Revised article title: Association of health care expenditures with aggressive versus

palliative care for cancer patients at the end of life: a cross-sectional study using claims data

in Japan

Revised running title: Terminal care and expenditure

Word count for the abstract: 249

Word count for the text of the manuscript: 2840

Abstract

Background: End-of-life (EOL) care imposes heavy economic burdens on patients and

health insurers. Little is known about the association between the types of EOL care and

health care costs for cancer patients across various providers.

Objective: To explore the association of health care expenditures with benchmarking

indicators of aggressive versus palliative care among terminally ill cancer patients, from the

perspective of health insurers.

Design: Cross-sectional retrospective study using health insurance claims data.

Setting/Participants: Cancer patients who had died in Kyoto prefecture, Japan, between

April 2009 and May 2010.

Main Outcome Measure: Claims data were analyzed using multilevel generalized linear

models to examine whether aggressive care and palliative care were associated with

expenditures during the last 3 months of life, after adjusting for patient characteristics, hospital characteristics, and other non-indicator procedures.

Results: We analyzed 3,143 decedents from 54 hospitals. Median expenditure per patient during the last 3 months was US$13,030. Higher expenditures were associated with the aggressive care indicators of higher mortality at acute-care hospitals and use of chemotherapy in the last month of life, as well as with the palliative care indicators of increased hospice care and opioid use in the last 3 months of life. However, increased physician home care in the last 3 months was associated with lower expenditure.

Conclusions: Indicators of both aggressive and palliative EOL care were associated with higher health care expenditures. These results may support the coherent development of measures to optimize aggressive care and reduce the financial burdens of terminal cancer care.

Introduction

The populations of many developed nations are aging rapidly, accompanied by dramatic increases in national health care costs. End-of-life (EOL) care imposes a substantial economic burden on patients and health insurers, and the EOL component of health care costs are frequently targeted in efforts to control overall costs [1,2]. Although numerous reports have been published on health care costs and the utilization of health care services in terminally ill patients, these tend to focus on all-cause mortality [1-8]. Among the leading causes of death, cancer has one of the highest fatality rates in many countries, including Japan [9]. Currently, there are not many studies that have explored EOL health care expenditures associated with cancer patients irrespective of cancer type [10-19]. Little is known about the determinants of EOL health care expenditures incurred for treating terminally ill cancer patients in various health care settings. Therefore, comprehensive studies that integrate various settings (e.g., hospitals, intensive care units [ICU], hospices, and patient homes) are required.

The quality of EOL care has also been the focus of numerous studies. Quality indicators based on procedures for terminal cancer care have been developed for analyses using administrative data [20-25]. Although intensive treatments may be employed during EOL care, aggressive procedures do not necessarily correlate with better quality of life (QOL) for the patients [26-29]. Therefore, replacing certain aspects of aggressive care in favor of increased palliative care may improve QOL and reduce the use of health care resources [2, 26].

Unfortunately, little is known about the relationship between aggressive/palliative care and health care expenditures at the EOL.

In contrast to the US and Europe, palliative and hospice care are not well-established in Japan and other Asian countries [30]. Approximately 80% of terminally ill patients in Japan die in hospitals, while only 3% of deaths occur at hospices [31].

Understanding the associations between health care expenditures and the provision of aggressive/palliative care at the EOL can help clinical leaders and policy-makers to optimize EOL care and reduce expenditures. In this study, we aimed to explore the association of EOL health care expenditures with aggressive versus palliative care indicators from the perspective of health insurers, based on a comprehensive analysis of administrative claims data of terminally ill cancer patients in Japan.

Methods

Study design and data source

We conducted a cross-sectional retrospective analysis using health insurance claims data from Kyoto prefecture, Japan. The data source comprised reimbursement claims electronically submitted from health care providers to National Health Insurance (NHI) and Long Life Medical Care System (LLMCS), two major insurance payers in Japan. NHI provides insurance coverage for individuals not working in companies (e.g., farmers, the self-employed,

retirees, the unemployed, part-time workers, and their families). LLMCS provides coverage

for individuals aged 75 years or older, as well as for disabled individuals aged 65–74 years.

