

TITLE

Informative Presence Bias in Comorbidity Data of Medicare Advantage-Enrolled Beneficiaries

SUBTITLE

Comorbidities in Medicare Advantage Beneficiaries

AUTHORS

Justin M. Schaffer¹, MD, Austin Kluis^{1,2}, MD, John J. Squiers^{1,2}, MD, Jasjit K. Banwait², PhD, Mario F. L. Gaudino³ MD, PhD, Michael J. Mack^{1,2}, MD, J. Michael DiMaio¹, MD,

AFFILIATIONS

¹Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery, Baylor Scott & White, The Heart Hospital Plano; Plano, TX

²Baylor Scott & White Research Institute, The Heart Hospital Plano; Plano, TX

³Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery, Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, NY, USA.

FUNDING: Data acquisition and effort of AK and JKB was supported by a philanthropic gift of Satish and Yasmin Gupta to Baylor Scott & White The Heart Hospital, Plano, TX

DISCLOSURES: none

ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE

Justin Schaffer
Baylor Scott and White - The Heart Hospital, Plano
4708 Alliance Blvd.
Plano, TX 75093
Phone: (469) 800-6200
Fax: (469) 800-6210
justin.schaffer@bswhealth.org

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

We are especially grateful to Alessandro Gasparini (Red Door Analytics), for his helpful feedback regarding our statistical methodologies.

KEYWORDS

bias, comorbidities, Medicare, Medicare Advantage, Traditional Medicare

ABSTRACT (ABSTRACT WORD COUNT: 297)

Background: Analyses of Medicare administrative claims data are faced with methodological challenges, including accounting for the potential effect of insurance status on documented comorbidities. We present an example of how failing to account for informative presence bias related to beneficiary enrollment status in such analyses may lead to flawed results.

Methods: In this retrospective observational study of Medicare beneficiaries undergoing isolated coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG) from 1999-2019, we compare the distribution of documented comorbidities between beneficiaries with Medicare Advantage (MA) and Traditional Medicare (TM) plans. Long-term survival was then compared in both unweighted and overlap weighted analyses with and without the inclusion of documented comorbidities.

Results: Among 3,015,066 Medicare beneficiaries undergoing CABG from 1999-2019, 2,345,476 underwent isolated CABG and had suitable data for analysis. The annual proportion of MA-enrolled beneficiaries undergoing CABG remained stable from 1999-2007 (1.1-4.5%) and then progressively increased annually, reaching 38.2% in 2019. The incidences of documented comorbidities were substantially lower among MA-enrolled versus TM-enrolled beneficiaries. Among MA-enrolled and TM-enrolled beneficiaries, respectively, the unweighted median survival difference was only 8 [-12,28] days (10.02 [9.96,10.07] vs 10.00 [9.98,10.01] years); the weighted (adjusted for demographics and procedural characteristics, but not beneficiary comorbidities) median survival difference was also minimal at -2 [-28,24] days (10.00 [9.95,10.06] vs 10.01 [9.98,10.04] years). However, the weighted (with adjustments including beneficiary comorbidities) median survival difference demonstrated a substantial survival disadvantage for MA-enrolled beneficiaries compared to their TM-enrolled counterparts: -604 [-626,-575] days (9.78 [9.73,9.83] vs 11.44 [11.41,11.47] years), respectively.

Conclusions and Relevance: Comorbidities in MA-enrolled beneficiaries may be severely under-reported in Medicare data. Studies failing to account for this are susceptible to informative presence bias with a significant treatment effect. In the absence of policy changes, increasing enrollment in MA plans will continue to decrease the population of Medicare beneficiaries with suitable data for study in comparative analyses.

