

A PRACTICAL MODEL FOR EARLY IDENTIFICATION OF PROSPECTIVE HIGH NEED HIGH COST PATIENTS

Avivit Golan Cohen^{1,2} MD, Shlomo Vinker^{1,2} MD, Adi Isaacson MD, Eva Avramovich^{1,3} MD
MPH, Eugene Merzon^{1,2} MD

- ^{1.} Leumit Health Services, Tel-Aviv, Israel ;
- ^{2.} Department of Family Medicine, Sackler Faculty of Medicine, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel ;
- ^{3.} Department of Management, Bar-Ilan University, Israel

Corresponding author: **Dr. Avivit Golan-Cohen**, 23 Shprinzak St., Tel Aviv, Israel, tel. 972-50-6990363, fax 972-3-6949624. E-mail- agolanchoen@leumit.co.il

Ethics approval: The study protocol was approved by the Shamir Medical Center Review Board and the Research Committee of LHS (ID number 0235-18-ASAF, Date: 9.10.2018)

Consent for publication: Not applicable

Availability of data and materials: The datasets analyzed during the current study are not publicly available because it is a business Information, but are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding: The authors declare that there was no funding in this research

Acknowledgments: authors would like to express their deep and sincere gratitude to Mr. Haim Fernandes, Mr. Ilia Merhasin, and Mrs. Ety Cohen-Adar.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Authors' contribution:

AVG: contributing the research questions and study design, literature search, data collection, analysis and interpretation, writing the manuscript.

SV: contributing the research questions and study design, drafting the manuscript, analysis and interpretation.

AI: literature search, data analysis and interpretation, writing the manuscript.

EA: data interpretation, editing the manuscript.

EM: contributing the research questions and study design, data collection, analysis and interpretation, drafting the manuscript.

Word Count: 2713

Abstract word count: 191

ABSTRACT

1

Background: High Need-High Cost (HNHC) patients are those who experience poor health outcomes and high health care costs. Early identification may improve outcomes and lower costs.

2

3

Aim: Development of a model using retrospective data to identify patients at risk for becoming HNHC patients, in order to efficaciously plan interventions.

4

5

Methods: Data from a large Israeli Health Maintenance Organization (HMO) that includes 488,615 clients above the age of 21 were examined. Multivariate linear regression models were developed using 2012–2016 health expenditure as a dependent variable.

6

7

8

Results: The number of yearly purchases of medications for chronic disorders, yearly outpatient visits, yearly emergency department and hospital admissions and the last measured HgA1c level were highly predictive of increased expenditure over a five-year period. Each of these indicators has a different coefficient of influence.

9

10

11

12

Conclusions: We developed a predictive model, based on easily obtained data from electronic medical records that enabled us to identify a population at risk for becoming HNHC in the next five years, a time window allows for intervention. Further research is needed to evaluate whether this is an early enough stage to implement pro-active intervention in the primary care setting.

13

14

15

16

Trial registration: retrospectively registered.

Keywords: complex patients, High Need-High Cost, Electronic Medical Records (EMR), medical costs prediction

17

18

19

20

<u>HIGHLIGHTS:</u>	21
In this study, we developed a numerical point system calculator, to indicate a risk score for health deterioration within 5 years of patients, by using numerical indicators existing in standard EMR data.	22 23 24
The indicators introduced into this calculated risk can guide healthcare providers to the needed areas of intervention. The display of indicators also promotes optimization of care management and continuity of care.	25 26 27
This risk score is expected to focus the attention of primary care teams on the population that will benefit most from it, as well as to evaluate the effectiveness of specific interventions.	28 29
	30