Both the NHI and LLMCS pay for the majority of medical services and medications for

beneficiaries, including palliative care services (e.g., hospice care, physician home care, and

opioid use).

Study population

A total of 3,323 cancer patients who had died between April 2009 and May 2010 with

available claims records for at least 3 months prior to death were included in this study.

Cancer was defined according to the International Classification of Diseases, 10th Revision

(ICD-10, codes Cxx.x). We excluded from analysis patients who did not receive EOL care at

hospitals or hospices during their last 3 month of life (n = 23) and those who received EOL

care at hospitals with fewer than 10 terminally ill cancer patients (n = 157). There were 3,143

patients included in the final analysis.

Response variable

The response variable used in this study was direct health care expenditures (including

copayment and health insurance coverage) for each decedent during the last 3 months of life

across various health care settings (inpatient, outpatient, hospital, hospice, office, home care,

and pharmacy). We focused on the last 3 months of life because it has been previously stated

that terminally ill patients should ideally receive hospice care for 3 months before death [32].

Explanatory variables

Data on patient characteristics were obtained using claims data corresponding to the last 3

months of life. Types of cancer were classified into the following categories based on ICD-10

codes (Table 1): lung, stomach, colorectum, liver, pancreas, biliary tract, blood (leukemia,

Hodgkin's disease, and non-Hodgkin's lymphoma), prostate, breast, and others. A comorbidity

score was calculated according to ICD-10 coding algorithms for the Charlson Comorbidity

Index (excluding cancer-related diseases) [33].

We used the recommended benchmark measures for terminal cancer care developed

and validated by Earle et al. [20-25] to identify aggressive and palliative procedures from

administrative data. These measures were: (a) dying at acute-care hospitals (aggressive care),

(b) receiving chemotherapy using cytotoxic agents or molecular-targeted therapies during the

last month of life (aggressive care), (c) admission to ICUs or receiving life-sustaining

treatments (cardiopulmonary resuscitation, intubation, or mechanical ventilation) during the

last month of life (aggressive care), and (d) admission to institutional hospices or palliative

care units during the last 3 months of life (palliative care). Additionally, the following

procedures during the last 3 months of life were included as indicators of palliative care: (e)

palliative team consultation using multidisciplinary approaches [20, 24, 25], (f) opioid use

[23], and (g) home care provided by family practitioners [24, 25]. The following

non-indicator procedures were identified as potential confounding factors: total parenteral

nutrition, dialysis, blood transfusion, rehabilitation, surgery, and radiotherapy during the last 3

months of life. Also included as potential confounding factors were chemotherapy, ICU

admission, or life-sustaining treatments during the last 2 months prior to the month in which

the patient died.

Treatment hospitals during the last 3 months of life were identified for each patient in

the following order: the first acute-care hospital that provided inpatient care, followed by the

first acute-care hospital that provided outpatient care, and finally the first hospice. Hospital

characteristics included hospitals teaching status, urban/rural location (urban referring to any

location within the prefectural capital city and rural referring to anything outside the city), and

ownership (governmental, public, or private).

Statistical analysis

Multilevel regression models were developed for patients clustered in hospitals, with a

random intercept at level 2 used to handle data comprising patients within a given hospital.

Patient characteristics, the various indicator procedures, and non-indicator procedures were

used as explanatory variables at level 1; hospital characteristics were added at level 2.

Because the distribution of health care cost data is typically skewed to the right, generalized linear models (GLM) with a gamma distribution and log link function were used to evaluate health care expenditures [34]. Gamma regression models are multiplicative. Using an approach outlined in a previous study [3], the exponentiated coefficients of each explanatory variable were interpreted as rate ratios (RRs), with an RR of 1 indicating no association of that explanatory variable with increased or decreased values of the response variable. All explanatory variables used in the multilevel GLM were calculated as categorical variables.

