, 2026. Provides current U.S. program context following the federal extension.

External sources provide policy and evidence context and do not replace the MDForLives survey findings.