<u>INTRODUCTION:</u>	31
Coping with the rising prevalence of chronic diseases is one of the major challenges facing	32
health-care systems throughout the world. The increase in both, longevity and disease	33
complexity, has led to a growing number of patients with multiple concurrent morbidities;	34
ranging from 50% to 98% of people older than 65 years in various studies [1-2]. These co-	35
morbidities have complex interactions that can influence the progression and management of	36
both disorders [1]. From the economic point of view, complex co-morbidities translate to tripling	37
the national expenditure on health per capita, and it is expected to continue to rise [2]. The	38
increasing burden on resources is compelling healthcare systems to seek ways to ease the burden.	39
Analyses of health expenditures worldwide reveals a pattern; approximately 5% of the	40
population incurs roughly 50% of all national health care costs [3-5]. Therefore, in an attempt to	41
stem the tide of rising costs, the focus has been on this 5% of the population. It was assumed that	42
a comprehensive approach would reduce multi-morbidity impact, thus resulting in reduced	43
expenditure [6].	44
Effective management requires a practical algorithm to identify which patients are more likely to	45
deteriorate and to generate substantial future health expenditures. Identification of "complex	46
patients" would be effective and can lead to reduced health care costs only if it occurs in a timely	47
manner. The treatment plan can then be adjusted to impact the course of illness [4]. Originally,	48
researchers focused on patients with specific single diseases known to have major health	49
repercussions (such as CHF or diabetes) or patients with multi-morbidity [1, 4]. Many studies	50
have been conducted on modeling healthcare costs data as an estimator of medical complexity	51
[7-10]. However, when the identified patients presented medically complex conditions, the	52
ability to predict who would deteriorate and become HNHC was limited [11-12].	53

In 1987, the Charlson Comorbidity Index was developed to predict the risk of death within a year of hospitalization based on the number of chronic diseases [7]. Charlson et al. used 19 categories of diseases, each with a score of 1 to 6. Higher overall calculated score led to a greater chance of dying in the following year. Over the years, the index underwent modifications and in 2008 was validated and adjusted so that it could predict a future increase in medical expenditure [8]. Several additional models have been developed (chronic illness and disability payment system [CDPS], diagnostic cost groups [DCGs], RxGroups, episode risk groups [ERGs]) [10] are among the most quoted. These models use medical insurance claims to generate the main predictor variables [9]. Some of these models predict patient's chances of dying, some the odds of hospitalization and others predict future total healthcare costs. It turns out that not all patients with multiple chronic diseases deteriorate in a manner that would increase their medical expenditures. Complexity measured only by a quantitative count of chronic diseases does not produce an accurate and useful prediction of the individual patient that may benefit from a proactive intervention [5].

In recent years, the Commonwealth Fund and others have brought to the forefront the role of functional and psychosocial difficulties associated with significant risk factors for future health deterioration [1, 3-5, 11-12]. They found that patients with three or more chronic diseases are more likely to deteriorate if they have functional limitations, poor disease self-management, economic problems, or lack a support system, resulting in fragmentation and poor coordination of care [13-14] and increased pressure on primary care professionals (PCPs) [14]. Following these new insights, the terminology pertaining to the 5% of the population that incurs 50% of health expenditure has been changed to "High Need High Cost" (HNHC) patients. The term reflects the understanding that the management of all complex patient needs, including those beyond the medical disorders, is responsible for the high cost.

An effective definition of the intervention group [18-19] needs to identify not only the patients at risk of deterioration, but within this group, those who would benefit from the intervention.

Therefore, the indicators chosen should reflect not only a patient's current state, but through continuous monitoring, they should also reflect any future changes incurred through interventions. Monitoring enables evaluation of the effectiveness of the intervention, and can potentially motivate both the staff and the patients.

Of the published accepted characteristics of HNHC, we chose indicators associated with high health expenditures such as - clinical parameters (e.g. certain diseases or treatments or lab results that indicate an unbalanced disease state), health resources utilization (e.g. multiple inpatient hospitalizations or multiple physician visits) or patient's executive functioning (e.g. compliance to medication use or to follow-up visits of physician) [10].

We excluded indicators that did not meet the SMART model (Specific, Measurable, Attainable/Achievable, Realistic/Relevant, and Time-Bound) [20] which is the most common model for the examination of the compatibility of selected indicators. According to the SMART model, indicators should be:

1. Specific – accurately describe the value we want to measure.
2. Measurable – return the same value every time it is measured under the same conditions.
3. Attainable – easy to extract from existing data.
4. Relevant – directly connected to the desired intervention and influenced by it.
5. Time-bound – changes can be tracked over a period of time.

Exclusion of indicators that cannot be influenced or changed is important because their inclusion would skew the results and create a score that is not sensitive to changes. A good example of this is age - an eminent risk factor for deterioration that would mask improvements in any other indicator.

The objective of our study was to formulate a predictive model based on the selected simple numerical indicators from the electronic medical records (EMRs), which would allow us to identify a population at risk for becoming HNHC, at a stage with potential for pro-active intervention in the primary care setting.

