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**Introduction: The burden of chronic disease in Latin America and the Caribbean is large and growing**

The four main chronic non-communicable diseases (NCD) - cardiovascular disease, cancer, chronic lung diseases and diabetes - kill three in five people worldwide. Latin American and Caribbean (LAC) countries currently face the double burden of NCD in addition to the continued burden of reproductive and communicable diseases and child malnutrition and anemia--especially in poor communities. See Exhibit 1. The region’s rapid demographic and epidemiological transition has led to high levels of NCDs, particularly cardiovascular disease (CVD), stroke and cancers. See Exhibit 2. Mental health problems such as depression have similarly increased. Chronic diseases are now the leading causes of death and illness in LAC, accounting for 68 percent of deaths and 60 percent of disability-adjusted life years (DALY) in the region. Cardiovascular diseases alone are responsible for 35% of deaths in LAC, while the combination of AIDS, TB and malaria, and all other infectious diseases is responsible for 10% of deaths.\(^1\)

Growing exposure to risk factors in combination with low levels of access to preventive care are increasing unmet health needs. LAC has been experiencing a “nutrition transition” towards less healthy diets.\(^2\) Thirty to sixty percent of the region’s population does not achieve the minimum recommended levels of physical activity and obesity is rising rapidly.\(^3\) Inadequate access to high quality health services, including clinical prevention and diagnostic services and difficult access to essential medicines are significant contributing factors to the growing burden of chronic disease.\(^1\) This chronic disease burden is expected to increase due to the aging of the population and to the relative decline in the proportion of communicable diseases. Predictions for the next two decades show a near tripling of diabetic patients, ischemic heart disease and stroke mortality in LAC.\(^4\)

In recognition of these facts, the United Nations General Assembly in recognition of the burden of NCD convened a High-Level Meeting on NCDs on 19-20 September 2011. "The summit in September in New York is our chance to broker an international commitment that puts non-communicable diseases high on the development agenda, where they belong", said Ban Ki-moon-United Nations Secretary-General.

---

\(^1\)Pan American Health Organization, 2007.
\(^3\) Hoehner, C.M., et al., 2008.
Although chronic diseases affect all population groups, outcomes are considerably worse for the poor, because of higher prevalence of risk factors, lower access to screening and treatment services\textsuperscript{5,6}, and lower ability to cope with the financial consequences of chronic diseases.\textsuperscript{7}

Inequalities affect both communicable and non-communicable diseases, and are an issue even in the wealthiest countries. NCDs affect the poor disproportionally and this is compounded by lack of access to quality interventions to prevent and manage these conditions.\textsuperscript{8}

The economic and fiscal costs of chronic diseases are large and growing. A study of low and middle income countries, which included Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, and Colombia, estimated that US$ 85 billion of economic production will be lost from heart disease, stroke and diabetes between 2006 and 2015 within the 23 nations that were analyzed.\textsuperscript{6} The direct costs of diabetes alone in Latin America and the Caribbean have been estimated to be around US$ 10 billion per year.\textsuperscript{9} The economic consequences of chronic disease also include the negative impact on consumption and saving, on labor supply and productivity, and on human capital accumulation.\textsuperscript{7} Therefore governments will need to strengthen their responses and prioritize interventions based on evidence of cost-effectiveness, financial protection and responsiveness criteria.

A. Chronic disease deaths are largely preventable, but prevention requires a multi-sectorial approach

To a large extent, most NCD deaths are preventable. Up to 80\% of heart disease, stroke and type II diabetes could be prevented by eliminating shared risk factors like tobacco use, unhealthy diet, physical inactivity and the harmful use of alcohol.\textsuperscript{10} Tobacco consumption is the leading cause of avoidable death in the Americas; approximately one-third of all death from heart disease and cancer can be attributed to tobacco consumption.\textsuperscript{11}

The greatest reductions in NCDs are expected to result from a comprehensive, population-wide approach to addressing risk factors.\textsuperscript{12} These “best buys” include public

\textsuperscript{5} Anderson, G.F., 2009.  
\textsuperscript{6} Abegunde, D.O., et al., 2007.  
\textsuperscript{8} The World Bank, 2011.  
\textsuperscript{9} Barcelo, A., et al., 2003.  
\textsuperscript{10} World Health Organization, Primary 2008.  
\textsuperscript{11} World Health Organization, 2009.  
\textsuperscript{12} World Health Organization, 2010.
policy-based approaches to primary prevention, such as tobacco-control (taxes, advertising regulation, and smoking bans), alcohol regulations (taxes, advertising regulations, purchasing restrictions), and diet improvement (reducing salt \[13\] and replacing trans-fats in foods); public health interventions (promoting healthy diets, community-based physical activity promotion, among others); and primary care interventions (tobacco and alcohol counseling, multi-drug therapy for controlling risk factors, and screening and early treatment).\[14\]

The chronic disease model (Exhibit 3) has been proposed as a way to view these components of a chronic disease strategy designed to decrease incidence, reduce prevalence, and tackle ongoing treatment and rehabilitation.\[15,16\] The model shows that health systems have an essential role in NCD prevention and control strategies, but one that must be coordinated with other sectors and actors.\[17\]