ABBREVIATION LIST

ADI	area deprivation index
CABG	coronary artery bypass grafting
CC-MBSF	chronic conditions segment of the master beneficiary summary file
CM	clinical modification
CMS	centers for Medicare and Medicaid services
ICD-9/10	international classification of diseases, ninth and tenth revision
MA	Medicare advantage insurance plan
MBSF	Master Beneficiary Summary File
MedPAR	Medicare provider analysis and review file
OW	overlap weighting
PCS	procedural coding system
TM	traditional Medicare insurance plan

INTRODUCTION

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) maintains a database of administrative claims that is increasingly used in clinical research.¹ Hospital claims submitted to CMS using International Classification of Diseases clinical modification (ICD-CM) and procedural (ICD-PCS) codes are available in the Medicare Provider Analysis and Review (MedPAR) file for analysis by research groups.² CMS also maintains an annual record of beneficiary demographics in the Master Beneficiary Summary File (MBSF). The chronic conditions segment of the MBSF (CC-MBSF) identifies individual beneficiary status (and date of initial diagnosis) for chronic conditions and has become a standard tool to adjudicate comorbidities in Medicare analyses.³

Studies using Medicare claims data are contingent upon the correct interpretation of coding data to characterize beneficiary comorbidities, procedural characteristics, and outcomes.⁴ In 2015, CMS transitioned from ICD-9 to ICD-10 coding; studies spanning this transition must accurately handle the coding change.⁵ Importantly, CC-MBSF data has been adjudicated across the ICD-9/10 transition, making it suitable for use in such analyses.⁶ It has been noted, however, that beneficiaries who enroll in Medicare Advantage (MA) plans are less likely to have chronic conditions documented within the CC-MBSF as compared to those enrolled in Traditional Medicare (TM) plans.⁷ As a result, beneficiary insurance status may be associated with the under-reporting of comorbidities, a form of informative presence bias.⁸

Experts have called for improvements in the documentation of cohort selection methodologies to ensure retrospective analyses of observational data are reproducible and minimize potential bias.⁹ However, examples demonstrating the impact informative presence bias can have in studies using CMS administrative claims data remain largely absent from the

literature. Using a longitudinal cohort of Medicare beneficiaries undergoing coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG), we demonstrate the impact of informative presence bias related to MA-enrollment on survival analyses.

METHODS

Study Design

We retrospectively reviewed CMS data from 1999 to 2019. The Baylor Scott & White Research Institute institutional review board provided approval (IRB#: 019-270, dated 8-23-2019).

A 100% sample of Medicare beneficiary hospitalizations during which CABG was performed was identified from the MedPAR file using ICD-9/10-PCS codes (**Supplemental Table 1**). Beneficiaries undergoing concomitant cardiac surgery were excluded (**Supplemental Table 2**). Demographics and social determinants of health including neighborhood disadvantage at the time of CABG were established from the MBSF. Neighborhood deprivation was estimated using the Area Deprivation Index (ADI), a validated ranking of socioeconomic contextual disadvantage derived from census data and linked to 9-digit ZIP code data available from MedPAR.¹⁰ Comorbidities present at the time of surgery were obtained from the CC-MBSF. Annual hospital Medicare CABG volumes were tallied and included as a variable for analysis.

The incidences of documented comorbidities among MA-enrolled and TM-enrolled beneficiaries were measured. Three survival analyses were undertaken to evaluate whether the assumption that MA-enrolled beneficiaries have adequately documented comorbidities in CC-MBSF is appropriate: (1) unweighted, (2) weighted for demographics, social determinants of health, admission urgency, and procedural characteristics but not comorbidities, and (3) weighted

for demographics, social determinants of health, admission urgency, procedural characteristics, and comorbidities.

Primary Endpoint

The primary endpoint was all-cause mortality. Vital status and date of death were determined from the MBSF.

Statistical Analysis

Year-to-year trends in the distribution of beneficiary insurance status were evaluated using the Cochran-Armitage test. Overlap weighting (OW) adjusted for imbalances between MA-enrolled and TM-enrolled beneficiary demographics, social determinants of health, admission urgency, surgical characteristics, and, in the second weighted analysis, comorbidities (**Supplemental Methods**).^{11,12} Between-group differences were evaluated using standardized mean differences (SMD) before and after OW.¹³ Survival probabilities were estimated using the Kaplan-Meier method, before and after OW. 95% confidence intervals (CI) for weighted KM analyses and weighted median survival estimates were obtained using a non-parametric bootstrap procedure.¹⁴ Data management was conducted using SAS 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC). Statistical analyses were conducted with Stata software, version Stata/MP 18.0 (StataCorp, College Station, TX).