METHODS:

Leumit Health Services (LHS) is an HMO in Israel serving about 720,000 members. LHS has a comprehensive computerized database continuously updated with patients' demographics, medical encounters, laboratory tests and medication prescriptions, and healthcare services utilization.

Study period and population:

Study period: our study was conducted retrospectively on records from 2011 until 2016.

Study population consisted of all LHS members over the age of 21 at the time of the study period - 488,615 patients.

Exclusion criteria: patients who, at the beginning of the study, were diagnosed with cancer, patients requiring dialysis, and patients with diseases defined by the Israeli Ministry of Health as "costly" and covered with a special budget – Thalassemia major, Gaucher, Hemophilia and AIDS.

Patients who died or left the HMO during the study period were also excluded.

After these exclusions, the data of 460,912 patients was analyzed.

Total expenditures for 2011 for each patient served as the baseline against which the change in expenditure was measured during the evaluation period. Total medical costs were calculated for each patient for each year from 2012 to 2016, including: medications, hospital admissions, emergency department (ED) visits, office-based physician visits (primary care and consultants),

hospital outpatient visits, ambulatory medical services (laboratory and imaging procedures, 125
physical and occupational therapy, ambulances, etc.) and medical devices (such as insulin pumps 126
and supplies, glucometers, orthopedic assistance devices, etc.). These were obtained directly 127
from the billing database of LHS. 128

Data regarding chronic medication consumption was drawn from the LHS pharmacy claims, 129
based on the Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical (ATC) classification system. A medication was 130
considered chronic if the patient purchased at least 3 prescriptions during the 180 days preceding 131
the index date. 132

The number of hospital admissions and ER visits was calculated according to hospital claims. 133
Data on visits to primary care physicians and community consultants were obtained from the 134
LHS EMR. Only face to face visits in an LHS ambulatory setting were included. 135

Uncontrolled diabetes mellitus (DM) was defined according to the last measured HgA1c level 136
result (above 8%) in 2011 and reflected poor glycemic control. 137

Multivariate linear regression models were created using the following formula on the 2012– 138
2016 data and the stepwise approach to locate the most influential variables. In order to improve 139
the statistical test, a deviation of at least 5 standard deviations was filtered out. 140

$$Y_{Total\ Medical\ Costs} = \alpha + \beta_1 X_{1t} + \beta_2 X_{2t} + \beta_3 X_{3t} \dots + \beta_n X_{nt} + u_t \quad 141$$

Y- is the dependent (explained) variable. 142

α – is the constant alpha. In our case it reflects the "minimum" average expenditure given the 143
other variables. 144

X_n – are the independent (explanatory) variables $X_1, X_2, X_3 \dots X_n$ 145

β – is the coefficient for each independent (explanatory) variable $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \dots$ etc 146

u – is a random interference, the part that is not explained by the model. 147

Regression analysis calculated all independent (X) variables in the analysis as numerical. 148

Additionally, we used dummy variables and when the coefficient changed mid-regression (e.g. 149

for HgA1C), we utilized the piecewise approach. 150

The *p-value* of each variable and the adjusted *R-squared* values were used to test all possible 151

linear regression models to predict total medical costs in combination with the other available 152

independent variables. *R-squared* is the proportion of variability in a data set that provides a 153

measure of how well the future outcome variable (total medical costs) is likely to be predicted by 154

the independent continuous, ordinary and dummy variables in our model. The Kolmogorov– 155

Smirnov test was used for the goodness of fit test. Assumptions were two sided with an α of 0.05. 156

Statistical analysis was performed using STATA 12.0. 157

The study had no external funding source. 158

RESULTS: 159

Baseline study population characteristics are presented in **Table 1**. As expected, age was a 160

remarkable predictor for future cost, both as a categorical (**Table 2**) and as a continuous (**Table** 161

3) variable. Although age was highly correlated with future health expenditure we decided to 162

exclude it from the model. After exclusion of age R squared remained almost the same. After 163

inclusion age as a categorical and not a continuous variable the result didn't changed. 164

In Table 3 we described correlation between the dependent variable and other variables selected 165

into the regression model, in order to build the final score. Variables for which correlation was 166

not statistically significant (gender, mean last creatinine, mean last hemoglobin level) or the 167

association with future medical cost was obvious (e.g. age) were not included in the model. The 168

number of hospital admissions per year and the number of hospitalization days per year showed 169

co-linearity and contributed to cost prediction in a similar and significant manner. We decided to use only the *number* of hospital admissions per year because this indicator better reflects the dynamics of the patients and the intervention necessary for their care.

