Supplementary appendix

Calculating informal integration

Our measure of informal integration is based on the assortativity coefficient of each health system-year network. In network analysis, the assortativity coefficient measures the extent to which nodes with similar features are connected to one another compared to what would be expected if connections were randomly assigned. In our case, the feature that we use is physician specialty (primary care physician, surgeon, medical specialist). Typically, the assortativity coefficient takes positive values if similar nodes are *more* likely to associate and negative values if similar nodes are *less* likely to associate. Because we are more interested in the extent to which dissimilar connections occur, we use the *disassortativity* coefficient (i.e., the reverse of assortativity) such that positive values indicate more cross-specialty ties than we would expect at random.

Mathematically, the disassortativity coefficient that we use to measure integration can be represented as:

$$
r = \frac{\sum_{i} a_{i} b_{i} - \sum_{i} e_{ii}}{1 - \sum_{i} a_{i} b_{i}}
$$

where e_{ij} is a quantity that represents the fraction of edges that connect a node of type i to one of type *j*, $a_i = \sum_j e_{ij}$, $b_j = \sum_i e_{ij}$, and $\sum_{ij} e_{ij} = 1$.¹ A value of *r* = 1 indicates that *all* edges connect nodes of different types whereas $r = 0$ indicates that all edges connect similar nodes.

Sensitivity analyses

Our primary regression analysis (Appendix Exhibit 1, Model 1) was a linear probability model with mortality as the outcome, regressed on ACO participation, informal integration, the interaction of the two, and a series of controls. The sample used for this analysis comprises

53,239 beneficiaries for which we have complete data for all variables. We test the sensitivity of the associations we observed in Model 1 through a series of supplementary regression analyses (Appendix Exhibit 1, Models 2-8).

First, in Appendix Exhibit 1, Model 2 we relax the two-procedure threshold for inclusion of health systems that we utilize in our main analysis and include all observations for which we have complete data (53,702 beneficiaries across 1,211 health systems). The results are consistent with those of Model 1, suggesting that the relationship among variables is similar for health systems that only perform one CABG procedure in a year.

Second, to further evaluate potential bias in our models due to low volume systems, in Model 4 we drop observations if the hospital did not perform at least 10 CABG procedures in a given year. This criterion reduces the number of total observations to 40,598, but the regression results are consistent with Model 1 (threshold of 2 procedures) and Model 2 (no threshold).

Third, to ensure our findings are not driven by particularities of the subsample of cases for which we have complete data on all of the control variables, we drop all controls and regress our primary outcome on only informal integration, ACO participation, and the interaction, using all 80,782 observations (Model 3). Although the explanatory power of the model decreases (R^2 = 0.002 vs. 0.03) without the controls, we note that the relationships of interest are consistent with our main results, suggesting that the associations among informal integration, ACO participation, and mortality are similar within the subsample of observations that are lost due to incomplete control variable data.

Fourth, in Model 5 we adjust our main model for CABG procedures that were performed on an emergent basis, which helps to further account for heterogeneity in case complexity. Unsurprisingly, the dummy variable for whether or not the procedure was performed on an

emergent basis had a positive and statistically significant (*p*<0.01) relationship with mortality. However, the results were otherwise consistent with Model 1.

Fifth, to account for instances where outcomes may be more attributable to surgeon skill, we exclude 741 observations where the beneficiary died within 3 days of surgery (Model 6). Again, the analysis supports our reported results.

Sixth, in Model 7 we conduct an analysis that includes both the dummy variable for emergent cases and the exclusion of 3-day mortality. The coefficient on the emergent case variable is consistent with Model 5 and the results for informal integration, ACO participation, and the interaction term are consistent with our main results.

Finally, in Model 8 we run the fully adjusted specification from Model 7 using health system fixed effects instead of the random effects.² Although the magnitude of the coefficient on informal integration is reduced relative to other specifications, it is still statistically significant and the results are largely consistent with those of Model 1.

Appendix Table 1. Models for 90-d operative mortality for CABG beneficiaries (2008-2014)

Standard errors (clustered by health system) in parentheses. ACO: accountable care organization; CBSA: core-based statistical area; PCP: primary care physician † < 0.1

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

Appendix Table 1. Models for 90-d operative mortality for CABG beneficiaries (2008-2014), continued

Standard errors (clustered by health system) in parentheses. ACO: accountable care organization; CBSA: core-based statistical area; PCP: primary care physician † < 0.1

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

Appendix Table 2. Patient, health system, and community characteristics by ACO participation, level of informal clinical integration

ACO: accountable care organization; CBSA: core-based statistical area; PCP: primary care physician

p-values from Kruskal-Wallis test except for categorical variables (χ² test)

References

- 1. Newman, Mark EJ. Mixing patterns in networks. Physical Review E 67, no. 2 (2003): 026126.
- 2. Specifying Model 1 with fixed effects instead of random effects also yields similar results to Model 8. Results can be provided upon request.