There is evidence that existing interventions can address NCD challenges in low and middle income countries and although implementation requires strong delivery platforms, results can be cost-effective.\[14\] For example, secondary prevention of cardiovascular disease (CVD) through simplified non-laboratory risk screening to identify 6% of the population with CVD risk greater than 25% costs $1.20 per capita and can lead to a 20% reduction in CVD mortality.\[18,19\]

**B. Primary care has an important role in NCD prevention and control strategies**

Primary care contributes to NCD prevention and control through primary prevention of risk factors (promotion of physical activity, discouragement of smoking initiation), secondary prevention of complications resulting from existing risk factors, and tertiary prevention (rehabilitation and prevention of future complications resulting from stroke or uncontrolled diabetes). There is varied evidence of the effectiveness of primary care to perform all of these functions.\[20\] Perhaps the weakest evidence is for primary prevention, largely because adjustment of behavioral factors is complex, requires a sustained commitment over time, and often individual choices are constrained by the environment (e.g. availability of fresh food, places to perform physical activity, price and availability of cigarettes)--although there is

---

\[13\] Campbell, N.R.C., B. Legowski, and B. Legetic, 2011.
\[17\] Samb, B., et al., 2010.
evidence that regular contact with a primary care provider can enhance the extent to which individuals adhere to behavior change plans.\textsuperscript{21, 22}

The bulk of evidence for primary care effectiveness seems to be in the area of secondary prevention via management of risk factors and coordination of care and medications obtained through specialty and hospital providers.\textsuperscript{23} For example, diabetes control in primary care requires regular blood glucose monitoring, provision of glucose-lowering medications, effective control of cardiovascular risk factors, and coordination of other care and medications. Hypertension management requires blood pressure monitoring, prescription and adherence to anti-hypertensives, coordination of other care and medications, and lifestyle changes such as smoking cessation, diet and exercise counseling. Asthma requires assessment of asthma control, monitoring use of rescue inhaler, coordination of other care and medications. And chronic obstructive pulmonary diseases require smoking cessation counseling and more intensive referral and coordination of diagnostic and specialty care and medications. See Exhibit 4.

A validation study in Spain noted that the role of primary care in preventing avoidable hospitalizations differed by type of condition. For infectious diseases for which there was vaccine, primary care could play an important role in providing primary prevention. But for the majority of conditions, the expert panel concluded that primary care’s principal role was in early diagnosis and timely treatment (e.g. ulcer, cardiac insufficiency, diabetes), or appropriate control and follow-up (e.g. diabetes, cardiovascular disease).\textsuperscript{24} This study reinforces the importance of multisectorial approaches to primary prevention and the need for better integration of care across the treatment spectrum.

Of course, for primary care to contribute maximally to chronic disease prevention and control there are requirements beyond simply increasing access. The literature suggest a number of other features, including: enhancing practice design to improving access and follow-up, facilitating patient self-management through better communication and on-going support, improving the capacity of the healthcare team to provide high quality care through provider education and enhanced decision support, strengthening health service networks to facilitate access to diagnostic and needed specialist care, and improving information systems to facilitate the use of clinical records, patient and providers reminders, coordination of

\textsuperscript{21} Coleman, K., et al., 2009.
\textsuperscript{22} Forrest, C.B., et al., 2002.
\textsuperscript{24} Caminal Homar, J., et al., 2003.
medications, and tracking outcomes over time. These features go beyond the individual primary care provider and require a health system-wide investment with appropriate resources and incentives.

I. Approaches to measuring primary care effectiveness

There is evidence that health systems with a strong primary care orientation achieve better health outcomes. But several recent reports have documented major shortcomings that have left conventional health care systems unable to meet the needs of large numbers of people. These include the provision of “inverse care,” whereby better-off people consume more care than people with less means and greater health needs; “impoverishing care,” in which individuals and families who lack social protection fall into poverty as a result of catastrophic out-of-pocket expenses; “fragmented care” due to overspecialization, which prevents a holistic, continuous approach to people’s care; “unsafe care” due to poor system design that fails to ensure safety and hygiene standards; and “mis directed care,” whereby resources are allocated disproportionately toward curative care while neglecting prevention and health promotion.

Recently, the World Health Organization has called for a global commitment to strengthening the primary care basis of health systems. This strategy includes guaranteeing universal access and social protection, reorganizing health services around people’s needs and expectations, implementing public policies that guarantee more healthy communities while integrating public health actions with those of primary care, reforming leadership to be more inclusive and participatory, and strengthening the scientific evidence and social support for primary care. Each of these is ambitious objectives is congruent with strategies for strengthening the ability of primary care to tackle chronic disease. However, there is as yet little in the way of tools to aid low and middle income countries in assessing the performance of their primary care systems and their ability to achieve each of the objectives in the WHO strategy.