Blood glycosylated hemoglobin (HgA1c) level was found to be a strong indicator of future costs, even when its results were in the normal range (less than 5.5%).

After the first regression model (**Table 4**) identified the most significant variables, we incorporated dummy variables in our second regression model (**Table 5**), to achieve better prediction for a future medical cost model.

In our dataset, 5,900 patients had uncontrolled diabetes mellitus (DM), according to their last measured HgA1c (>8%). We hypothesized and examined whether there was an independent and statistically significant synergistic relationship in the *combination* of uncontrolled DM with the other indicators using dummy variables. We found the association to be statistically significant with emergency department (ED) visits (1173 patients), hospitalizations (851 patients) and having *less* than 4 chronic medications (2164 patients), but not for outpatient visits (**Table 6**). To reflect this in our final score, a "penalty" was set for the relevant variables.

The final predictive model was formulated using the following indicators:

- The mean number of chronic disease medications purchased per year. This was the most significant indicator. Due to a low number of patients (270), those receiving 16 medications or higher were grouped together.

- The mean number of outpatient visits per year. Up to 30 visits per year showed good correlation. 30-50 visits per year were still significant, but each additional visit had less influence on overall future costs. More than 50 visits per year (1300) were excluded from the final calculation.

- The mean number of ED admissions per year. The first visit was the most significant. 193
- The mean number of hospital admissions per year. Up to 3 visits a year showed very significant 194
financial correlation. More than 4 visits failed to increase the risk and were therefore grouped 195
with 3 visits per year. 196
- The last measured HgA1c level. 197
- The aforementioned "penalties" for uncontrolled DM concurrent with other variables. 198

DISCUSSION:

Leading global health organizations invest considerable resources in defining the requirements 200
for pro-active intervention programs aimed at reducing healthcare expenditure by slowing or 201
stopping the deterioration of patients at risk of becoming High Need-High Cost [22-23]. Such 202
intervention plans require the timely identification of the appropriate target patient population. 203

Whereas health care systems currently tend to rely on the intuitive detection of "complex 204
patients" by family physicians (qualitative detection) [18, 23] or the use of computerized 205
detection based solely on the number of chronic diseases (quantitative detection) [24-25], these 206
methods have proven ineffective, and allow many of those in need to go unnoticed while 207
including patients that will stay stable for many years. 208

There is a noticeable increase in the use of predictive models, using linear regression techniques, 209
to estimate the expected total health care costs for managed care organizations. Various data 210
sources have been used for such predictive modeling, including medical and pharmaceutical 211
insurance claims, health risk-assessment surveys, and laboratory data [26-28]. The computerized 212
predictive models can be used for proactive identification of high-risk patients for the effective 213
adaptation of disease management programs [28-31]. 214

In this study, we developed a predictive model, which is based on numerical indicators with the most significant association with patient medical expenditure within 5 years, as an expression of health deterioration during this time period. We hypothesize that this model will enable us to detect a population at risk for deterioration, with a sufficient time period for effective pro-active intervention in primary care.

The next goal will be to develop a weighted numerical risk score, based on the relative influence of the variables, included in our predictive model.

A numerical point system awarded to each of these variables, according to its appropriate risk value, will be calculated into a final predictive score between 0-100. A higher score will indicate a higher risk for health deterioration within 5 years.

This calculated risk score will enable us to build a mechanism for the efficient identification of complex patients, and to put additional focus on their management in an attempt to prevent deterioration to HNHC, as well as to evaluate the effectiveness of specific interventions.

The indicators introduced into this calculated risk will guide healthcare providers to the needed areas of intervention. The display of indicators also promotes optimization of care management and continuity of care.

The introduction of this calculated risk score for deterioration is expected to focus the attention of primary care teams on the population that will benefit most from it. It is important to continually evaluate each intervention while receiving feedback from family physicians who are familiar with their "complex" patients, know patients' ability to manage their illness and the factors which affect their disease control. Such feedback is very important because effective involvement of the primary care team is critical for the success of the intervention [18-19].