We performed three sets of multivariable analyses. In the first model (Model 1), patient characteristics and hospital characteristics were included in analysis. In the second model (Model 2), non-indicator procedures were entered in addition to the variables included in Model 1. In the third model (Model 3), aggressive/palliative indicators of EOL care were entered in addition to the variables included in Model 2. Model 3 was used to assess the association between aggressive/palliative indicators of procedures and health care expenditures at EOL, while controlling for patient characteristics, hospital characteristics, and other non-indicator procedures. The goodness of fit of each model was compared using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), where smaller values denote a better fit.

We used IBM SPSS version 19 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL) for data manipulation and SAS version 9.2 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC) for analyses. A two-sided test was used and $P < 0.05$ was considered significant. All health care expenditures were reported in US dollars,

using the 2011 purchasing power parity rate for Japanese yen to US dollars (¥107 = $1) from

the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) National Accounts

database.

Results

The present study involved 3,143 decedents from 54 hospitals. Median health care

expenditure per patient during the last 3 months of life was $13,030 (interquartile range,

$8,120–$18,970).

Table 2 shows the patient and hospital characteristics of the study sample.

Hospital-level data for each patient is included and expressed as the number of patients in

each category. The majority of decedents were in the 75–79 years age group, with a higher

proportion of men. The most common type of cancer was lung cancer, followed by gastric

cancer. Our findings showed that patients died predominantly in acute-care hospitals (89%),

and that 7% of patients underwent chemotherapy during the last month of life. Nine percent of

patients were admitted to ICUs or received life-sustaining treatments during the last month;

6% and 3% used hospice services and received palliative team consultation, respectively.

Patient and hospital characteristics and health care expenditure

Table 3 shows RR estimates for the multivariable regression models used in this study. Model

1 evaluated the association between patient and hospital characteristics and health care expenditures during the last 3 months of life. After adjusting for other patient characteristics, age was found to be significantly associated with health care expenditure. Also, when compared with lung cancer patients, the health care expenditures for EOL care were significantly lower in patients with liver cancer and higher for those with blood or prostate cancer. Patients from hospitals in urban areas incurred higher expenditure compared with those in rural areas.

Non-indicator EOL procedures were entered into Model 2 in addition to the variables included in Model 1. For non-indicator procedures, results are presented as an RR for patients who received a non-indicator procedure when compared with those who did not receive it (serving as the referent group), after adjusting for patient and hospital characteristics and other non-indicator procedures. All procedures were found to be significantly associated with higher expenditures. Teaching, public, and private hospitals were associated with lower expenditures than non-teaching and governmental hospitals.

Aggressive versus palliative care and health care expenditure

Model 3 was used to assess the association between aggressive/palliative EOL care and health care expenditure during the last 3 months of life (Table 3). Results for aggressive/palliative care in Model 3 are presented in the same way as non-indicator procedures in Model 2, with

patients who did not receive the procedures used as the referent groups. Similar to Models 1 and 2, factors showing significant association with health care expenditures included age, certain cancer types, Charlson Comorbidity Index, non-indicator procedures, and certain hospital characteristics. Also, significant associations were found between aggressive treatments and higher expenditures. Patients who died in acute-care hospitals were associated with higher expenditure when compared with those who died at home or at a hospice (RR: 1.32; 95% confidence interval [CI] 1.21–1.44). Patients who underwent chemotherapy during the last month of life were associated with higher expenditure when compared with those who did not (RR: 1.25; 95% CI 1.17–1.34). ICU care or life-sustaining treatments during the last month were not associated with health care expenditures for insurers.

Our results showed that specific palliative procedures were significantly associated with either an increase or decrease in health care expenditures. The RRs (95% CI) of hospice services, opioid use, and physician home care in Model 3 were 2.31 (2.07–2.59), 1.07 (1.03–1.11), and 0.90 (0.84–0.98), respectively. We found no significant association between palliative team consultation and health care expenditure. The AIC indicated that Model 3 fitted the data better than Models 1 and 2.

Discussion

This study explored the association of health care expenditures with aggressive versus

palliative care for terminally ill cancer patients across various health care settings. Our findings were obtained from a single dataset, which showed that both aggressive and palliative procedures were differentially associated with variations in expenditures. The novelty of this study lies in the identification of specific terminal procedures that are significantly associated with EOL expenditures based on a comprehensive analysis of direct health care expenditures for terminally ill cancer patients.