There have been advances in the measurement of primary care that allow for ascertainment of the functions of primary care services and providers. These include approaches such as the Primary Care Assessment Tools which allow measures to be taken of the ability of a primary care practice or a whole network of primary care providers to provide

26 World Health Organization, Primary 2008.
first contact care, continued person-focused care over time, comprehensive care that meets most population health needs, to effectively coordinate care provided by other services and levels of the health system, culturally appropriate care, and to provide a link with community-based approaches to public health and health promotion. Such tools have been applied in several countries, including Brazil, Spain, New Zealand, Hong Kong, the USA and other countries, but have not, to date, been linked with the study of AH or other forms of health systems assessment.\textsuperscript{27-37}

A. Hospitalizations for ambulatory care–sensitive conditions and primary care effectiveness

Hospitalizations for ambulatory care–sensitive conditions (also referred to as avoidable hospitalizations) have been used to monitor health system performance in the United States and in several European countries. The idea behind the indicator is that hospitalizations for certain health problems represent a failure of the health system to provide access to good quality primary care, which should have detected the condition early in its progression, reduced its severity, or prevented the appearance of complications, thus obviating the need for hospitalization. Avoidable hospitalization rates have been associated with primary care access and quality for adults as well as children in several countries, including Australia, Canada, Spain, and the United States.\textsuperscript{38,42} Moreover, these conditions have been found to vary among different socioeconomic groups, even in countries with universal health coverage such as in Canada and Spain.\textsuperscript{43-46} Avoidable hospitalizations have also been used to guide health planning, aid in policy making, evaluate the effects of health policies, compare the performance of health systems, and identify inequalities between regions, communities and population groups.\textsuperscript{38, 44, 46-48} However, these measures have only recently been used to study health system performance in low- and middle-income countries.

The use of avoidable hospitalization rates is based on the premise that timely and high quality primary health care can help to avoid hospital admissions altogether or at least reduce their frequency for some health problems deemed sensitive to primary care. In order to achieve this, primary care services must be effective and comprehensive, so that patients are

\textsuperscript{27} Rocha, K.B., et al., 2007.
\textsuperscript{38} Bermudez-Tamayo, C., et al., 2004.
\textsuperscript{42} Laditka, J.N., S.B. Laditka, and J.C. Probst, 2005.
\textsuperscript{43} Roos, L.L., et al., 2005.
\textsuperscript{44} Shah, B.R., N. Gunraj, and J.E. Hux, 2003.
\textsuperscript{45} Magan, P., et al., 2008.
\textsuperscript{49} Starfield, B., 2002.
hospitalized only in serious cases or when there are complications. Good quality primary health care should improve population health by preventing the occurrence of disease and/or reducing the seriousness of health problems and their complications through health promotion, injury prevention, early diagnosis and treatment, disease management, and adequate follow-up of cases. For example, primary care actions can reduce hospital admissions for preventable infectious diseases through immunization (e.g. measles, tetanus, diphtheria and others) and prompt treatment (e.g. gastroenteritis and pneumonia), as well as reducing admissions, readmissions and length of hospital stay for acute complications of non-communicable diseases (e.g. diabetes, hypertension, and congestive heart failure). Note that alongside the use of avoidable hospitalizations, there has been a parallel development of examination of emergency department (ED) use for a number of the same conditions. These indicators are complementary to the avoidable hospitalizations conditions, since a number of the conditions for which people seek care at the ED are a result of poor access to primary care, and some of these may be less serious (and potentially of a higher volume) than those that actually required a hospital admission. To date, there appears to be less analysis of ED use than avoidable hospitalizations in low and middle income countries.

B. How is primary care related to avoidable hospitalizations for ambulatory care sensitive conditions?

The primary assumption behind the avoidable hospitalizations indicator is that for a given set of conditions, access to quality primary health care should have resulted in prevention or better management of these conditions to prevent hospitalizations or reduce their frequency. But how is this supposed to work in practice?

Specific aspects of primary care are thought to be associated with reductions in avoidable hospitalizations. These include access (measured most commonly by primary care physician density, health insurance, geographic distance to primary care providers), continuity of care, primary care ability to coordinate care provided at specialist and outpatient settings, and the comprehensiveness of care provided at the primary level. But these measures have been studied in only a handful of studies. Exhibit 5 presents a framework, adapted from Caminal and Casanova, for visualizing the ways in which

---

52 Menec, V.H., et al., 2006.
primary care may act to reduce avoidable hospitalization rates. The figure identifies a number of contextual factors associated with the risk of hospitalization, including population characteristics (age and sex distribution, socioeconomic status, epidemiologic profile, insurance coverage), health provider characteristics (e.g. practice patterns, levels of training, incentives), health services (e.g. geographical location and distribution, financial barriers to access), health systems (e.g. norms for referral and counter-referral, practice guidelines, regulations and monitoring of quality standards), and health policy (factors affecting the distribution of risk factors in the population, availability of social safety nets). Given this overall context, an individual seeking care for a non-emergency condition would ideally first consult with their primary care provider and have their health problem resolved (sequence A). In a health system where primary care is the first point of contact, it is expected that the sequence A would dominate, especially given studies suggesting that good quality primary care is capable of resolving the majority of population health needs.\textsuperscript{55,56}

In sequence A1, individuals access primary care as the first point of contact and then are referred from primary to specialized or diagnostic care. Primary care thus plays its important coordination role and patients (and the information generated in the specialist encounter) return to the patient’s primary care provider. It is expected that when sequence A and A1 are followed, rates of AH should be low.

