## Medication Adherence Patterns and Targeted Interventions

## **Cerner**

Darcy Davis Advocate Cerner Collaboration, Advocate Health Care, Chicago, IL

## Introduction

Medication adherence is an important factor for controlling medical utilization and cost, as well as improving outcomes and quality of life. Studies about consequences of non-adherence vary widely in methods, drug classes, populations, and outcomes. How much is enough, varies by patient, condition and drug. Furthermore, while often overlooked in research, adherence pattern is relevant. For example, taking a daily medication every other day is not clinically equivalent to stopping medication for 3 months. Similar to research on adherence consequences, results reporting the effectiveness of interventions show widely varying results. There are many different causes of medication non-adherence, including personal choices, access issues, and barriers to medication management. Unsurprisingly, the effectiveness of interventions depends on the root cause. Patient needs and quality of life must be central to the conversation in order to incentivize adherence.

This project is focused on measuring and describing patient medication adherence patterns and ultimately applying the data to inform clinical decisions, design intervention strategies, and improve patient outcomes. Our approach is structured in incremental stages, each designed to produce both immediately applicable results and support for future stages. We are currently finalizing Stage 3, and earlier stages continue to be refined.

## Stage 1: Measure and Define Adherence Patterns

#### **Goals:**

- 1. Calculate medication adhrence scores appropriate for a rolling time frame in a clinical setting
- 2. Design a graphic for a quick, intuitive look at adherence "big picture", encompassing both medication-specific adherence and patient-level patterns.
- 3. Define patient-level labels that describe intervention-relevant adherence patterns in a few simple words.



#### **PDC Scores**

To measure medication adherence, we used the Percentage of Days Covered (PDC) measure applied to pharmacy insurance claims. PDC is calculated as the proportion of days in a time interval that are covered, where a covered day indicates that the medication was available to the patient on that day. Good PDC methods adjust pharmacy fill data to account for early refills and prescriptions extending past the study end date.

Advocate Health Care

$$PDC = \frac{Days Covered}{Eligible Days} = \frac{95}{150} = 0.63$$

#### - all prescribed, long-term medications Patient x52, Female, Age 54 Patient x01, Male, Age 45 Patient x81, Female, Age 34 Patient x76, Male, Age 40 -adherence score, fill pattern, and days covered for fenofibrat ateno furosemid olmesartar each prescription simvastatiı hydrochlorothiazide Q4: PDC 75 - 100 citalopra valsartan (160m -overall pattern of adherence across all prescriptions olmesarta **Adherence Pattern Labels** amlodipi lisonopr Q3: PDC 50 - 75 **Base Labels** (all patient have 1 base label) topirama celecox -High: 75% of prescriptions in Q4 -Moderate: 75% of prescriptions in Q3 furosemide G\_\_\_\_\_ risperidone ergocalciferc hydrochlorothiazide benztropin Q2: PDC 25 - 50 -Low: 75% or prescriptions in Q1 and Q2 valsartan (320mg -Mixed: all other patients drospirenone ethinyl estradio amlodipin pantaprazole **Add-On Labels** (patients may have 1+ add-on labels) lamotrigine Q1: PDC 0 - 25 bupropio -Outlier: 1+ drugs with PDC 2+ quartiles from base dexlansoprazole G--Sync Gap: 3+ drugs with sychronized gaps Days Days Days Days -End Gap: no coverage within 30 days of end date -Overpossession: >120% possession ratio High, Outlier, Sync Gap, End Gap Moderate, Sync Gap, End Gap Low, End Gap Mixed, End Gap

## Stage 2: Adherence Statistics and Relationships to Patient Outcomes

#### **Goals:**

1. Determine the distributions of prescription patterns and adherence behaviors in an Advocate population

2. Demonstrate meaningful relationships between adherence labels and health outcomes (proof-of-concept analysis)

#### Data

Medication adherence scores and labels were computed for the Advocate population of commercially insured patients (n=49,306) with at least one maintenance drug fill in the 180 day period from July 5, 2011 to December 31, 2011 (the last 180 days in 2011). This span covered 736,276 fills across 123,998 prescriptions. Drugs were not grouped by class or category. Outcomes data was extracted from claims with dates of service during the study period and the subsequent 180 day period, from January 1, 2012 to June 28, 2012. The included outcomes were number of inpatient admissions, number of ED visits, and total cost of care.

