#### **Appendix**

#### **The Association Between Primary Care Physician Diagnostic Knowledge and Death, Hospitalization and Emergency Department Visits Following an Outpatient Visit at Risk for Diagnostic Error: A Retrospective Cohort Study Using Medicare Claims**

Bradley M. Gray, PhD, corresponding author Email: bgray@abim.org 202-213 6646, FAX 202-213 6646 American Board of Internal Medicine 510 Walnut Street, Suite 1700, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106, USA

#### **Contents**



1

# **Section 1: 90-day Index Visit Clean Period Derivation**

Figure 1.1 displays the visit periodicity between each of the 921,416 visits to an internist in the sample and the most recent visit prior to that one.

To determine what the index visit clean period was we assumed that when two contacts happen "close" together they are more likely to be visits for the same acute episode of care. Therefore, if we exclude all but the first visit that happen "close" together then the remaining visits are highly likely to represent the first visit for a new episode of care (i.e., a new problem). However, the visit periodicity threshold that distinguishes visits that are "close" versus "not close" is unknown.

To help delineate this threshold, Figure 1.1 visit shows periodicity between each of the 921,416 visits to an internist in the sample and the most recent adjacent visit prior to that one. In Figure 1.1, you can see the slope of frequency curve is falling until about a 90 day gap between visits. This indicates that many of the visits prior to this point may be related to an existing episode of care. After 90 days, the periodicity slope begins to flatten out which indicates that the timing between visits is likely random and so it is less likely that the two visits are related to the same episode of care.

This flattening of the slope after 90 days is more clearly displayed in Figure 1.2 which displays the 15 day moving average of the change in visit counts per day (i.e., the changing slope). Here the slope stabilizes at about zero beginning around 90 days suggesting that a 90 day clean period for physician visits is likely to exclude most visits that are a follow-up to an ongoing episode of care from the index visit sample.



**Figure 1.1. Visit Periodicity Plot for the 921,416 Outpatient Visits to Physicians in the Sample** 



**Figure 1.2. Average Change in Visit Count over the 15 days (15-day slope) Following each Data Point Listed in Figure 1** 

## **Section 2. ICD-9 Code Codes for Diagnostic Error sensitive Conditions and ICD-9 Code Groups for Index Visit Eligibility and Related Relative Risks**

The Section includes a list the list of diagnostic error sensitive condition ICD-9 diagnoses (Table 2.1), index visit eligible ICD-9s diagnoses groups (Table 2.2), and relative risks for each index visit diagnosis group (Table 2.3).



## **eTable 2.1. ICD-9 Code Codes for Diagnostic Error Sensitive Conditions**

5

# **eTable 2.2. ICD-9 Code Groups for Index Visit Eligibility**





7

# **eTable 2.3 Relative Risks for each Index Visit Diagnosis**







<sup>a</sup>Outcomes include any hospitalization or emergency department visit for the diagnostic conditions within 90 days of the index visits including same day events

<sup>b</sup>Index visit diagnoses groups applied in the analysis include those with a relative risk greater than one. Relative risks were computed as the probability of an outcome if the index visit diagnosis group was recorded in the index visit divided by the probability of an outcome if the diagnosis group was not recorded.

## **Section 3. Psychometric Analysis of Whether Diagnosis Related Questions Reflect an Underlying Construct**

To examine the degree to which treatment and diagnosis related questions represented an underlying construct, we calculated separate Cronbach's alpha indices to determine reliability of the subset of items for the 2010 IM-MOC examination for diagnosis related questions and treatment questions.<sup>[1](#page-20-0)</sup> Overall, 170 of the questions were categorized as treatment or diagnostic related with 71 items classified as treatment and 99 items classified as diagnosis related questions. Overall, reliability for the diagnosis related questions was high, 0.84, suggesting that these questions hung together and were related to one underlying construct. The reliability for treatment related questions was also high, 0.75. This index, however, is partly a function of the number of items included in the calculation, where more items typically result in higher reliability. Consequently, it is not surprising that the diagnostic related questions have higher reliability given there were 28 more items than the treatment scale. To make these indices more equal, we computed the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula, which indicates expected reliability if the treatment scale was 99 items instead of 71. That formula resulted in a value of 0.81 for the treatment items which suggests that treatment related questions also measure one underlying construct.

Although performance on diagnosis and treatment related questions were correlated (Pearson Correlation=.62), 59.5% of the variation in diagnosis exam performance for the physician study sample was not explained by performance on other parts of the exam.

## **Section 4. Imputations for missing variables**

Missing practice characteristics (1,432 or 2.94% of sample) were coded as "other unknown". Missing HCC (86 or .18% of sample) were replace by in sample mean HCC. Missing rural indicator (22 or .05% of sample) were assumed to be non-rural Missing ZIP code median income (708 or 1.46% of sample) were replace by in sample mean median income.

## **Section 5. Full Regression Coefficient Estimates and Explanatory Variables List**

eTables 5.1 lists the probit coefficient associations with outcome measures across all explanatory variables as well as regression descriptive statistics. See Section 7 for percentage point associations with physician characteristics.