In contrast, sequence B1 and B2 represent utilization patterns where primary care is either not easily accessible (due to geographic, financial, organization, or other barriers) or it does not perform its role as first contact care. In sequence B1, patients go directly to specialist providers without having consulted at primary care level. In sequence B2, patients go directly to emergency rooms or hospitals for care that could be managed at the primary care level.

Sequence C represents another sub-optimal pathway that may generate avoidable hospitalizations. In this scenario, patients present to primary care, but, due to either a) lack of previous access to primary care interventions, b) poor primary care quality provided, or c) lack of capacity at the primary care level to treat what should be a controllable condition, the individual is referred immediately to the emergency room or hospital.

Several studies also emphasize the importance of hospital and specialty care as additional factors that may affect avoidable hospitalization rates. If needed specialty care is not coordinated by primary care providers (whether due to structural barriers within the
health system or other factors such as insurance status or ability to pay) then this may also
result in higher avoidable hospitalization rates. Likewise, hospitals with financial incentives
to admit patients may have higher avoidable hospitalizations due to induced demand.

C. What constitutes an “ambulatory care sensitive” condition?

There may be different expectations for the way in which primary care acts to reduce
avoidable hospitalizations. For some conditions, avoidable hospitalizations may be
completely avoided, such as for hospitalizations related to immunization preventable
conditions (e.g. measles, tetanus). Second are those acute conditions for which hospitalization
could be reduced through early diagnosis and prompt treatment within primary care settings
(e.g. dehydration, gastroenteritis). Third are those conditions for which primary care could
reduce hospitalizations for acute complications (e.g. diabetic coma) and reduce admissions,
re-admissions, and length of hospital stay (e.g. congestive heart failure). For this reason, the
selection of the conditions which are included in the AH list is essential.

The US Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) identified two main
types of avoidable hospitalizations. Type 1 consists of conditions “for which the risk of
hospitalization can be reduced, either through better outpatient management of chronic
diseases (asthma, congestive heart failure--CHF , diabetes) or through more timely diagnosis
and effective treatment of acute conditions (pneumonia, UTI, cellulitis)”. Type two
consists of "conditions for which evidence exists that specific ambulatory care modalities
reduce hospitalization rates.” The latter differs from category 1 because it specifically
identifies problems in primary care, such as a lack of prior outpatient visits or antibiotic
prescriptions. The AHRQ report notes that type 1 is the best validated and serves as the basis
for their quality indicators. These include: dehydration, bacterial pneumonia, urinary
infection, perforated appendix, angina, adult asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease,
congestive heart failure, diabetes (short and long term complications, uncontrolled diabetes,
and lower extremity amputation), hypertension, low birth weight, pediatric asthma and
pediatric gastroenteritis.

---

58 Purdy, S., et al., 2009.
Other recent efforts have been made to attempt to standardize the conditions and make more explicit their relationship to primary care. These have included techniques such as Delphi and other consensus based approaches. However, despite its uses in multiple countries, there is no international consensus concerning how the list of conditions should be composed and there are now several alternative lists used both among and within different countries.

The AHRQ provides a summary of evidence for their avoidable hospitalization indicators (they use the acronym ACSC) based on specific criteria. These include:

- Precision: All of the ACSC indicators can be measured relatively precisely, and all involve serious complications that are at least somewhat common.
- Minimum bias: Many factors that influence area healthcare utilization rates can also influence area ACSC rates. Other factors include environmental conditions for COPD and pediatric asthma. Socioeconomic status is related to ACSC rates and this can complicate attribution of differences in rates to problems in accessing primary care or other explanations such as patient preferences or hospital capacity.
- Construct validity: Better outpatient (primary) care can reduce complication rates that may generate an ACSC admission. Most of the ACSC rates are correlated with each other, suggesting a common underlying factor that influences them.
- Fosters true quality improvement: "Despite the relationships demonstrated at the patient level between higher-quality ambulatory care and lower rates of admission with subsequent complication, there is generally little evidence on whether improvements in access to high-quality care can reduce ACSC hospitalization rates in an area….On the other hand, there is also little evidence that use of these quality indicators would have any undesirable effects on hospital activities.”

Exhibit 6 provides a list of the most common conditions (that are also classified as NCDs) used in a selection of international studies. There appears to be more agreement on these conditions (with some important exceptions such as diabetes) than among some of the infectious and other conditions included in full lists of AH conditions used internationally.

---

III. State of the art and unanswered questions in using AH to study primary care and chronic disease control

This section is based on the literature as well as discussion with researchers about best practices, precautions and unanswered questions related to using avoidable hospitalization measures when assessing primary care and NCDs in low and middle income contexts. It is provided to stimulate further discussion and debate.

