

May 20th, 11:00 AM

# Predicting Key Healthcare Outcomes

Arlene S. Ash

*University of Massachusetts Medical School*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://escholarship.umassmed.edu/cts\\_retreat](http://escholarship.umassmed.edu/cts_retreat)

 Part of the [Clinical Epidemiology Commons](#), [Epidemiology Commons](#), [Health Services Administration Commons](#), [Health Services Research Commons](#), and the [Translational Medical Research Commons](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 License](#).

---

Ash, Arlene S., "Predicting Key Healthcare Outcomes" (2014). *UMass Center for Clinical and Translational Science Research Retreat. 2.* [http://escholarship.umassmed.edu/cts\\_retreat/2014/presentations/2](http://escholarship.umassmed.edu/cts_retreat/2014/presentations/2)

This material is brought to you by eScholarship@UMMS. It has been accepted for inclusion in UMass Center for Clinical and Translational Science Research Retreat by an authorized administrator of eScholarship@UMMS. For more information, please contact [Lisa.Palmer@umassmed.edu](mailto:Lisa.Palmer@umassmed.edu).



# Predicting Key Healthcare Outcomes

**Arlene S. Ash, PhD**

University of Massachusetts Medical School  
Department of Quantitative Health Sciences


**5th Annual UMass CCTS Research  
Retreat  
May 20, 2014**



# Risk adjustment is needed to make health care data informative

- Which treatment costs more?
- Can we identify “quality” through patient outcomes?
  - After a heart attack: 30-day or 1-year survival rates
  - Pain levels, level of physical functioning, or health-related quality of life at 1 year for low back pain (e.g., for patients receiving surgery vs. chiropractic)?
  - Do patients with diabetes understand what their meds are for and how to take them? Do they take them?
  - Are patients [who experienced treatment X] happy with their care?
- Which treatments/institutions/systems/doctors *add* the most value?


**Patients are not “well-controlled animal models.” We don’t randomly assign them to treatments/providers.**



# Risk adjustment goal: To enable useful comparisons in health care

In health care, both a patient's *initial conditions* (severity of the main problem/presence of comorbidities/frailty...) *and quality of care* matter

Performance measures should address patients' different "starting positions"




# Example: Mortality rates for open heart surgery

- For uncomplicated cases it would be shocking if a facility has mortality within 30 days as high as 2%. For complex patients (often, those who have the most to gain from CABG), mortality might be as high as 50%
- We can *measure many factors* that make a patient sicker and *quantify their effects on that patient's expected outcome*
- Key principle: It is fair and useful to compare *actual vs. expected outcomes* for groups of patients

# Open heart surgery in Boston

Mass General Hospital typically takes the most complicated cases; Mount Auburn Hospital, the simplest



- The same doctors admit lower-risk CABG patients to Mount Auburn and more complicated ones to MGH
- Asking which hospital is the better place to go for CABG surgery is fairly meaningless
- We can ask if a hospital does better (worse) *than expected* with the kinds of patients that it treats

# Open heart surgery (cont'd)

Asking if Hospital A is better than Hospital B only makes sense if there is a lot of overlap in the kinds of patients they see

With little overlap, no technical adjustment can tell which is better

- That would be like asking: Is Usain Bolt a better runner than Michael Phelps is a swimmer?
- Medicare's "Hospital Compare" compares each hospital to its expected
- Comes with an (easily missed) warning: don't compare non-comparables!







# Comparing hospitals


Mount Auburn *and* MGH may both be doing well

- Each may get excellent results with the kinds of patients it sees
- BUT the measures don't tell you, say, how a complicated patient would fare at Mount Auburn

In looking at raw (unadjusted) outcomes, Mount Auburn will do better, because it starts with lower-risk cases

After risk adjustment, either could look better ...

# Potential confounders



- What is the principal question we want to answer?
- What is the stuff we try to “not get fooled by”?
  - Factors that might fool us: “potential confounders”
  - These include: age & sex, severity & comorbidity
- What kinds of things should we *not* “adjust for”?
  - A surgical mishap (which “explains” the bad outcome, but itself reflects poor quality)
- What factors are controversial (as risk adjusters)?
  - Socio-economic factors, race

# System vs. patient perspectives



- A system administrator might be interested in questions like:
  - Do hospitals that are in poor financial shape have worse outcomes? And, if so,
  - Do particular financially-stressed hospitals perform better or worse than similarly-situated hospitals?
- However, a patient considering elective surgery at a nearby hospital wants to know whether that hospital gets worse- or better-than-expected outcomes *with patients like her*
- Different questions require different models and different reporting formats

# Health policy perspective



- If hospitals in financial distress typically have worse outcomes, should we penalize hospitals that *do well given their finances*, even though they do less well than better-financed hospitals?
  - Will taking money away improve their performance?
- Same question for hospitals that treat many poor people, who typically have worse outcomes.
  - We could measure and risk adjust for ‘poverty’ *or not*
  - This is a hot controversy (google: nqf risk adjustment)

Bottom Line: How you adjust for risk really matters!

# Questions?

arlene.ash@umassmed.edu