RESULTS

3,015,066 Medicare beneficiaries underwent CABG by ICD-9/10-PCS codes from 1999-2019, of whom 2,345,476 underwent isolated-CABG and had suitable data for analysis: 354,254

(15.1%) beneficiaries were MA-enrolled and 1,991,222 (84.9%) were TM-enrolled (**Figure 1**). The annual percentage of MA-enrolled beneficiaries remained low and stable from 1999-2007 (1.1-4.4%), but after 2007 increased annually to 38.2% in 2019, (Cochran-Armitage Z-statistic 573, $P < 0.001$, **Figure 2**).

Compared to TM-enrolled beneficiaries, MA-enrolled beneficiaries were older, more commonly male, less commonly white, more likely residing in the Western US, and more likely to have undergone surgery recently (**Table 1**). Neighborhood disadvantage as assessed by ADI was similar between MA-enrolled and TM-enrolled beneficiaries. The incidences of all documented preoperative comorbidities were significantly higher in TM-enrolled beneficiaries (**Table 1**). For reference, the incidence of dialysis dependence (a variable maintained separately by CMS in the MedPAR file) in MA-enrolled vs TM-enrolled beneficiaries was 2.6% vs 3.5%, $SMD = 0.052$, yet the incidence of chronic kidney disease (as recorded in the CC-MBSF) was 10.2% vs 20.6%, $SMD = 0.292$ in MA- vs TM-enrolled beneficiaries.

Median follow-up was 12.15 [95% CI: 6.17-17.08] years. Unweighted survival analysis suggested an early survival advantage for MA-enrolled beneficiaries but a late survival advantage for TM-enrolled beneficiaries, with similar median survival: median survival difference 8 [-12,28] days (10.02 [9.96,10.07] vs 10.00 [9.98,10.01] years), respectively (**Figure 3a**). After applying OW to adjust for potential confounding variables aside from comorbidities, we no longer noted the early survival advantage for MA-enrolled beneficiaries, although a slight late survival advantage in TM-enrolled beneficiaries did persist (**Figure 3b**). Weighted median survival was similar between MA-enrolled and TM-enrolled beneficiaries: median survival difference -2 [-28,24] days (10.00 [9.95,10.06] vs 10.01 [9.98,10.04] years). To demonstrate the effect of informative presence bias, OW was repeated including comorbidities. This repeated

weighted analysis exhibited dramatically reduced survival in MA-enrolled vs TM-enrolled beneficiaries, median survival difference of -604 [-626,-575] days (9.78 [9.73,9.83] vs 11.44 [11.41,11.47] years) (**Figure 3c**).

DISCUSSION

This analysis evaluated the incidence of MA and TM enrollment, and long-term survival, among Medicare beneficiaries undergoing isolated-CABG from 1999-2019. We highlight the increasing number of beneficiaries enrolled in MA over time, findings concordant with prior studies.¹⁵ We demonstrate that the incidence of comorbidities documented in the CC-MBSF are dramatically lower for MA-enrolled beneficiaries as compared to TM-enrolled beneficiaries, likely related to the under-reporting of comorbidity claims data in MA-enrolled beneficiaries that has been previously described.⁷ Despite differences in documented comorbidities, both unweighted and weighted (without comorbidities) survival were similar among MA-enrolled and TM-enrolled beneficiaries. This finding of similar post-CABG survival between MA-enrolled and TM-enrolled beneficiaries is concordant with the hypothesis that MA-enrolled and TM-enrolled beneficiaries share a similar incidence of comorbidities, despite the CC-MBSF data suggesting otherwise.