Note:

<sup>a</sup>Missing practice characteristics (1,432 or 2.94% of sample) were coded as "other unknown".

bMissing HCC (86 or .18% of sample) were replace by in sample mean HCC.

<sup>c</sup>Missing rural indicator (22 or .05% of sample) were assumed to be non-rural

bMissing ZIP code median income (708 or 1.46% of sample) were replace by in sample mean median income.

## **Section 6. Regression Sensitivity Analyses**

In this section we describe the results of falsification and robustness sensitivities. Falsification sensitivities examine associations with diagnostic knowledge under scenarios where we expect the underlying associations to be weaker than in the base case. Robustness sensitivities examine the degree to which base case associations with diagnostic knowledge were robust to assumptions regarding index visit diagnoses eligibility, outcome variable construction, and regression control variables.

## *Falsification sensitivities*

Results of falsification sensitivities are exhibited in eTable 6.1. These sensitivities include applying the index visit sample that did not meet any diagnoses eligibility criteria and applying elective hospitalizations as an outcome measure. Presumably diagnostic knowledge would not impact outcomes with the diagnostic error sensitive conditions after index visits where related diagnoses codes for these conditions were not present. That is, either because the underlying condition was not present or not detectable at the time of the index visit and therefore was not preventable. However, outcomes after these index visits could be associated with omitted variables that were both correlated with our outcome measures and exam performance. For example, it could be that physicians with low diagnostic knowledge also have less healthy patients in ways we do not control for and therefore would be more likely to experience adverse events more generally. We also assume that elective hospitalizations would be related to the overall propensity to hospitalize but would not be related to underlying diagnostic skill.

Overall the results of falsification sensitivities support the validity of our base case finding. For example, although the overall risk of each adverse outcome was comparable to the base case, all associations with diagnostic knowledge were very small in absolute terms and none were statistically significant (P>0.05). For example, applying for the sample of index visits without eligible diagnoses codes, scoring in the top versus bottom tertile of diagnostic knowledge was associated with a 0.0 (95% CI -1.3 to 1.3, p=0.99) difference in the risk of death within 90 days of the index visit or under one tenth of the statistically significant 2.9 (95% CI: -5.0 to -0.7, p=0.008) fewer death per 1,000 observed in the base case. Yet, the mean risk of death in the base case and this sensitivity was comparable (0.7% in the base case versus 0.4% in this sensitivity). This sensitivity also addressed another limitation of our study, that we did not have a direct measure of cause of death since if the associations we found were driven by reductions in death due to the 13 diagnostic error prone conditions applied in our study we would expect that the associations with death and diagnostic exam performance would be much smaller when estimated using the index sample without eligible diagnoses codes for these conditions. Similarly we found that the associations between diagnostic knowledge and risk of an elective hospitalization were statistically insignificant, top compared to bottom tertile association P was 0.63, and was wrong signed.

## *Robustness sensitivities*

Results of robustness sensitivities are exhibited in eTables 6.2.1 (for death), 6.2.2 (hospitalization) to 6.2.3 (for emergency department visit).

For the first sensitivity we expanding the eligible diagnoses code groups to all 76 identified by physician authors versus 38 in the base case that also met the relative risk criteria.

For the third sensitivity we expand the index visit clean period to 97 days and contracted the index visit clean period to 83 days.

For the fourth sensitivity, we excluded physician in academic medical centers to consider the possibility that the unobserved physician characteristics related to where they worked or who they worked with could be were independently both related to the underlying physician diagnostic skill and our outcome measures.

For the fifth sensitivity we accounted for the possibility that adverse outcomes were avoided because the patient died by altering the ED and hospitalization measures to include all-cause mortality. For this sensitivity we added the following two outcome measures: base case hospitalization or death and base case ED or death.

Overall results of robustness sensitivity analysis suggests that our base case results were not highly sensitive to different underlying assumptions related to these factors (e.g., across all robustness sensitivities percent change in the outcome measures between top versus bottom diagnostic knowledge exam performers remained statistically significant (P<0.05)).

## **Table 6.1. Results of Falsification Sensitivity Analyses for All Adverse Outcomes**



#### **Table 6.2.1. Results of Robustness Sensitivity Analyses for the Death Adverse Outcome**



a 1,791 observations excluded due to lack of variation in outcomes within control test administrations or other controls

#### **Table 6.2.2. Results of robustness sensitivity analyses for the hospitalization adverse outcome**



a 133 observations excluded due to lack of variation in outcomes within control test administrations or other controls

#### **Table 6.2.3. Results of robustness sensitivity analyses for the emergency department visit adverse outcome**



<sup>a</sup> **133 observations excluded due to lack of variation in outcomes within control test administrations or other controls**

## **References**

<span id="page-20-0"></span>**1.** Bandalos DL. *Measurement theory and applications for the social sciences*: Guilford Publications; 2018.