

General internists at the hospital: cost savers or big spenders?

Pedro PB^{1,2} Sara RM¹

¹Universidade Nova de Lisboa

²CEPR

October 2009

Introduction

Motivation

Methodology

Methodology

Estimation methods

The data

Results

Matching

Probits

Conclusion

Background

- ▶ Are the internists working at your hospital big spenders? Or do they help saving costs?
- ▶ One might be tempted to take the amount of money they spend as their contribution to the hospital budget

Background

- ▶ Are the internists working at your hospital big spenders? Or do they help saving costs?
- ▶ One might be tempted to take the amount of money they spend as their contribution to the hospital budget
- ▶ What lies beneath those costs?

Methodology

1. Production function

Methodology

1. Production function
2. Production outcomes

Methodology

1. Production function
2. Production outcomes
 - ▶ Resource utilization

Methodology

1. Production function
2. Production outcomes
 - ▶ Resource utilization

 - ▶ Health outcome

Methodology

1. Production function
2. Production outcomes
 - ▶ Resource utilization
 - ▶ Matching estimators
 - ▶ Length of stay
 - ▶ Health outcome

Methodology

1. Production function
2. Production outcomes
 - ▶ Resource utilization
 - ▶ Matching estimators
 - ▶ Length of stay
 - ▶ Health outcome
 - ▶ Probit
 - ▶ Change in the probability of death

Matching estimators

- ▶ First best
 - ▶ to have the same patient treated in both types of services

Matching estimators

- ▶ First best
 - ▶ to have the same patient treated in both types of services
 - ▶ compare resources and outcome

Matching estimators

- ▶ First best
 - ▶ to have the same patient treated in both types of services
 - ▶ compare resources and outcome
- ▶ Abadié & Imbens (2002) - define two groups, match the observations

Matching estimators

- ▶ First best
 - ▶ to have the same patient treated in both types of services
 - ▶ compare resources and outcome
- ▶ Abadié & Imbens (2002) - define two groups, match the observations
 1. define measure of distance - covariates
 2. measure effect of the treatment both in the whole sample (SATE) and in the treated ones (SATT)

Probit

- ▶ Goal: estimate what drives the probability of leaving the hospital alive
- ▶ Same covariates as in the matching process

Probit

- ▶ Goal: estimate what drives the probability of leaving the hospital alive
- ▶ Same covariates as in the matching process
- ▶ Sign and magnitude of the internal medicine marginal effect

The data

- ▶ Portuguese hospitals, 2005
- ▶ Diagnosis Related Group (DRG) database

The data

- ▶ Portuguese hospitals, 2005
- ▶ Diagnosis Related Group (DRG) database
 - ▶ age
 - ▶ gender
 - ▶ length of stay
 - ▶ service codes
 - ▶ ICD-9-CM codes for diagnosis and procedures
 - ▶ discharge

The data

- ▶ Portuguese hospitals, 2005
- ▶ Diagnosis Related Group (DRG) database
 - ▶ age
 - ▶ gender
 - ▶ length of stay
 - ▶ service codes
 - ▶ ICD-9-CM codes for diagnosis and procedures
 - ▶ discharge
- ▶ Patient complexity and comorbidity measured by

The data

- ▶ Portuguese hospitals, 2005
- ▶ Diagnosis Related Group (DRG) database
 - ▶ age
 - ▶ gender
 - ▶ length of stay
 - ▶ service codes
 - ▶ ICD-9-CM codes for diagnosis and procedures
 - ▶ discharge
- ▶ Patient complexity and comorbidity measured by
 - ▶ Charlson comorbidity index (CCI) - Deyo approach
 - ▶ Index for procedure complexity
 - ▶ Observation room (OR)

Selecting the observations

- ▶ Focus on specific type of DRG - patients can be assigned to both internal medicine and specialty