We suggest that the median survival advantage of 604 days for TM-enrolled over MA-enrolled beneficiaries noted in our weighted analysis with comorbidities helps to quantify the amount of bias to which comparative analyses are susceptible if they include both MA-enrolled and TM-enrolled beneficiaries and their documented comorbidities. We recommend that comparative analyses using CMS comorbidity data should be limited to TM-enrolled beneficiaries to avoid introducing informative presence bias. We echo the sentiments of other

research groups that releasing claims data for MA-enrolled beneficiaries will mitigate the dwindling cohort of TM-enrolled Medicare beneficiaries with adequate CC-MBSF data for robust comparative analyses.¹⁶

REFERENCES

- ¹ Mues KE, Liede A, Liu J, et al. Use of the Medicare database in epidemiologic and health services research: A valuable source of real-world evidence on the older and disabled populations in the US. *Clin Epidemiol* 2017;9(9):276-177.
- ² Cartwright, DJ. ICD-9-CM to ICD-10-CM codes: What? Why? How?. *Adv Wound Care (New Rochelle)* 2013;2(10):588-592.
- ³ Goodman AR, Posner SF, Huang ES, Parekh AK, Koh HK. Defining and measuring chronic conditions: Imperatives for research, policy, program, and practice. *Prev Chronic Dis* 2013;10:E66.
- ⁴ Hall M, Attard TM, Berry JG. Improving cohort definitions in research using hospital administrative databases—Do we need guidelines?. *JAMA Pediatr* 2022;176(6):539-540.
- ⁵ Khera R, Dorsey KB, Krumholz HM. Transition to the ICD-10 in the United States: an emerging data chasm. *JAMA* 2018;320(2):133-134.
- ⁶ Weeks WB, Huynh G, Cao ST, Smith J, Weinstein JN. Assessment of year-to-year patient-specific comorbid conditions reported in the Medicare Chronic Conditions Data Warehouse. *JAMA Netw Open* 2020;3(10):e2018176.
- ⁷ Meyers DJ, Johnston KJ. The growing importance of Medicare Advantage in health policy and health. *JAMA Health Forum* 2021;2(3):e210235.
- ⁸ Sisk R, Lin L, Sperrin M, et al. Informative presence and observation in routine health data: A review of methodology for clinical risk prediction. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2021;28(1):155-166.

-
- ⁹ Benchimol EI, Smeeth L, Guttman A, et al, "The REporting of studies Conducted using Observational Routinely-collected health Data (RECORD) Statement. PLoS Med 2015;12(10):e1001885.
- ¹⁰ Kind AJH, Buckingham WR. Making neighborhood-disadvantage metrics accessible the Neighborhood Atlas. N Engl J Med. 2018;378:2456-8
- ¹¹ Cheng C, Li F, Thomas LE, Li FF. Addressing extreme propensity scores in estimating counterfactual survival functions via the overlap weights. Am J Epidemiol 2022;191(6):1140-1151
- ¹² Thomas LE, Li F, Penicina MJ. Overlap weighting: A propensity score method that mimics attributes of a randomized clinical trial. JAMA 2020;323(23):2417-2418.
- ¹³ Austin PC. Balance diagnostics for comparing the distribution of baseline covariates between treatment groups in propensity-score matched samples. Stat Med 2009;28(25):3083-3107.
- ¹⁴ Rogawski ET, Westreich DJ, Kang G, Ward HD, Cole SR. Brief report: Estimating differences and ratios in median times to event. Epidemiology 2016;27(6):848-51.
- ¹⁵ Neuman P, Jacobson GA. Medicare Advantage checkup. N Eng J Med 2018;379(22):2163-2172.
- ¹⁶ Brennan N, Ornstein C, Frakt AB. Time to release Medicare Advantage claims data. JAMA 2018;319(10):975-976.

Table 1. Baseline demographics, comorbidities, and procedural characteristics of all Medicare beneficiaries undergoing isolated coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG), stratified by insurance status. Distribution of these variables before and after two overlap weighting analyses are shown in three sets of columns.