Our study showed that aggressive care was generally associated with higher health care expenditures. On the other hand, physician home care (regarded as palliative care) was associated with reduced expenditures. These results are similar to those of previous studies attributing cost differences to a reduction in acute-care services provided during EOL [4, 5, 10]. Other studies have shown that physician home care is associated with good QOL and better satisfaction at EOL [4, 27, 28]. Our findings corroborate these reported results, and may indicate that measures to improve cost savings and QOL can involve the control of aggressive care and promotion of home care for terminal cancer patients, although this requires further studies to determine if there is a causal relationship between these factors [2, 26].

To promote cost savings and reduce aggressive care at the EOL, several fundamental problems must first be addressed. First, physicians are not always accurate in predicting actual time to death [35]. Second, there are no gold standards for the appropriate time to stop aggressive therapy. Third, patients are rarely prepared for death, which may be exacerbated in

many Eastern countries due to taboos against open discussions concerning death [30].

Advance directives documenting patient preferences for the use or avoidance of

life-sustaining treatments or procedures have been shown to reduce health care expenditures

[1, 11]. New policies are required to encourage people to consider more preferable ways to

die, to promote physician and medical student education about EOL care, and to expand

palliative care programs in hospitals.

Japan is promoting the policy of home death in anticipation of an increase of decedents

incurring huge health care expenditures at the EOL [36]. The promotion of physician home

care and eventual death at home may be a possible means to reduce the surge in EOL health

care expenditures that can be expected from the rising number of decedents in aging Japan.

This policy may take the form of improved systems and incentives for physicians to provide

home care, as well as engaging patient interest groups to improve acceptance of death at

home.

We demonstrated that hospice service and opioid use, which were used as palliative

care indicators, were associated with increased health care expenditures. With regard to

whether hospice services generate more cost or enable cost savings, our findings differ from

those of previous studies from other countries, which have indicated that hospice services

reduce overall health care costs [6-8, 12, 13]. This inconsistency may be due to the higher

fees for hospice care when compared with acute care in Japan.

Limitations

Our study has several limitations that should be noted. Firstly, because a claims database was used in this study, we were unable to include information regarding other health outcomes such as QOL, patient satisfaction, patient preferences, or clinical details which might further explain cost-related differences. This may lead to possible confounding of the results, but is an intrinsic limitation of administrative data-based studies. Secondly, this study is a retrospective observational analysis, and as such is unable to determine causal relationships. Finally, although Japan has a long-term care (LTC) insurance system which supports the elderly living at home or in nursing care facilities, LTC insurance claims data were not available for analysis. This insurance program provides payment for in-home care and facility services, including nursing care and rehabilitation. Patients who receive physician home care may use these services covered by LTC insurance. Hence, further studies are needed to incorporate data from both health and LTC insurance claims databases.

With regard to home care, an association between having nearby family and lower health care costs has been reported, which may indicate that relatives can act as caregivers to help patients avoid undesired hospitalizations [3]. However, policies that promote home care may lead to the shifting of costs from health insurers to LTC insurers, patients, or relatives in the form of having to provide more formal care, loss in productivity, or additional payments

for hired caregivers. Further investigations from the societal perspective are warranted in order to better inform the policymaking process.

Conclusions

In this study, we evaluated the association of health care expenditures with aggressive versus palliative care for terminally ill cancer patients in Japan. Our findings show that certain modes of both aggressive and palliative care during the last few months of life were associated with increased health care expenditures independent of other factors, and that physician home care was associated with reduced expenditures. The findings in this study may help to identify specific candidate measures to reduce the financial burdens of terminal cancer care.

Conflict of interest statement

None declared.

References

1. Nicholas LH, Langa KM, Iwashyna TJ, et al. Regional variation in the association between advance directives and end-of-life Medicare expenditures. JAMA 2011; 306: 1447–1453.

2. Curtis JR, Engelberg RA, Bensink ME, et al. End-of-life care in the intensive care unit: can we simultaneously increase quality and reduce costs? Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2012; 186: 587–592.