#### **Prescription Statistics**

- 75.9% of patients (60.2% of prescriptions) had at least one gap of 5+ days -54.3% of patients (36.7% of prescriptions) had temporary gaps -49.0% of patients (31.5% of prescriptions) had end gaps (non-persistence)







#### **Label Distributions**

	Total		Outlier		Overpossession		End Gap	Sync Gap		
High	26,373	(53.5)	1,449	(5.5)	951	(3.6)	2,185	(8.3)	765	(2.9)
Moderate	4,384	(8.9)	35	(0.8)	5	(0.1)	1,442	(32.9)	225	(5.1)
Low	5,706	(11.6)	187	(3.3)	0	(0.0)	5,009	(87.8)	58	(1.0)
Mixed	12,843	(26.0)	NA		251	(2.0)	9,851	(76.7)	984	(7.7)
Total	49,306	(100.0)	1,671	(3.4)	1,207	(2.4)	18,487	(37.5)	2,032	(4.1)

#### **Outcomes Comparison**

	High	Moderate	Low	Mixed	
Count	24,110	3,964	5,132	11720	
Average PDC	0.93	0.63	0.29	0.64	
Cost (PMPM)	858.14	740.68	1045.99	1454.61	
Inpatient Days (PM)	0.2959	0.2762	0.4799	0.6538	
ED Days (PM)	0.0018	0.0013	0.0033	0.0032	

Patient ID:

#### Goals:

1. Incorporate drug- and patient-specific information into adherence statsistics on labels and outcomes 2. Conduct patient survey/study to record self-reported causes of observed medication gaps or non-persistence 3. Collect clinicial feedback on developed tools and concepts (beta-testing)

Age: Gender:

Location:	

**Goals:** 

3 coordinated outpatient clinics	x01	45	Male Female		☐ Acute condition ⊠ Chronic condition ☐ Routine	
•	Adherence Base Label:	I			Additional Labels:	
Cohort/Users:	🗌 High 🛛 Moderate 🗌 Low 🗌	Mixed			<ul> <li>□ Temporary Gap ⊠ End Gap ⊠ Sync Gap</li> <li>□ Outlier □ Overpossession</li> </ul>	
<u>Beta-testing</u> All clinicians	Atenolol Topirimate Amlodipine Celecoxib Lisonopril				Adherence Gap Rationale:CostImportSide EffectLanguage/Literacy BarrierNot NecessaryPhysical ImpairmentStigmaUnable to Obtain	Auto-generated content
	☐ Temporary Gap ☐ End Gap ⊠ ☐ Outlier ☐ Overpossession	Sync Gap	)		Patient is stretching medication due to financial pressure	Clinician Input
<u>Patient Needs/Baseline Pilot</u> Outpatient Pharmacists Select Physicians	Furosemide				Adherence Gap Rationale:CostMemorySide EffectLanguage/Literacy BarrierNot NecessaryPhysical ImpairmentStigmaUnable to Obtain	
	<ul> <li>☐ Temporary Gap</li> <li>☑ End Gap</li> <li>□ Outlier</li> <li>□ Overpossession</li> </ul>	Sync Gap	•		Patient reports feeling lightheaded after taking furosemide	
	Comments: Please describe advice					
	Referred to social work for financia Change some anti-hypertensives to	al support o night ad	ministral	tion.		

Primary reason for visit:

## Stage 4: Design Evidence- and Value-Driven Pilots

# 1. Design adherence intervention pilots tailored to needs of target populations

2. Early Pilot: targeted interventions for highly adherent patients with high-opportunity outliers

### Summary

<ul> <li>While the majority of patients are highly adherent, nearly 76% of patients had at least one medication gap of 5 or more days. The (narrow) majority of gaps are temporary.</li> <li>A mixed pattern of adherence is nearly 3 times more likely than consistently moderate adherence.</li> <li>Moderate adherence (not mixed) is usually due to temporary gaps.</li> <li>Low and mixed patterns are most often attributable to non-persistence.</li> <li>At the population level, moderate adherence showed similar outcomes and</li> </ul>
lower cost than high adherence.
<ul> <li>Mixed adherence patterns resulted in similar outcomes to low adherence.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>A pilot of the medication adherence tool is ongoing in three coordinated out- patient clinics. Feedback from clinicians has been encouraging.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>"It's extremely beneficial for new patients or when you are taking care of a different physician's patients"</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>"Very helpful. It was useful in helping patients figure out reason for non- adherence"</li> </ul>
- "She was lying to me and I would have never known"

## Acknowledgements

Fran Wilk Amanda Sullins Cole Erdmann

Tina Esposito Rami Rihani Rick Bone

Anna Tarnowski Justine Janociak AMG Clinics Staff