	Unweighted Analysis			Weighted Analysis, Comorbidities not Included			Weighted Analysis, Comorbidities Included		
	Medicare Advantage N=354,254	Traditional Medicare N=1,991,222	SMD	Medicare Advantage	Traditional Medicare	SMD	Medicare Advantage	Traditional Medicare	SMD
Age	72.1±7.2	71.8±7.9	0.033	71.9	71.9	0.000	71.7	71.7	0.000
<65	34,713 (9.8)	217,307 (10.9)	0.037	(10.4)	(10.1)	0.010	(11.3)	(10.3)	0.033
65-69	92,174 (26.0)	516,740 (26.0)	0.002	(26.5)	(26.8)	0.007	(26.6)	(27.6)	0.022
70-74	97,395 (27.5)	512,916 (25.8)	0.039	(26.8)	(23.8)	0.001	(26.5)	(26.5)	0.002
75-79	77,040 (21.7)	432,498 (21.7)	0.001	(21.2)	(21.2)	0.001	(21.1)	(21.0)	0.001
80-84	40,581 (11.5)	238,889 (12.0)	0.017	(11.5)	(11.5)	0.000	(11.2)	(11.1)	0.000
≥85	12,351 (3.5)	72,872 (3.7)	0.009	(3.6)	(3.6)	0.000	(3.4)	(3.4)	0.002
Male	248,940 (70.3)	1,367,708 (68.7)	0.034	(70.5)	(70.5)	0.000	(70.9)	(70.9)	0.000
Race									
White	300,378 (84.8)	1,766,239 (88.7)	0.115	(85.6)	(85.6)	0.000	(85.8)	(85.8)	0.000
Black	28,001 (7.9)	120,932 (6.1)	0.072	(7.4)	(7.4)	0.000	(7.5)	(7.5)	0.000
Hispanic	8,273 (2.3)	29,856 (1.5)	0.061	(2.0)	(2.0)	0.000	(2.0)	(2.0)	0.000
Asian/NHOPI	5,941 (1.7)	20,123 (1.0)	0.058	(1.6)	(1.6)	0.000	(1.5)	(1.5)	0.000
Native American	865 (0.2)	8,751 (0.4)	0.033	(0.3)	(0.3)	0.000	(0.3)	(0.3)	0.000
Other/Unknown	10,796 (3.0)	45,321 (2.3)	0.048	(2.9)	(2.9)	0.000	(2.8)	(2.8)	0.000
Insurance Status									
Traditional Medicare Plan	0 (0.0)	1,991,222 (100)	***	(0.0)	(100)	***	(0.0)	(100)	***
Medicare Advantage Plan	354,254 (100)	0 (0.0)	***	(100)	(0.0)	***	(100)	(0.0)	***
State buy-in	46,026 (13.0)	251,057 (12.6)	0.011	(13.0)	(13.0)	0.000	(13.0)	(13.0)	0.000
Location of Residence (HHS Region)									
1 (HQ: Boston)	11,016 (3.1)	83,534 (4.2)	0.058	(3.4)	(3.4)	0.000	(3.3)	(3.3)	0.000
2 (HQ: New York)	34,180 (9.6)	162,716 (8.2)	0.052	(8.9)	(8.9)	0.002	(8.6)	(8.6)	0.002
3 (HQ: Philadelphia)	36,205 (10.2)	206,520 (10.4)	0.005	(10.0)	(10.0)	0.000	(10.1)	(10.1)	0.000
4 (HQ: Atlanta)	82,882 (23.4)	497,866 (25.0)	0.038	(24.0)	(24.0)	0.000	(24.0)	(24.0)	0.000
5 (HQ: Chicago)	67,979 (19.2)	381,876 (19.2)	0.000	(18.8)	(18.8)	0.000	(19.8)	(19.8)	0.000
6 (HQ: Dallas)	42,616 (12.0)	272,179 (13.7)	0.049	(12.9)	(12.9)	0.000	(13.4)	(13.4)	0.000
7 (HQ: Kansas City)	12,311 (3.5)	118,881 (6.0)	0.118	(4.0)	(4.0)	0.000	(4.2)	(4.2)	0.000
8 (HQ: Denver)	7,448 (2.1)	47,175 (2.4)	0.018	(2.2)	(2.2)	0.000	(2.3)	(2.3)	0.000
9 (HQ: San Francisco)	44,123 (12.5)	162,177 (8.1)	0.142	(11.6)	(11.6)	0.001	(10.2)	(10.2)	0.000
10 (HQ: Seattle)	15,464 (4.4)	57,783 (2.9)	0.078	(4.1)	(4.1)	0.000	(4.0)	(4.0)	0.000