3. Kelley AS, Ettner SL, Morrison RS, et al. Determinants of medical expenditures in the last 6 months of life. Ann Intern Med 2011; 154: 235–242.

4. Brumley R, Enguidanos S, Jamison P, et al. Increased satisfaction with care and lower costs: results of a randomized trial of in-home palliative care. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2007; 55: 993–1000.

5. Seow H, Barbera L, Howell D, et al. Using more end-of-life homecare services is associated with using fewer acute care services: a population-based cohort study. Med Care 2010; 48: 118–124.

6. Smith TJ, Coyne P, Cassel B, et al. A high-volume specialist palliative care unit and team may reduce in-hospital end-of-life care costs. J Palliat Med 2003; 6: 699–705.

7. Campbell DE, Lynn J, Louis TA, et al. Medicare program expenditures associated with hospice use. Ann Intern Med 2004; 140: 269–277.

8. Taylor D, Ostermann J, Van Houtven C, et al. What length of hospice use maximizes reduction in medical expenditures near death in the US Medicare program? Soc Sci Med 2007; 65: 1466–1478.

9. Lozano R, Naghavi M, Foreman K, et al. Global and regional mortality from 235 causes of death for 20 age groups in 1990 and 2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. Lancet 2012; 380: 2095–2128.

10. Fassbender K, Fainsinger R, Brenneis C, et al. Utilization and costs of the introduction of system-wide palliative care in Alberta, 1993-2000. Palliat Med 2005; 19: 513–520.

11. Zhang B, Wright AA, Huskamp HA, et al. Health care costs in the last week of life associations with end-of-life conversations. Arch Intern Med 2009; 169: 480–488.

12. Jung HM, Kim J, Heo DS, et al. Health economics of a palliative care unit for terminal cancer patients: a retrospective cohort study. Support Care Cancer 2012; 20: 29–37.

13. Gómez-Batiste X, Tuca A, Corrales E, et al. Resource consumption and costs of palliative care services in Spain: a multicenter prospective study. J Pain Symptom Manage 2006; 31: 522–532.

14. Tan TS, Jatoi A. End-of-life hospital costs in cancer patients: do advance directives or routes of hospital admission make a difference? Oncology 2011; 80: 118–122.

15. Smith AK, Earle CC, McCarthy EP. Racial and ethnic differences in end-of-life care in fee-for-service medicare beneficiaries with advanced cancer. J Am Geriatr Soc 2009; 57:

153–158.

16. Walker H, Anderson M, Farahati F, et al. Resource use and costs of end-of-life/palliative care: Ontario adult cancer patients dying during 2002 and 2003. J Palliat Care 2011; 27: 79–88.

17. Koroukian SM, Beaird H, Madigan E, et al. End-of-life expenditures by Ohio Medicaid beneficiaries dying of cancer. Health Care Financ Rev 2006; 28: 65–80.

18. Balboni T, Balboni M, Paulk ME, et al. Support of cancer patients' spiritual needs and associations with medical care costs at the end of life. Cancer 2011; 117: 5383–5391.

19. Johnson AP, Abernathy T, Howell D, et al. Resource utilisation and costs of palliative cancer care in an interdisciplinary health care model. Palliat Med 2009; 23: 448–459.

20. Earle CC, Park ER, Lai B, et al. Identifying potential indicators of the quality of end-of-life cancer care from administrative data. J Clin Oncol 2003; 21: 1133–1138.

21. Earle CC, Neville BA, Landrum MB, et al. Trends in the aggressiveness of cancer care near the end of life. J Clin Oncol 2004; 22: 315–321.

22. Earle CC, Neville BA, Landrum MB, et al. Evaluating claims-based indicators of the intensity of end-of-life cancer care. Int J Qual Health Care. 2005; 17: 505–509.

23. Setoguchi S, Earle C, Glynn R, et al. Comparison of prospective and retrospective indicators of the quality of end-of-life cancer care. J Clin Oncol 2008; 26: 5671–5678.

24. Grunfeld E, Urquhart R, Mykhalovskiy E, et al. Toward population-based indicators of

quality end-of-life care: testing stakeholder agreement. Cancer 2008; 112: 2301–2308.