Strengths and weaknesses:

The main strengths of the study are its large size, and its real-world, population-based nature. An additional strength is the inclusion of a multitude of numerical variables that could be identified in most health care organizations.

However, there are some weaknesses, including its retrospective design. Furthermore, relevant clinical variables such as the specific diagnosis of a chronic illness (both somatic and psychiatric) and the severity of its presentation were not included in the model because this data was not accurately presented in the medical records.

In conclusion, we formulated a predictive model for precise and early identification of patients whose prognosis may be altered before they experience medical deterioration, by using numerical indicators existing in standard EMR data. Using this model may benefit the population that will potentially improve considerably following an intervention program.

The next step should be to integrate a calculated risk score for health deterioration into the LHS EMR and to prospectively evaluate its contribution towards reducing the utilization of health care resources and possible deterioration of patients to HNHC.

Table1. Population characteristics at baseline, 2011

254

Number of patients		Number 431413 patients (Mean; %)
Male Gender		219589 (50.9%)
Mean Age(years)		43.94± 16
Number of Chronic Medications (N)	0	346,411 (80.30%)
	1-3	55,320 (12.82 %)
	4-6	18,691(4.33%)
	6+	10,991(2.55%)
Number of outpatient visits in LHS ambulatory care /Year (N)	0	142,300(32.98%)
	1-30	287,962(66.75%)
	Above30+	1,151(0.27%)
Number of Hospitalizations/Year (N)	0	417,825(96.85%)
	1	11,545(2.68%)
	2	1,549(0.36%)
	3+	494(0.11%)
Number of ED admissions/Year (N)	0	385,109(89.27%)
	1-2	43,475(10.08%)
	3-4	2,458(0.57%)
	5+	371(0.09%)
Mean last HgbA1c level (%)		6.5±1.2
HgbA1c level categories	No test	377,837(87.58%)
	<5.7	20,238(4.69%)
	5.7-6.4	18,407(4.27%)
	6.5-7.9	10,084(2.34%)
	≥8.0	4,847(1.12%)
Mean last Hemoglobin level (g/dL)		12.9± 2.4
Hemoglobin level categories	No test	67,837(13.9%)
	<12 g/dL	98,569(20.2%)
	12+	322119(65.9%)
Mean last Creatinine level (mg/dL)		1.1±0.6
Creatinine level categories	No test	108,656(25.2%)
	<1.5	309458(71.7%)
	1.5+	13,299(3.1%)
Mean costs per patient NIS/Year (2011)		923.74 ± 5628.47
Mean costs per patient NIS/ (2012-2016)		15,162± 25,242

255

256

Table 2: Distributions of total future medical costs

257

258

Variable		Mean total costs per patient NIS (2012-2016)
Age categories	≤30	2132.37 ± 1307.56
	31-60	4442.39 ± 2089.73
	61+	15757.44 ± 4113.1
Number of Chronic Medications (N)	0	3280.535±164.22
	1-3	10591.11±345.77
	4-6	20818.11± 4641.99
	6+	36311.93± 6194.6
Number of outpatient visits in LHS ambulatory care /Year (N)	0	1654.91±1308.23
	1-30	7801.157±2822.03
	Above30+	24846.91±4984.58
Number of Hospitalizations/Year (N)	0	5273.59 ± 2263.19
	1	19844.25± 4983.66
	2	33852.15±7267.28
	3+	51725.59±10138.6
Number of ED admissions/Year (N)	0	5310.188 ± 23536.83
	1-2	9856.694 ± 31296.62
	3-4	12238.45± 32466.32
	5+	18669.32 ± 53509.71
Last HgbA1c level categories	No Test	4355.496 ± 20731.2
	<5.7	9993.659 ± 32218.04
	5.7-6.4	14384.6 ± 38306.14
	6.5-7.9	22676.88 ± 48046.23
	≥8.0	34899.74 ± 59904.72

259

Table 3: Linear correlation (Spearman) between study variables and future medical cost

260

Variables	r	P
Mean Age(years)	0.291	<0.001
Male Gender	0.005	0.672
Mean number of Chronic Medications (N)	0.3011	0.048
Mean number of outpatient visits/Year (N)	0.259	0.036
Mean number of Hospitalizations /Year (N)	0.1614	0.041
Mean number of Hospital Days /Year (N)	0.1495	0.046
Mean number of ED admissions/Year (N)	0.1214	0.034
Mean last HgbA1c level (%)	0.1943	0.028
Mean last Hemoglobin level (g/dL)	0.01	0.321
Mean last Creatinine level (mg/dL)	0.102	0.058