A. Data availability and quality

Most published studies use data from government administrative databases that were designed for payment. These claims data often have the advantage of being very large since they are based on individual patients and contain a variety of clinical and demographic data and are generally thought to be of good quality. Some limitations include the fact that in the United States, such claims are available only for individuals 65 years of or over or for those with access to Medicaid (which has different eligibility criteria in each state and so presents a serious selection issue). While a few other studies collect primary data based on emergency room or admissions data collected as a single hospital or within one city. The latter may be one way to study avoidable hospitalizations in countries with decentralized healthcare management structures.

A key challenge for most low and middle income countries will be to identify appropriate national or regional databases, to verify the quality of the clinical data contained therein, and to assess the extent to which the data can be used for research and surveillance purposes. This includes having, at minimum, valid indicators of the patients’ place of residence, age, sex and ideally information about other health services use, including other admissions, length of hospital stay, etc. In many public systems, managers and health providers may be skeptical about the quality of the diagnostic codes included in patient records. These may be influenced by poor record keeping or by financial or other incentives based on the way the hospital itself is financed. In addition to these possible systematic issues, analysis of time series data must also take into account compatibility with ICD9 and ICD10 codes is important as it affects several conditions included in most avoidable hospitalization condition lists.
Another important consideration is the scope of the database and the population it represents. In mixed public and private systems, it may be difficult or even impossible to capture all hospital use. This includes the ability to calculate meaningful denominators (what is the true population at risk for hospitalization in a public hospital if 25% of the population has private insurance?). Moreover, results can be skewed due to potential for selection bias, i.e. poorer patients may be sicker and use the public system, or private providers may not cover sicker patients or fail to cover some high-cost procedures.

B. Study design, measurement issues, and unit of analysis

Studies presented in Exhibit 7 range from simple correlations of avoidable hospitalization rates with SES measures, to natural experiments using panel data methods with instrumental variables. They include both explicit tests of the hypothesis that primary care can reduce avoidable hospitalizations alongside studies that infer this relationship based on results where avoidable rates are compared to all hospitalizations or a set of “non-avoidable” conditions for which hospitalizations are thought to be relatively stable.

An important source of variation among studies is the unit of analysis. The studies listed in Exhibit 7 vary from city (municipality, metropolitan statistical area), to state, to region, to national-level. Given the well-known modifiable areal unit problem (MAUP), the level of aggregation at which rates are measured by introduce different conclusions based on resulting differences in AH rates. The AHRQ recommends constructing denominators at the “area level” and (with the exception of perforated appendix and low birth weight rate) this is defined as the age- and sex-adjusted population rate of hospitalization with the procedure or diagnosis. For the exceptions, all hospitalized cases of appendicitis and all births are used. The authors note that “By constructing ambulatory-care sensitive condition indicators at the area level, outliers for these measures will not simply be hospitals that specialize in procedures or that happen to care for a disproportionate share of patients receiving poor outpatient care.” They also note that “because HCUP (healthcare utilization project) data do not include specific information on patient residence (e.g., zip code), it is not possible to construct meaningful measures of area rates for very small areas. The smallest feasible area
for analysis is the level that provides relatively modest "leakage" into or out of hospitals within the area at the level of metropolitan statistical areas (MSA).” 57

The studies differ to the extent to which they explicitly include measures of primary care. Many studies assess variations in avoidable hospitalizations occur either by geography or by population groups. Authors often attribute these variations to poor access to and quality of primary care, but do not always explicitly include measures of primary care access, utilization, or quality. Others note that factors such as practice patterns at the hospital, induced demand at the hospital, or other aspects of the health system that could be driving such results.

An essential challenge for many potential uses of the indicator is that of obtaining appropriate information on denominators. Basic demographic information may be unavailable at each geo-political unit for each year. It may not be available for age-specific groups and these age groups may not match the age groups present in the numerator. Further, there is a tension in the literature over using the entire population in an area or attempting to construct a more precise measure of the population at risk of hospitalization in that particular hospital. This has been accomplished by counting only those with a certain type of insurance, those with a certain type of benefit plan, or by limiting analysis to specific hospital catchment areas.

C. Data analysis

The studies also demonstrate a variety of different approaches to data analysis. A number of the studies listed in exhibit 7 perform ecological-level analyses to compare changes of aggregate level avoidable hospitalization rates with changes in other factors, such as primary care supply. Other studies take advantage of claims data to assess rates at the individual-level, while controlling for confounders such as co-morbidity or illness severity of each individual.

Because it can be difficult to obtain data and to create stable rates at small areas of analysis, some studies use count models (e.g. Poisson or negative binomial) to perform multivariable analyses or to measures rates of change. Other studies prefer to construct rates and often perform demographic adjustment to these rates before then using them in multivariable models. These two approaches may yield somewhat different conclusions

depending on how the rates are calculating, the means of rate adjustment used, and the type of analysis performed.

Numerous studies have found adjustment for other chronic conditions (comorbidities) as well as other risk factors (age, sex), and some behaviors (smoking) can change the interpretation of rates (as above or below expected values, or affecting the ranking of different health services areas). Careful adjustment for these factors is essential, yet many countries do not have individual-level “claims” data and those that do may not have it available in such a way as to do risk adjustment. Moreover, there are numerous ways to adjust for such risks and using different methods may result in different results. The studies presented in the annex differ greatly in availability of individual-level claims data and the subsequent choice of risk adjustment methods.