25. Grunfeld E, Lethbridge L, Dewar R, et al. Towards using administrative databases to measure population-based indicators of quality of end-of-life care: Testing the methodology. Palliat Med 2006; 20: 769–777.

26. Wennberg JE, Bronner K, Skinner JS, et al. Inpatient care intensity and patients' ratings of their hospital experiences. Health Aff (Millwood) 2009; 28: 103–112.

27. Curtis JR, Patrick DL, Engelberg RA, et al. A measure of the quality of dying and death: initial validation using after-death interviews with family members. J Pain Symptom Manage 2002; 24: 17–31.

28. Zhang B, Nilsson ME, Prigerson HG. Factors important to patients' quality of life at the end of life. Arch Intern Med. 2012; 172: 1133–1142.

29. Teno J, Mor V, Ward N, et al. Bereaved family member perceptions of quality of end-of-life care in US regions with high and low usage of intensive care unit care. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2005; 53: 1905–1911.

30. Chen CH, Tang ST. Meta-analysis of cultural differences in Western and Asian patient-perceived barriers to managing cancer pain. Palliat Med 2012; 26: 206–221.

31. Ida E, Miyachi M, Uemura M, et al. Current status of hospice cancer deaths both in-unit and at home (1995-2000), and prospects of home care services in Japan. Palliat Med 2002; 16: 179–184.

32. Iwashyna TJ, Christakis NA. Attitude and self-reported practice regarding hospice referral in a national sample of internists. J Palliat Med 1998; 1: 241–248.

33. Quan H, Sundararajan V, Halfon P, et al. Coding algorithms for defining comorbidities in ICD-9-CM and ICD-10 administrative data. Med Care 2005; 43: 1130–1139.

34. Manning WG, Basu A, Mullahy J. Generalized modeling approaches to risk adjustment of skewed outcomes data. J Health Econ 2005; 24: 465–488.

35. Glare P, Virik K, Jones M, et al. A systematic review of physicians' survival predictions in terminally ill cancer patients. BMJ 2003; 327: 195–198.

36. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Medium and long-term medical care expenditure regulation plan: http://www.mhlw.go.jp/english/wp/wp-hw3/dl/2-005.pdf [Accessed March 7, 2013].

Table 1. ICD-10 codes for cancer types

Type	Codes
Lung	C34.x
Stomach	C16.x
Colorectum	C18.x, C19.x, C20.x
Liver	C22.x
Pancreas	C25.x
Biliary tract	C23.x, C24.x
Blood	C81.x–C85.x, C91.x–C95.x
Prostate	C61.x
Breast	C50.x
Other	C00.x–C15.x, C17.x, C21.x, C26.x, C30.x–C33.x, C37.x–C41.x, C43.x–C49.x, C51.x–C58.x, C60.x, C62.x–C80.x, C88.x, C90.x, C96.x, C97.x

ICD-10, International Classification of Diseases, 10th Revision.

Table 2. Study population characteristics and performance of aggressive and palliative care indicators

No. of patients	3143
Patient characteristics	
Women	1249 (40)
Age, y	
<65	383 (12)
65–69	388 (12)
70–74	452 (14)
75–79	698 (22)
80–84	631 (20)
≥85	591 (19)
Cancer type	
Lung	622 (20)
Stomach	444 (14)
Colorectum	367 (12)
Liver	302 (10)
Pancreas	265 (8)
Biliary tract	151 (5)
Blood	180 (6)
Prostate	91 (3)
Breast	80 (3)
Other	641 (20)
Charlson Comorbidity Index	
0–1	1197 (38)
2	642 (20)
3	434 (14)
≥4	870 (28)