Neighborhood Deprivation (ADI)	53.8±26.7	54.8±27.0	0.041	53.7	53.7	0.000	54.3	54.3	0.000
ADI 1-20 (low deprivation)	48,400 (13.7)	267,700 (13.4)	0.006	(13.8)	(13.6)	0.004	(13.1)	(13.0)	0.005
ADI 21-40 (low-intermediate deprivation)	70,922 (20.0)	376,851 (18.9)	0.028	(20.0)	(20.1)	0.005	(19.7)	(19.9)	0.006
ADI 41-60 (intermediate deprivation)	83,405 (23.5)	446,592 (22.4)	0.027	(23.4)	(23.3)	0.004	(23.4)	(23.3)	0.004
ADI 61-80 (intermediate-high deprivation)	80,516 (22.7)	464,442 (23.3)	0.014	(22.8)	(22.9)	0.001	(23.1)	(23.1)	0.001
ADI 81-100 (high deprivation)	71,011 (20.0)	435,637 (21.9)	0.045	(20.0)	(20.1)	0.002	(20.6)	(20.7)	0.002
Dialysis dependence	9,131 (2.6)	69,145 (3.5)	0.052	(2.9)	(2.9)	0.000	(2.8)	(2.8)	0.000
Preexisting Comorbidities*									
Hypertension	157,850 (44.6)	1,572,004 (78.9)	0.757	(45.0)	(85.0)	0.880	(62.5)	(62.5)	0.000
Diabetes	96,570 (27.3)	848,633 (42.6)	0.326	(27.4)	(48.7)	0.452	(36.4)	(36.4)	0.000
Atrial fibrillation	11,588 (3.3)	209,467 (10.5)	0.289	(3.4)	(12.0)	0.343	(5.2)	(5.2)	0.000
Acute myocardial infarction	12,663 (3.6)	305,833 (15.4)	0.411	(3.8)	(16.0)	0.426	(6.1)	(6.1)	0.000
Congestive heart failure	37,182 (10.5)	683,733 (34.3)	0.597	(10.9)	(35.5)	0.616	(17.0)	(17.0)	0.000
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	35,054 (9.9)	455,100 (22.9)	0.356	(10.2)	(25.2)	0.411	(14.9)	(14.9)	0.000
Chronic kidney disease	36,185 (10.2)	411,030 (20.6)	0.292	(10.2)	(31.6)	0.597	(15.8)	(15.8)	0.000
Depression	39,893 (11.3)	334,945 (16.8)	0.161	(11.3)	(22.6)	0.326	(15.6)	(15.6)	0.000
Stroke or TIA	18,845 (5.3)	239,942 (12.0)	0.241	(5.4)	(13.8)	0.301	(8.0)	(8.0)	0.000
Dementia	5,871 (1.7)	82,658 (4.2)	0.149	(1.7)	(5.4)	0.223	(2.6)	(2.6)	0.000
Cancer	17,779 (5.0)	215,525 (10.8)	0.216	(5.1)	(12.0)	0.260	(7.2)	(7.2)	0.000
Admission urgency									
Elective	165,019 (46.5)	936,976 (47.1)	0.009	(47.1)	(47.1)	0.000	(47.2)	(47.2)	0.000
Urgent	83,918 (23.7)	526,334 (26.4)	0.063	(23.8)	(23.8)	0.000	(23.5)	(23.5)	0.000
Emergent	105,078 (29.7)	526,922 (26.5)	0.071	(29.0)	(29.0)	0.000	(29.3)	(29.3)	0.000
Other	239 (0.1)	990 (0.1)	0.007	(0.1)	(0.1)	0.000	(0.1)	(0.1)	0.000
Year of Surgery	2014 [2011-2017]	2007 [2002-2012]	1.236	2013 [2010-2017]	2013 [2010-2017]	0.000			0.000
1999-2004	14,870 (4.2)	851,540 (42.8)	1.022	(6.0)	(6.0)	0.000	(7.6)	(7.6)	0.000
2005-2011	96,008 (27.1)	634,656 (31.9)	0.105	(29.9)	(29.9)	0.000	(31.0)	(31.0)	0.000
2012-2019	243,376 (68.7)	505,026 (25.4)	0.964	(64.1)	(64.1)	0.000	(61.4)	(61.4)	0.000
Hospital annual Medicare CABG volume	195±141	208±149	0.093	197	197	0.000	199	199	0.000

