

# Causal Pathways for Social Risk Variable Selection-Hybrid HWR

Although some recent literature evaluates the relationship between patient social risk factors and the readmission outcome, few studies directly address causal pathways or examine the role of the hospital in these pathways<sup>1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 11, 14, 17</sup>. Moreover, the current literature examines a wide range of conditions and risk variables with no clear consensus on which risk factors demonstrate the strongest relationship with readmission.

The social risk factors that have been examined in the literature can be categorized into three domains: (1) patient-level variables, (2) neighborhood/community-level variables, and (3) hospital-level variables.

Patient-level variables describe characteristics of individual patients and include the patient's income or education level<sup>8</sup>. Neighborhood/community-level variables use information from sources such as the ACS as either a proxy for individual patient-level data or to measure environmental factors. Studies using these variables use one dimensional measures such as median household income or composite measures such as the Area Deprivation Index (ADI)<sup>12, 15, 16</sup>. Some of these variables may include the local availability of clinical providers<sup>5-6</sup>. Hospital-level variables measure attributes of the hospital which may be related to patient risk. Examples of hospital-level variables used in studies are ZIP code characteristics aggregated to the hospital level or the proportion of Medicaid patients served in the hospital<sup>3, 9-10</sup>.

The conceptual relationship, or potential causal pathways by which these possible social risk factors influence the risk of readmission following an acute illness or major surgery, like the factors themselves, are varied and complex. There are at least four potential pathways that are important to consider:

1. **Patients with social risk factors may have worse health at the time of hospital admission.** Patients who have lower income/education/literacy or unstable housing may have a worse general health status and may present for their hospitalization or procedure with a greater severity of underlying illness. These social risk factors, which are characterized by patient-level or neighborhood/community-level (as proxy for patient-level) variables, may contribute to worse health status at admission due to competing priorities (restrictions based on job), lack of access to care (geographic, cultural, or financial), or lack of health insurance. Given that these risk factors all lead to worse general health status, this causal pathway should be largely accounted for by current clinical risk-adjustment.
2. **Patients with social risk factors often receive care at lower quality hospitals.** Patients of lower income, lower education, or unstable housing have inequitable access to high quality facilities, in part, because such facilities are less likely to be found in geographic areas with large populations of poor patients. Thus, patients with low income are more likely to be seen in lower quality hospitals, which can explain increased risk of readmission following hospitalization.
3. **Patients with social risk factors may receive differential care within a hospital.** The third major pathway by which social risk factors may contribute to readmission risk is that patients may not receive equivalent care within a facility. For example, patients with social risk factors such as lower education may require differentiated care (e.g. provision of lower literacy information – that they do not receive).
4. **Patients with social risk factors may experience worse health outcomes beyond the control of the health care system.** Some social risk factors, such as income or wealth, may affect the likelihood of readmissions without directly affecting health status at admission or the quality of

care received during the hospital stay. For instance, while a hospital may make appropriate care decisions and provide tailored care and education, a lower-income patient may have a worse outcome post-discharge due to competing financial priorities which don't allow for adequate recuperation or access to needed treatments, or a lack of access to care outside of the hospital.

Although we analytically aim to separate these pathways to the extent possible, we acknowledge that risk factors often act on multiple pathways, and as such, individual pathways can be complex to distinguish analytically. Further, some social risk factors, despite having a strong conceptual relationship with worse outcomes, may not have statistically meaningful effects on the risk model. They also have different implications on the decision to risk adjust or not.

Based on this model and that the Area Deprivation Index (ADI) and dual-eligibility variables aim to capture the social risk factors that are likely to influence these pathways (income, education, housing, and community factors) - the following social risk variables were considered for risk-adjustment:

- Dual-eligible status
- Dual eligibility for Medicare and Medicaid is available at the patient level in the Medicare Master Beneficiary Summary File. The eligibility threshold for over 65-year-old Medicare patients considers both income and assets. For the dual-eligible (DE) indicator, there is a body of literature demonstrating differential health care and health outcomes among beneficiaries<sup>18</sup>. High Area Deprivation Index (ADI)

Area Deprivation index (ADI): The ADI, initially developed by Health Resources & Services Administration (HRSA), is based on 17 measures across four domains: income, education, employment, and housing quality<sup>12, 16</sup>.

The 17 components are listed below:

- Population aged  $\geq 25$  y with  $< 9$  y of education, %
- Population aged  $\geq 25$  y with at least a high school diploma, %
- Employed persons aged  $\geq 16$  y in white collar occupations, %
- Median family income, \$
- Income disparity
- Median home value, \$
- Median gross rent, \$
- Median monthly mortgage, \$
- Owner occupied housing units, % (home ownership rate)
- Civilian labor force population aged  $\geq 16$  y unemployed, % (unemployment rate)
- Families below poverty level, %
- Population below 150% of the poverty threshold, %
- Single parent households with children aged  $< 18$  y, %
- Households without a motor vehicle, %
- Households without a telephone, %
- Occupied housing units without complete plumbing, % (log)
- Households with more than 1 person per room, % (crowding)