	DRG						
Pneumology	79	82	88	89	90	96	97
Cardiology	127	134	138	139	140		
Gastroenterology	174						
Nephrology	316						

- ▶ Valid observation: the patient was treated at either internal medicine or the corresponding specialty

Matching estimates per DRG (1)

Figure: Stata output: DRG 88 - Average treatment effect (SATE)

```

Matching estimator: Average Treatment Effect

Weighting matrix: inverse variance      Number of obs      =      1683
                                        Number of matches  (m) =           1

```

los	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
SATE	-1.408693	.6742706	-2.09	0.037	-2.730239 - .0871467

```

Matching variables:  so g_cci sexo gravidade age age2 amad vise guar covi guim
                    feir
Bias-adj variables: so g_cci sexo gravidade age age2 amad vise guar covi guim
                    feir

```

Matching estimates per DRG

Figure: Sign and significance level for each DRG

	SATE(1)	SATE(4)	SATT(1)	SATT(4)
Pneumology	79	-	-	-
	82	***	**	***
	88	**	**	-
	89	-	-	-
	90	-	-	-
	96	-	+	-
	97	***	+	+
Cardiology	127	***	***	***
	134	-	+	-
	138	-	-	+
	139	***	***	+
	140	+	+	+
G 174	***	***	***	**
N 316	-	-	**	***

SATE: Sample average treatment effect

SATT: Sample average treatment effect for the treated group

m(1) - one match m(4) - match the average of the closest four

Pneumology

Figure: Sign and significance level for each *top 5* hospital

	SATE(1)	SATE(4)	SATT(1)	SATT(4)
1	***	***	***	***
2	+	+	+	+
3	+	+	+	+
4	**	**	**	**
5	***	***	***	***
	-	-	-	-

	SATE(1)	SATE(4)	SATT(1)	SATT(4)
1	-	-	-	-
2	***	***	***	***
3	-	**	-	-
4	+	+	+	+
5	*	**	**	***
	-	-	-	-

Cardiology

Figure: Sign and significance level for each *top 5* hospital

		SATE(1)	SATE(4)	SATT(1)	SATT(4)
1	1	+	+	-	-
	2	***	***	***	***
3	3	**	**	-	-
	4	***	***	***	***
4	5	***	***	***	***
		-	+	-	-

		SATE(1)	SATE(4)	SATT(1)	SATT(4)
1	1	+	+	+	+
	2	+	*	***	***
4	3	+	+	-	-
	4	-	-	+	+
0	5	-	+	*	***
		+	+	+	+

Mortality - Probit estimates per DRG

Figure: Marginal effects *per* DRG

DRG	Marginal effect	DRG	Marginal effect
79	-0.086 **	90	-0.085***
82	n.s.	96	-0.071***
88	n.s.	127	-0.064***
89	-0.058***	316	n.s.

Significance levels: * : 10% ** : 5% *** : 1%

- ▶ Mg. effect = -0.086 \Rightarrow the probability of alive discharge decreases by almost 9% if the patient was treated in internal medicine, when compared to pneumology

Main results

- ▶ Are the internists working at your hospital big spenders? Or do they help saving costs?

Main results

- ▶ Are the internists working at your hospital big spenders? Or do they help saving costs?
- ▶ There is evidence that the internal medicine affects health care production in an inpatient setting

Main results

- ▶ Are the internists working at your hospital big spenders? Or do they help saving costs?
- ▶ There is evidence that the internal medicine affects health care production in an inpatient setting
- ▶ In some cases, it decreases resource utilization (measured by the length of stay), but the reverse is also true

Main results

- ▶ Are the internists working at your hospital big spenders? Or do they help saving costs?
- ▶ There is evidence that the internal medicine affects health care production in an inpatient setting
- ▶ In some cases, it decreases resource utilization (measured by the length of stay), but the reverse is also true
- ▶ The probability of death has shown to be higher if the patient is treated in the internal medicine, *caeteris paribus*