

Transitional care programs to prevent hospital readmissions: Comprehensive programs

Health Care: System Efficiency

Benefit-cost estimates updated December 2016. Literature review updated December 2014.

Current estimates replace old estimates. Numbers will change over time as a result of model inputs and monetization methods.

The WSIPP benefit-cost analysis examines, on an apples-to-apples basis, the monetary value of programs or policies to determine whether the benefits from the program exceed its costs. WSIPP's research approach to identifying evidence-based programs and policies has three main steps. First, we determine "what works" (and what does not work) to improve outcomes using a statistical technique called meta-analysis. Second, we calculate whether the benefits of a program exceed its costs. Third, we estimate the risk of investing in a program by testing the sensitivity of our results. For more detail on our methods, see our [Technical Documentation](#).

Program Description: Comprehensive transitional care programs focus on preventing future hospital readmissions after discharge. Interventions include pre-discharge assistance (e.g., a transition coach, enhanced discharge planning, and primary care provider communication), as well as post-discharge follow-up.

The effects in this analysis reflect the effects of comprehensive transitional care programs on high-risk patient populations.

Benefit-Cost Summary Statistics Per Participant

Benefits to:

Taxpayers	\$826	Benefit to cost ratio	\$4.33
Participants	\$47	Benefits minus costs	\$1,377
Others	\$712	Chance the program will produce	
Indirect	\$206	benefits greater than the costs	100 %
Total benefits	\$1,790		
Net program cost	(\$413)		
Benefits minus cost	\$1,377		

The estimates shown are present value, life cycle benefits and costs. All dollars are expressed in the base year chosen for this analysis (2015). The chance the benefits exceed the costs are derived from a Monte Carlo risk analysis. The details on this, as well as the economic discount rates and other relevant parameters are described in our [Technical Documentation](#).

Detailed Monetary Benefit Estimates Per Participant

Benefits from changes to: ¹	Benefits to:				
	Participants	Taxpayers	Others ²	Indirect ³	Total
Health care associated with hospital readmissions	\$47	\$826	\$712	\$413	\$1,997
Adjustment for deadweight cost of program	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$207)	(\$207)
Totals	\$47	\$826	\$712	\$206	\$1,790

¹In addition to the outcomes measured in the meta-analysis table, WSIPP measures benefits and costs estimated from other outcomes associated with those reported in the evaluation literature. For example, empirical research demonstrates that high school graduation leads to reduced crime. These associated measures provide a more complete picture of the detailed costs and benefits of the program.

²“Others” includes benefits to people other than taxpayers and participants. Depending on the program, it could include reductions in crime victimization, the economic benefits from a more educated workforce, and the benefits from employer-paid health insurance.

³“Indirect benefits” includes estimates of the net changes in the value of a statistical life and net changes in the deadweight costs of taxation.


Detailed Annual Cost Estimates Per Participant

	Annual cost	Year dollars	Summary	
Program costs	\$413	2014	Present value of net program costs (in 2015 dollars)	(\$413)
Comparison costs	\$0	2014	Cost range (+ or -)	37 %

We estimated an average per-participant cost by computing an average of the typical costs reported in each study in our analysis. These costs include the salary of the nurse practitioner (main cost), cell phone and pager costs, mileage expenses, and costs for the reproduction of personal health record. When a study reported nursing staff hours, we estimated nursing costs by applying the most recent reported average wages reported in Washington State.

The figures shown are estimates of the costs to implement programs in Washington. The comparison group costs reflect either no treatment or treatment as usual, depending on how effect sizes were calculated in the meta-analysis. The cost range reported above reflects potential variation or uncertainty in the cost estimate; more detail can be found in our [Technical Documentation](#).

Detailed Annual Cost Estimates Per Participant



The graph above illustrates the estimated cumulative net benefits per-participant for the first fifty years beyond the initial investment in the program. We present these cash flows in non-discounted dollars to simplify the “break-even” point from a budgeting perspective. If the dollars are negative (bars below \$0 line), the cumulative benefits do not outweigh the cost of the program up to that point in time. The program breaks even when the dollars reach \$0. At this point, the total benefits to participants, taxpayers, and others, are equal to the cost of the program. If the dollars are above \$0, the benefits of the program exceed the initial investment.