ADI scores were derived using beneficiary's 9-digit ZIP Code of residence, which is obtained from the Medicare Enrollment Database, and is linked to 2017-2021 US Census/American Community Survey (ACS) data. In accordance with the ADI developers' methodology, an ADI score is calculated for the census block group corresponding to the beneficiary's 9-digit ZIP Code using 17 weighted Census indicators. Raw ADI scores were then transformed into a national percentile ranking ranging from 1 to

100, with lower scores indicating lower levels of disadvantage and higher scores indicating higher levels of disadvantage. Percentile thresholds established by the ADI developers were then applied to ADI percentile to dichotomize neighborhoods into more disadvantaged (high ADI areas=ranking equal to or greater than 85) or less disadvantaged areas (Low ADI areas= ranking of less than 85).

#### References:

1. Buntin MB, Ayanian JZ. Social Risk Factors and Equity in Medicare Payment. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2017;376(6):507-510.
2. Chang W-C, Kaul P, Westerhout C M, Graham M. M., Armstrong Paul W., "Effects of Socioeconomic Status on Mortality after Acute Myocardial Infarction." *The American Journal of Medicine*. 2007; 120(1): 33-39.
3. Gilman M, Adams EK, Hockenberry JM, et al. California safety-net hospitals likely to be penalized by ACA value, readmission, and meaningful-use programs. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. Aug 2014; 33(8):1314-22.
4. Gopaldas R R, Chu D., "Predictors of surgical mortality and discharge status after coronary artery bypass grafting in patients 80 years and older." *The American Journal of Surgery*. 2009; 198(5): 633-638.
5. Herrin J, Kenward K, Joshi MS, Audet AM, Hines SJ. Assessing Community Quality of Health Care. *Health Serv Res*. 2016 Feb;51(1):98-116. doi: 10.1111/1475-6773.12322. Epub 2015 Jun 11. PMID: 26096649; PMCID: PMC4722214.
6. Herrin J, St Andre J, Kenward K, Joshi MS, Audet AM, Hines SC. Community factors and hospital readmission rates. *Health Serv Res*. 2015 Feb;50(1):20-39. doi: 10.1111/1475-6773.12177. Epub 2014 Apr 9. PMID: 24712374; PMCID: PMC4319869.
7. Hamadi H, Moody L, Apatu E, Vossos H, Tafili A, Spaulding A. Impact of hospitals' Referral Region racial and ethnic diversity on 30-day readmission rates of older adults. *J Community Hosp Intern Med Perspect*. 2019;9(3):181-188.
8. Imran A, Rawal MD, Botre N, Patil A. Improving and Promoting Social Determinants of Health at a System Level. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf*. 2022;48(8):376-384.
9. Jha AK, Orav EJ, Epstein AM. Low-quality, high-cost hospitals, mainly in South, care for sharply higher shares of elderly black, Hispanic, and medicaid patients. *Health affairs* 2011; 30:1904-11.
10. Joynt KE, Jha AK. Characteristics of hospitals receiving penalties under the Hospital Readmissions Reduction Program. *JAMA*. Jan 23 2013; 309(4):342-3.
11. Kim C, Diez A V, Diez Roux T, Hofer P, Nallamotheu B K, Bernstein S J, Rogers M, "Area socioeconomic status and mortality after coronary artery bypass graft surgery: The role of hospital volume." *Clinical Investigation Outcomes, Health Policy, and Managed Care*. 2007; 154(2): 385-390.
12. Kind AJH, Buckingham W. Making Neighborhood Disadvantage Metrics Accessible: The Neighborhood Atlas. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2018. 378: 2456-2458. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp1802313. PMCID: PMC6051533. AND University of Wisconsin School of Medicine Public Health. 2023 Area Deprivation Index v4.0. Downloaded from <https://www.neighborhoodatlas.medicine.wisc.edu/>.
13. LaPar D J, Bhamidipati C M, et al. "Primary Payer Status Affects Mortality for Major Surgical Operations." *Annals of Surgery*. 2010; 252(3): 544-551.
14. Lindenauer PK, Lagu T, Rothberg MB, et al. Income inequality and 30 day outcomes after acute myocardial infarction, heart failure, and pneumonia: retrospective cohort study. *BMJ*. 2013 Feb 14; 346:f521. doi: 10.1136/bmj.f521.

15. Powell WR, Sheehy AM, Kind AJ. The area deprivation Index is the most scientifically validated social exposome tool available for policies advancing health equity. *Health Affairs Forefront*. 2023;
16. Singh, G. K. (2003). Area Deprivation and Widening Inequalities in US Mortality, 1969–1998. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93(7), 1137–1143. <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.93.7.1137>
17. Trivedi AN, Nsa W, Hausmann LR, et al. Quality and equity of care in U.S. hospitals. *The New England journal of medicine* 2014; 371:2298-308.
18. Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. Second Report to Congress on Social Risk Factors and Performance in Medicare’s Value-Based Purchasing Program. 2020. <https://aspe.hhs.gov/social-risk-factors-and-medicares-value-basedpurchasing-programs>