Another important difference among studies is whether they assess avoidable hospitalization measures (specific diagnostic codes) as a group or condition by condition. Many of the avoidable hospitalization indicators were developed as part of a set designed to comprehensively examine access to care. These indicators have been most often validated as a set and not individually and AHRQ recommends using them together as a set may be particularly ideal, since the evidence for some of these indicators alone is unclear. But at the same time, it may well be that the primary care actions needed to prevent hospitalizations from different conditions may be quite different (e.g. primary versus secondary versus tertiary prevention) and this might require disaggregating the conditions further.

Finally, studies differ dramatically in the inclusion of other factors in multivariable models. These include measures related to the hospital itself, the presence of different types of insurance or payment modalities, means of controlling for yearly trends and fixed effects. There is evidence that individual risk factors (such as illness severity) are associated with poorer access to primary care prior to the hospitalization as well as poor hospital capacity in rural areas to deal with highly advanced cases.66,67 Current and previous smoking as well as severe alcohol misuse is also associated with higher avoidable hospitalization rates although these measures are available in only a handful of datasets.68

IV. An agenda for advancing knowledge on avoidable hospitalizations and their use to understand the effectiveness of primary (health) care in chronic disease control in low and middle income countries

This section provides elements of a knowledge agenda seeking to advance understanding about avoidable hospitalizations as a diagnostic tool for assessing health system performance. The objective is to stimulate debate and lay out a series of questions that may benefit from an international collaborative approach to research and action.

- What is the role of primary health care in preventing avoidable hospitalizations? Does it differ by condition, by population, by health system?
- Are declining rates of avoidable hospitalizations an indicator of better access to primary care or better quality of care or both? What is the best way to understand these differences?
- Does analysis of avoidable hospitalizations depend on the development and validation of a single list of conditions? Can the validation be done in a way to make the conditions (or at least a subset thereof) similar across time, geography, and health system type?
- If primary care’s most important role is in secondary and tertiary prevention, how does the use of avoidable hospitalization as an indicator avoid promoting an overly medicalized, organ-based approach to people’s health? This could be considered contrary to a longitudinal, whole person-based approach often considered a hallmark of good quality primary care.
- How do approaches to priority setting and technology assessment relate to chronic disease prevention in primary care? Are all the available tools available at the primary care level in most countries? Are all the most important treatments available? Are primary care providers up-to-date in their knowledge and ability to use these technologies and treatments?
- What is the role of primary health care within primary care? That is, how to maximize both the clinical contribution (primary care) and the wider set of policies and actions linking clinical care to public health and intersectorial actions?
- What is the role of human resources? Which professionals have which functions in primary care? Is there a gold standard for what level of training for each action? How can teams be made to perform more effectively and efficiently? And how should
universities and professional training programs be structured to assure that the right type of professionals with the right kind of training are available when they are needed and into the future?

- What is the role of incentives within the health system in assuring that potentially avoidable hospitalizations are actually reduced? How do cost pressures at the hospital-level influence admission decisions? How do payment mechanisms at the hospital level (e.g. fee for service) and primary care level (e.g. capitation) create incentives for primary care to under-treat or hospitals to over-admit?
## Exhibit 1: The Rising NCD Challenge and Younger Populations

### Deaths from NCDs as a share of total deaths, 2008-2030*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>All ages, percent</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Ages 14-59, percent</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-income countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>+12%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>+11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East &amp; North Africa</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>+13%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>+3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>+12%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>+5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>+39%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>+17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle- and low-income countries by region</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>+64%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>+44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes: *Analysis by region uses WHO updated estimates for 2008 and baseline projections for 2030; analysis by income group uses WHO 2008-2030 baseline projections.
Exhibit 2: WHO estimates of age-adjusted chronic disease mortality rates, 2010

Source: WHO Global Infobase (https://apps.who.int/infobase/Index.aspx)
Exhibit 3: The Chronic Disease Model

Positive Policy Environment

- Strengthen partnerships
- Support legislative frameworks
- Integrate policies
- Provide leadership and advocacy
- Promote consistent financing
- Develop and allocate human resources

Community

- Raise awareness and reduce stigma
- Encourage better outcomes through leadership and support
- Mobilize and coordinate resources
- Provide complementary services

Links

Health Care Organization

- Promote continuity and coordination
- Encourage quality through leadership and incentives
- Organize and equip health care teams
- Use information systems
- Support self-management and prevention