261

262

Table 4: Baseline model for future medical cost prediction

263

Variables	Coefficient	Standard Err.	95% CI	P-value
Mean number of ED admissions/Year (N)	958.58	61.83	837.41-1079.76	<0.001
Mean number of outpatient visits/Year (N)	211.69	4.39	203.08-220.30	<0.001
Mean number of Hospitalizations /Year (N)	6,720.33	126.30	6472.79-6967.88	<0.001
Mean number of Chronic Medications (N)	2,461.32	18.41	2425.23-2497.41	<0.001
Mean last HgbA1c level (%)	496.86	14.94	467.58-526.13	<0.001
Intercept Cons.	1,655.05	33.95	1588.50-1721.59	<0.001

264

265

Table 5: Model for future medical cost prediction using dummy variables

266

Variables	Coefficient	Standard Err.	95% CI	P-value
Dummy Yes/No ED admissions/Year	411.66	122.37	171.83-651.51	<0.001
Dummy- more than one ED admissions/Year	878.37	182.64	520.39-1236.34	<0.001
Number of outpatient visits(0-30)/Year	225.08	4.85	215.08-234.64	<0.001
Number of outpatient visits(30-50)/Year	243.65	24.77	195.10-292.21	<0.001
Dummy- one Hospitalization /Year	6,567.61	126.30	6235.89-6899.33	<0.001
Dummy- two Hospitalizations /Year	13,913.11	439.67	13051-14774.85	<0.001
Dummy- three and more Hospitalizations/Year	18,454.33	931.79	16628.03- 20280.62	<0.001
Number of Chronic Medications	2,361.32	19.41	2324.49-2399.41	<0.001
Dummy- HgbA1c No/Yes (less than 5.5%)	323.86	114.69	99.07-548.66	<0.001
Dummy- HgbA1c Yes (5.5%-7.9%)	2,542.93	119.66	2308.39-2777.46	<0.001
Dummy- HgbA1c Yes (8% and more)	3,866.61	172.55	3528.41-4204.81	<0.001
Intercept Cons.	1,688.04	34.88	1619.67-1756.41	<0.001

267

Table 6: Baseline predictive cost model using "penalty" dummy variables

268

Variables	Coefficient	Standard Err.	95% CI	P-value
Dummy- Yes/No ED admissions/Year	417.66	122.34	177.83-657.07	<0.001
Dummy- more than one ED admissions/Year	831.77	183.54	473.39-1196.34	<0.001
Dummy- ED admissions & Uncontrolled DM	2,376.86	650.18	1102.53-3651.07	<0.001
Number of outpatient visits(0-30)/ Year	226.34	4.88	216.88-236.64	<0.001
Number of outpatient visits(30-50)/ Year	231.65	24.79	183.14-280.42	<0.001
Dummy- one Hospitalization /Year	6,176.93	171.73	5840.89-6513.53	<0.001
Dummy- two Hospitalizations /Year	13,349.84	441.67	12484-14284.85	<0.001
Dummy- three and more Hospitalizations/Year	17,729.33	933.45	15618.03- 19807.62	<0.001
Dummy- Hospitalizations & Uncontrolled DM	10,224.45	789.37	8677.31-11771.6	<0.001
Number of Chronic Medications	2,372.26	19.43	2334.49-2410.41	<0.001
Dummy- No Chronic Medications & Uncontrolled DM	1,064.31	519.85	45.41-2083.21	0.041
Dummy- HgbA1c No/Yes (less than 5.5%)	433.18	115.16	207.07-658.66	<0.001
Dummy- HgbA1c Yes (5.5%-7.9%)	2,234.33	125.66	1988.61-2479.86	<0.001
Dummy- HgbA1c Yes (8% and more)	3,168.99	190.81	2794.95-3542.81	<0.001
Intercept Cons.	1,693.31	34.88	1624.93-1761.69	<0.001