Meta-Analysis of Program Effects										
Outcomes measured	No. of effect sizes	Treatment N	Adjusted effect sizes and standard errors used in the benefit-cost analysis						Unadjusted effect size (random effects model)	
			First time ES is estimated			Second time ES is estimated			ES	p-value
			ES	SE	Age	ES	SE	Age		
Hospital readmissions	11	1597	-0.289	0.061	72	0.000	0.000	73	-0.289	0.001

Meta-analysis is a statistical method to combine the results from separate studies on a program, policy, or topic in order to estimate its effect on an outcome. WSIPP systematically evaluates all credible evaluations we can locate on each topic. The outcomes measured are the types of program impacts that were measured in the research literature (for example, crime or educational attainment). Treatment N represents the total number of individuals or units in the treatment group across the included studies.

An effect size (ES) is a standard metric that summarizes the degree to which a program or policy affects a measured outcome. If the effect size is positive, the outcome increases. If the effect size is negative, the outcome decreases.

Adjusted effect sizes are used to calculate the benefits from our benefit cost model. WSIPP may adjust effect sizes based on methodological characteristics of the study. For example, we may adjust effect sizes when a study has a weak research design or when the program developer is involved in the research. The magnitude of these adjustments varies depending on the topic area.

WSIPP may also adjust the second ES measurement. Research shows the magnitude of some effect sizes decrease over time. For those effect sizes, we estimate outcome-based adjustments which we apply between the first time ES is estimated and the second time ES is estimated. We also report the unadjusted effect size to show the effect sizes before any adjustments have been made. More details about these adjustments can be found in our [Technical Documentation](#).

Citations Used in the Meta-Analysis

- Balaban, R.B., Weissman, J.S., Samuel, P.A., & Woolhandler, S. (2008). Redefining and redesigning hospital discharge to enhance patient care: a randomized controlled study. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 23*(8), 1228-33.
- Coleman, E.A., Parry, C., Chalmers, S., & Min, S.J. (2006). The care transitions intervention: results of a randomized controlled trial. *Archives of Internal Medicine, 166*(17), 1822-8.
- Coleman, E.A., Smith, J.D., Frank, J.C., Min, S.-J., Parry, C., & Kramer, A.M. (2004). Preparing Patients and Caregivers to Participate in Care Delivered Across Settings: The Care Transitions Intervention. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 52*(11), 1817-1825.
- Jack, B.W., Chetty, V.K., Anthony, D., Greenwald, J.L., Sanchez, G.M., Johnson, A.E., Forsythe, S.R., ... Culpepper, L. (2009). A reengineered hospital discharge program to decrease rehospitalization: a randomized trial. *Annals of Internal Medicine, 150*(3), 178-87.
- Laramee, A.S., Levinsky, S.K., Sargent, J., Ross, R., & Callas, P. (2003). Case management in a heterogeneous congestive heart failure population: a randomized controlled trial. *Archives of Internal Medicine, 163*(7), 809-17.
- Naylor, M., Brooten, D., Jones, R., Lavizzo-Mourey, R., Mezey, M., & Pauly, M. (1994). Comprehensive discharge planning for the hospitalized elderly: a randomized clinical trial. *Annals of Internal Medicine, 120*(12), 999-1006.
- Naylor, M.D., Brooten, D.A., Campbell, R.L., Maislin, G., McCauley, K.M., & Schwartz, J.S. (2004). Transitional Care of Older Adults Hospitalized with Heart Failure: A Randomized, Controlled Trial. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 52*(5), 675-684.
- Parry, C., Min, S.J., Chugh, A., Chalmers, S., & Coleman, E.A. (2009). Further application of the care transitions intervention: results of a randomized controlled trial conducted in a fee-for-service setting. *Home Health Care Services Quarterly, 28*, 2-3.
- Rich, M.W., Vinson, J.M., Sperry, J.C., Shah, A.S., Spinner, L.R., Chung, M.K., & Davila-Roman, V. (1993). Prevention of readmission in elderly patients with congestive heart failure: results of a prospective, randomized pilot study. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 8*(11), 585-90.
- Rich, M.W., Beckham, V., Wittenberg, C., Leven, C.L., Freedland, K.E., & Carney, R.M. (1995). A Multidisciplinary Intervention to Prevent the Readmission of Elderly Patients with Congestive Heart Failure. *New England Journal of Medicine, 333*(18), 1190-1195.

For further information, contact:
(360) 664-9800, institute@wsipp.wa.gov

Printed on 02-10-2017



Washington State Institute for Public Policy

The Washington State Legislature created the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors—representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities—governs WSIPP and guides the development of all activities. WSIPP's mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State.