Better Outcomes for Chronic Conditions

Source: Adapted from 15, 16

### Exhibit 4: Primary care and NCD prevention and control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCD</th>
<th>Main primary health care actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preventable cancers (breast, cervical, colon, prostate, lung)</td>
<td>Regular screening, smoking cessation, diet and exercise counseling, coordination of other care (including diagnostic tests not available in primary care)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>Blood glucose monitoring, glucose-lowering medications, control of cardiovascular risk factors, coordination of other care and medications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>Blood pressure monitoring; prescription and adherence to anti-hypertensives; smoking cessation, diet and exercise counseling; coordination of other care and medications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cardiovascular diseases (angina, AMI)</td>
<td>Blood pressure monitoring; prescription and adherence to anti-hypertensives and lipid-lowering drugs; smoking cessation, diet and exercise counseling; coordination of other care and medications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebrovascular diseases (stroke)</td>
<td>Blood pressure monitoring; prescription and adherence to medications; smoking cessation, diet and exercise counseling; coordination of other care and medications, post-stroke rehabilitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>Assessment of asthma control, monitoring use of rescue inhaler, coordination of other care and medications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease</td>
<td>Smoking cessation counseling; referral and coordination of diagnostic and specialty care and medications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 5: Conceptual Framework for AHs and Primary Care

**Context**
- Characteristics
  - Population
  - Professionals
  - Health services
  - Health system
  - Health policies

**Health problem resolved or managed**

**Primary care**

**Specialized Care**

**Emergency room/Hospitalization**

- **A** = primary care is first contact into the health system; individual treated in primary care
- **A** = primary care is first contact into the health system; individual referred by primary care
- **B** = primary care is not first contact into the health system
- **C** = primary care not able to resolve problem (due to lack of access, capacity, or quality)