269

270

<u>References</u>	271
1. Dattalo M, Nothelle S, Chapman EN, <i>Targeting enhanced services toward high-cost, high-need medicare patients</i> . New Directions in Geriatric Medicine: Concepts, Trends, and Evidence-Based Practice (pp. 13-30). Springer International Publishing, (2016). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-28137-7_2	272 273 274 275
2. Central Bureau of Statistics. <i>State of Israel National Expenditure on Health 1962-2019</i> . Publication No. 1735, Retrieved from https://www.cbs.gov.il/he/publications/Pages/2020/%D7%94%D7%94%D7%95%D7%A6%D7%90%D7%94-%D7%94%D7%9C%D7%90%D7%95%D7%9E%D7%99%D7%AA-%D7%9C%D7%91%D7%A8%D7%99%D7%90%D7%95%D7%AA-2019-1962.aspx	276 277 278 279 280
3. Zulman DM, Pal Chee C, Wagner TH, et al. <i>Multimorbidity and healthcare utilization among high-cost patients in the US Veterans Affairs Health Care System</i> . BMJ Open 2015; 5 :e007771.	281 282 283
4. <i>Effective Care for High-Need Patients: Opportunities for Improving Outcomes, Value and Health</i> , National Academy of Medicine, July 6, 2017. Retrieved from https://nam.edu/initiatives/clinician-resilience-and-well-being/effective-care-for-high-need-patients/	284 285 286 287
5. Hayes SL, Salzberg CA, McCarthy D, Radley DC, Abrams MK, Shah T, Anderson GF <i>High-need, high-cost patients: Who are they and how do they use health care—A population-based comparison of demographics, health care use, and expenditures</i> . New York, NY: The Commonwealth Fund, 2016. Retrieved from http://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/issue-briefs/2016/aug/high-need-high-costpatients-meps1	288 289 290 291 292 293

6. Powers BW, et al. *Impact of complex care management on spending and utilization for high-need, high-cost Medicaid patients.* Am J Manag Care. 2020. PMID: 32059101
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32059101/>
7. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, MacKenzie CR, *A new method of classifying prognostic comorbidity in longitudinal studies: development and validation.* J Chronic Dis. 1987;40(5):373-8
8. Charlson ME, Charlson RE, Peterson JC, Marinopoulos SS, Briggs WM, Hollenberg JP. *The Charlson comorbidity index is adapted to predict costs of chronic disease in primary care patients.* J Clin Epidemiol. 2008 Dec; 61(12):1234-40. Epub 2008 Jul 10.
9. van Walraven C, Dhalla IA, Bell C, Etchells E, Stiell IG, Zarnke K, et al. *Derivation and validation of an index to predict early death or unplanned readmission after discharge from hospital to the community.* CMAJ. 2010;182(6):551–7.
10. Farley JF, Harley CR, Devine JW, *A comparison of comorbidity measurements to predict healthcare expenditures,* Am J Manag Care. 2006;12(2):110-9
11. Gulley SP, Rasch EK, Chan L. *The complex web of health: relationships among chronic conditions, disability, and health services,* Public Health Rep. 2011;126(4):495-507
12. Reichard A, Gulley SP, Rasch EK, Chan L, *Diagnosis isn't enough: Understanding the connections between high health care utilization, chronic conditions and disabilities among U.S. working age adults,* Disabil Health J. 2015;8(4):535-46.
13. Schoen C, Osborn R, Squires D, Doty M, Pierson R, Applebaum S. *New 2011 survey of patients with complex care needs in eleven countries finds that care is often poorly coordinated.* Health Aff (Millwood). 2011; 30(12):2437-48. Epub 2011 Nov 9.
14. Rudin RS, Gidengil CA, Predmore Z, Schneider EC, Sorace J, Hornstein R, *Identifying and Coordinating Care for Complex Patients: Findings from the Leading Edge of Analytics and*