Values are presented as mean ± standard deviation, median with inter quartile range (IQR), or N (%) – as appropriate – in the unweighted columns, and as mean or (%) in the weighted columns. SMD: Standardized mean difference between cohorts following overlap weighting.

* Preexisting comorbidity data obtained from the Chronic Conditions segment of the Master Beneficiary Summary File

*** SMD unable to be calculated

Figure 1. Patient selection flow diagram for the derivation of the study cohort.




Figure 2. Annual Trends of Insurance Status in Medicare Beneficiaries Undergoing Isolated CABG.







Figure 3. Post-CABG survival estimates for Medicare beneficiaries, stratified by insurance status (Traditional Medicare Plan vs Medicare Advantage Plan). Unweighted (Figure 3a), weighted by non-comorbidity covariates (Figure 3b), and weighted including comorbidity covariates (Figure 3c) survival analyses shown.



Medicare hospitalizations with ICD-9/10-PCS codes specific to coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG) (1999-2019) (N=3,015,066)

Exclude beneficiaries missing 9-digit zip code data (N=35,410)

Exclude beneficiaries with available 9-digit zip code data, but zip-code data is unable to be matched to area deprivation index data (N=80,445)

Exclude beneficiaries with missing hospital admission status (N=8,237)

Medicare hospitalizations for CABG (with or without concomitant cardiac surgery) with complete data including social determinants of health (N=2,890,974)

Exclude concomitant procedures (based on ICD-9/10-PCS codes) (N=545,498)

Aortic valve repair/replacement (N=376,377)

Mitral valve repair/replacement (N=125,228)

Tricuspid valve repair/replacement (N=3,097)

Pulmonic valve repair/replacement (N=227)

Ascending/arch/descending aortic repair (N=12,943)

Coronary artery anomaly or fistula repair (N=6,328)

Atrial septal defect repair (N=9,459)

Ventricular septal defect repair (N=2,285)

Ventricular aneurysmectomy (N=7,540)


Septal myectomy (N=203)


Placement of durable mechanical circulatory support (N=1,554)

Heart transplant, lung transplant, or heart-lung transplant (N=257)

Medicare hospitalizations with complete data for patients undergoing isolated CABG (N=2,345,476)

Annual Incidence of CABG±Concomitant Cardiac Surgery (CCS) in Medicare Beneficiaries, by ICD-9/10 Codes





Traditional Medicare	1991222	1783978	1843495	1519729	1394176	1288850	1141542	1017724	898099	781648	668911	563303	465882	377033	298264	225644	163876	112888	71296	39417	16120
Medicare Advantage	354254	292287	250393	211387	176226	143969	114498	89060	67430	48363	31497	17146	7809	5918	4815	3760	2912	2172	1608	1113	652