Source: Adapted from Caminal and Casanova, 2003
### Exhibit 6: Most common NCD conditions included in studies of AH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asthma (J45, J46)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J41</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J42</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J43</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J47</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J44</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(I11.9)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.0, 111.0, 112.0, 113.0, J67.4, I15.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angina pectoris (I20, I24)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(I24.0, I24.8-9)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart disease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I13.9, I11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J81</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J21 (AMI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebrovascular diseases (I60-69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes mellitus (E10.0 - E11.1)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(I11.0)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10.0 - E10.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10.2 - E11.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12.0 - E12.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12.2 - E12.8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13.2 - E13.8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14.2 - E14.8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10.9, E11.9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12.9, E13.9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14.9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16.1 - E16.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(iatrogenic)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G40, G41</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X = present in list; "-" = absent in list; N/A = study used only larger ICD categories
### Exhibit 7: Selected studies on AH and primary care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study, region, year</th>
<th>Primary Care Measure</th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>Analytic technique</th>
<th>AH Measure</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agabiti Italy 2009</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Age, gender, city of residence (Turin, Milan, Bologna, Rome)</td>
<td>Poisson regression analysis</td>
<td>Diabetes, hypertension, congestive heart failure, angina pectoris, COPD, and asthma; ICD-9-CM, (from AHRQ)</td>
<td>Low income people more likely to be hospitalized; socioeconomic gradient in ACSC hospitalization rates confirms gap in health status between social groups in Italy; insufficient or ineffective PC suggested as plausible factor aggravating inequality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billings Canada, US 1996</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Age, sex, area-level income</td>
<td>Linear regression</td>
<td>Billings ACSC list (ICD-9-CM for US, ICD-9 for Canada)</td>
<td>Large differences in admissions between low- and high-income areas remained regardless of citywide rates or geographic area; strong association in US urban areas between low-income residents ACS rates; No income gradient in Toronto, even for chronic conditions (eg, asthma, diabetes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blustein USA 1998</td>
<td>Access to care, propensity to receive care</td>
<td>Age and sex, general health status, insurance, education; income, prior medical history</td>
<td>Descriptive stats, bivariate associations, multivariate models</td>
<td>Billings ACSC list (ICD-9-CM (21 conditions)</td>
<td>Among Medicare beneficiaries, low SES associated with poor health; poorer, sicker, and less-educated elders more prone to ACSC hospitalization; using preventable hospitalizations as indicators of health plan quality without proper adjustment is prone to substantial bias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang USA 2011</td>
<td>Adult primary care physician workforce (general internists and family physicians)</td>
<td>Age, sex, race, presence of chronic conditions, income, specialty mix, hospital bed capacity</td>
<td>Multilevel Poisson models</td>
<td>12 ACSC from AHRQ (convulsions, COPD, pneumonia, asthma, CHF, hypertension, angina, cellulitis, diabetes, gastroenteritis, kidney or urinary infection, and dehydration)</td>
<td>A higher level of PC physician workforce, particularly with an FTE measure, was generally associated with lower AH hospitalizations, lower mortality, and lower medical costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correa-Velez Australia 2007</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Age, sex</td>
<td>Standardized rate ratios with confidence levels based on gamma distribution</td>
<td>classification for ACSC applied in Victorian Ambulatory Care Sensitive Conditions Study (acute, chronic, and vaccine-preventable categories), using ICD-10-AM</td>
<td>Preventable hospitalizations among people born in refugee-source countries were no higher than Australia-born population averages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dourado Brazil 2011</td>
<td>Family Health Program (FHP) (enrolment) at the state level</td>
<td>Age, sex, living conditions, availability of healthcare services, year trends</td>
<td>Fixed effects multivariate negative binomial regression</td>
<td>Brazil ACSH list PHCSC hospital admissions declined by 24% at national level; at state level, regression models showed the greater the FHP coverage, the less PHCSC hospital admissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiorentini Italy (Emilia-Romagna region) 2010</td>
<td>GP pay-for-performance, pay-for-participation, and pay-for-compliance schemes</td>
<td>For GPs: gender, age, practice location, type of practice for patients: gender, age, comorbidities. For district: hospitalization rate, total beds</td>
<td>Three-level logit model</td>
<td>27 medical diagnostic related groups (DRGs) selected by Emilia-Romagna region vs. ACSCs developed by Billings (ICD-9-CM) Pay-for-performance schemes may have significant effect over aggregate indicators of appropriate use of health resources; effectiveness of pay-for-participation schemes captured only by taking into account subpopulations affected by specific diseases; performance improvements limited to the specific policy targets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giuffrida UK 1999</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Age, sex, co-morbidities</td>
<td>Multiple regression analysis</td>
<td>Asthma, diabetes, epilepsy (ICD-10) At health authority level, socioeconomic characteristics, health status, and secondary care resources explained 45%, 33%, and 55% of variation in admission rates for asthma, diabetes, and epilepsy, respectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guanais Brazil 2009</td>
<td>Expansion of the Family Health Program (FHP) and Community Health Agents Program (PACS)</td>
<td>% municipal health expenditures, quartiles of municipal ambulatory care facilities, health exp./ capita, ambulatory facilities and hospital beds per 1000, illiteracy rates, clean water supply, per capita income, percentage of municipal pop ≥60, female pop ≥60, total female pop</td>
<td>Multivariate longitudinal analysis (using panel data); with fixed-effects specification in municipalities with good quality data</td>
<td>Diabetes mellitus; respiratory and circulatory conditions FHP expansions associated with reductions in hospitalizations for diabetes mellitus and respiratory problems; CHAP expansions associated with reductions in circulatory conditions hospitalizations; these impacts were found only in women.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hossain South Carolina 2009</td>
<td>GP supply</td>
<td>Population lifestyle, SES, physician practice behaviors, pop tendency to use health care resources, and disease prevalence</td>
<td>Multivariate spatial factor analysis</td>
<td>Diabetes complications, uncontrolled diabetes, lower extremity amputation, adult asthma, hypertension, dehydration, UTI, bacterial pneumonia, angina w/o procedure, COPD, CHF For South Carolina pop ≥18, counties with high rates of ED visits had less access to Primary Care; no community health centers were found in these counties, suggesting CHCs improve PC access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macinko</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Family Health Program (FHP) (% population covered in microregions 1999-2007)</td>
<td>Dynamic panel estimation</td>
<td>Higher FHP coverage associated with lower ACS rates; higher private/non-profit contracted hospital beds associated with higher ACS rates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macinko</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Family Health Program (FHP) (% population covered in municipalities 1999-2007)</td>
<td>Fixed-effects negative binomial regression approach with instrumental variables</td>
<td>Hospitalizations for main chronic diseases fallen significantly since 1999; expansion of FHP associated up to 13% of this decline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magan</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Geographical variation in GP density (implicit)</td>
<td>Coeff. of variation, systematic coeff of variation, weighted coeff of variation, ratio of variation, Chi-square, Student’s t, Pearson correlation</td>
<td>Significant variation in “preventable” hospitalizations b/w districts; in all, men present rates higher than women; important variations in access despite universal health coverage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendonca</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Family Health Program (FHP) coverage by census tract in BH from 2003-2006</td>
<td>Mixed model analysis (random coefficient model)</td>
<td>FHS contributed to reduction in hospitalizations due to primary care sensitive conditions while promoting greater health equality; 18% decrease in hospitalizations for sensitive conditions over 4yr period soon after large-scale implementation of FHS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nede</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Family Health Program (FHP)</td>
<td>Poisson model</td>
<td>ACSC accounted for 42.6% of hospitalizations; lower probability of ACSC among patients in Family Health Areas and among FHP users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rizza</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td># patients/GP, PCP access in past year, satisfaction with PCP</td>
<td>Multivariate logistic regression analysis of random sample of 520 patients in hospital</td>
<td>Proportion of patients who had preventable hospitalization significantly increased with regard to number of hospital admissions in previous year and to number of patients for each PCP, with lower number of PCP accesses and PCP medical visit in previous year, with less satisfaction about PCP health service, and with worse self-reported health status and shorter length of hospital stay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Saha  
| Oregon  
| 2007 |
| No PC measure (PC access implicitly assumed) | Age-sex standardize rates (Medicaid, Medicaid plus uninsured, uninsured population) | Logistic regression models, retrospective, time series analysis before/after health insurance expansion | Principal diagnosis of asthma, cellulitis, CHF, diabetes, gangrene, hypertension; or secondary diagnosis of asthma and COPD if primary diagnosis was pneumonia or bronchitis (ICD-9-CM) | Annual preventable hospitalization (PH) rates in the Medicaid + uninsured pop increased after eligibility expansion; non-Medicaid insured population experienced slight decline in annual PH rates. |
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