- Health Information Technology*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2016. 318
https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1234.html. 319
15. Peacock S, Chan C, Mangolini M, Johansen D, *Techniques for Measuring Efficiency in Health Services*, Productivity Commission Staff Working Paper, July 2001 320
<https://www.pc.gov.au/research/supporting/measuring-health-services/tmeihs.pdf> 322
16. Hazel-Fernandez L, Li Y, Nero D, Moretz C, Slabaugh L, Meah Y, Baltz J, Patel NC, Bouchard JR, *Relationship of diabetes complications severity to healthcare utilization and costs among Medicare Advantage beneficiaries*, Am J Manag Care. 2015 Jan 1;21(1):e62-70. 323
324
325
326
17. Division for supervision of HMO's and additional health services in the Ministry of Health. *A Summary Report of the HMO's activities for 2017*. Retrieved from: 327
<https://www.health.gov.il/publicationsfiles/dochhashvaatui2017.pdf> [Hebrew] 329
18. Hong CS, Siegel AL, Ferris TG, *Caring for high-need, high-cost patients: what makes for a successful care management program?* New York: The Commonwealth Fund, August 2014 330
331
19. *Intensive Outpatient Care Program (IOCP)*, Pacific Business Group on Health, California Quality Collaborative, revised Dec 2016. 332
333
http://www.calquality.org/storage/documents/IOCPPCC_Toolkit_V7_112216.pdf 334
20. The Compass, *How to Develop Indicators*, retrieved from- 335
<https://www.thecompassforsbc.org/how-to-guides/how-develop-indicators> 336
21. American Diabetes Association, *Glycemic Targets: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes – 2019*, Diabetes Care 2019 Jan; 42(Supplement 1): S61-S70. <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc19-S006> 337
338
339
22. The Commonwealth Fund International Experts Working Group on Patients with Complex Needs, *Designing a High-Performing Health Care System for Patients with Complex Needs – Ten Recommendations for Policymakers*, Sep 2017. Retrieved from - 340
341
342

https://www.commonwealthfund.org/sites/default/files/documents/_media_files_publications_fund_report_2017_aug_roland_10_recommendations_for_complex_patients_revisedexpanded.pdf	343
ns fund report 2017 aug roland 10 recommendations for complex patients revisedexpanded.pdf	344
nded.pdf	345
23. Hong C, Hwang A, Ferris T, <i>Finding a Match: How successful Complex Care Programs Identify Patients</i> , California HealthCare Foundation, March 2015	346
https://www.chcf.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/PDF-FindingMatchComplexCare.pdf	347
https://www.chcf.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/PDF-FindingMatchComplexCare.pdf	348
24. Lu J, Britton E, Ferrance J, Rice E, Kuzel A, Dow A, <i>Identifying Future High Cost Individuals within an Intermediate Cost Population</i> . Qual Prim Care. 2015;23(6):318-326.	349
	350
25. Forrest CB, Lemke KW, Bodycombe DP, Weiner JP, <i>Medication, Diagnostic, and Cost Information as Predictors of High-Risk Patients in Need of Care Management</i> , Am J Manag Care. 2009 Jan;15(1):41-8.	351
	352
	353
26. Cumming RB, Knutsin D, Cameron BA, Derrick B. <i>A comparative analysis of claims-based methods of health risk assessment for commercial populations</i> . Society of Actuaries. May 24, 2002. Available at: http://www.soa.org/ccm/content/areas-of-practice/special-interest-sections/health/health-section-sponsored-research . Accessed August 18, 2005.	354
	355
	356
	357
27. Von Korff M, Wagner EH, Saunders K. <i>A chronic disease score from automated pharmacy data</i> . J Clin Epidemiol. 1992;45:197-203	358
	359
28. Fishman PA, Goodman MJ, Hornbrook MC, et al. <i>Risk adjustment using automated ambulatory pharmacy data: the RxRisk Model</i> . Med Care. 2003;41:84-99	360
	361
29. Powers CA, Meyer CM, Cooper D, et al. <i>Predicting one and two-year risk of hospitalization using Patient Health Dimensions, a pharmacy-based risk index</i> (abstract for material presented at the 16th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy). J Manage Care Pharmacy. 2004;10:200.	362
	363
	364
	365
30. Zhao Y, Ellis RP, Ash AS, et al. <i>Measuring population health risks using inpatient diagnosis and outpatient pharmacy data</i> . Health Serv Res. 2001;36:180-193.	366
	367

31. Veazie PJ, Manning WG, Kane RL. <i>Improving risk adjustment for Medicare capitated reimbursement using nonlinear models. Med Care.</i> 2003;41:741-752	368 369
32. Chechulin Y, Nazerian A, Rais S, Malikov K. Predicting patients with high risk of becoming high-cost healthcare users in Ontario (Canada). <i>Healthc Policy.</i> 2014;9(3):68-79.	370 371 372 373