Table 2 continued

Procedures	
Aggressive care	
Death at acute-care hospitals	2811 (89)
Chemotherapy[a]	234 (7)
ICU care or life-sustaining treatments[a]	284 (9)
Palliative care	
Hospice care[b]	202 (6)
Palliative team consultation[b]	86 (3)
Opioid use[b]	1697 (54)
Physician home care[b]	172 (5)
Non-indicator procedures	
Total parenteral nutrition[b]	1126 (36)
Dialysis[b]	48 (2)
Blood transfusion[b]	871 (28)
Rehabilitation[b]	686 (22)
Surgery[b]	104 (3)
Radiotherapy[b]	216 (7)
Chemotherapy[c]	1196 (38)
ICU care or life-sustaining treatments[c]	86 (3)
Hospital characteristics	
Teaching hospital	2075 (66)
Urban location	2029 (65)
Ownership	
Governmental	1031 (33)
Public	642 (20)
Private	1470 (47)

Values are expressed as number of patients (column percentage). Because of rounding, percentages may not add up to 100%. Patients who had undergone more than one procedure are accordingly classified into more than one category for procedures. [a] Identified during the last month of life. [b] Identified during the last 3 months. [c] Identified during the last 2 months prior to the month in which the patient died. ICU, intensive care unit.

Table 3. The association between health care expenditures during the last 3 months of life and patient characteristics, hospital characteristics, non-indicator procedures, and aggressive/palliative care

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Rate ratio (95% CI)	P value	Rate ratio (95% CI)	P value	Rate ratio (95% CI)	P value
Patient characteristics						
Women	0.99 (0.95–1.04)	0.81	1.00 (0.96–1.04)	0.88	1.00 (0.96–1.03)	0.82
Age[a]						
65–69	0.91 (0.83–0.99)	0.02	0.91 (0.84–0.98)	0.01	0.93 (0.87–1.00)	0.05
70–74	0.93 (0.86–1.02)	0.11	1.00 (0.93–1.08)	0.92	1.02 (0.95–1.09)	0.55
75–79	0.91 (0.84–0.98)	0.01	0.95 (0.89–1.02)	0.13	0.97 (0.91–1.03)	0.33
80–84	0.80 (0.74–0.87)	<0.001	0.91 (0.85–0.98)	0.009	0.94 (0.88–1.01)	0.08
≥85	0.71 (0.66–0.77)	<0.001	0.85 (0.79–0.92)	<0.001	0.91 (0.84–0.97)	0.007
Cancer type[b]						
Stomach	1.05 (0.98–1.13)	0.19	0.91 (0.85–0.97)	0.006	0.94 (0.88–1.00)	0.04
Colorectum	1.08 (1.00–1.17)	0.07	0.98 (0.91–1.05)	0.53	0.99 (0.93–1.06)	0.79
Liver	0.82 (0.75–0.89)	<0.001	0.91 (0.84–0.98)	0.02	0.95 (0.88–1.02)	0.14
Pancreas	0.95 (0.87–1.04)	0.25	0.96 (0.89–1.04)	0.34	0.99 (0.92–1.06)	0.68
Biliary tract	1.05 (0.94–1.17)	0.35	1.03 (0.94–1.13)	0.56	1.08 (0.98–1.18)	0.11
Blood	1.81 (1.64–2.00)	<0.001	1.38 (1.26–1.51)	<0.001	1.32 (1.21–1.45)	<0.001
Prostate	1.16 (1.01–1.33)	0.03	1.02 (0.91–1.15)	0.75	0.99 (0.88–1.10)	0.79
Breast	1.07 (0.92–1.24)	0.37	1.04 (0.92–1.19)	0.53	1.04 (0.92–1.18)	0.49
Other	1.08 (1.01–1.16)	0.02	0.97 (0.92–1.03)	0.40	0.97 (0.91–1.02)	0.23
Charlson Comorbidity Index[c]						
2	0.99 (0.94–1.05)	0.86	0.95 (0.90–1.00)	0.04	0.98 (0.93–1.03)	0.37
3	1.04 (0.98–1.12)	0.20	0.98 (0.93–1.04)	0.58	0.99 (0.94–1.05)	0.85
≥4	1.15 (1.08–1.21)	<0.001	1.00 (0.95–1.05)	0.91	1.06 (1.01–1.11)	0.01

Table 3 continued

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Rate ratio (95% CI)	P value	Rate ratio (95% CI)	P value	Rate ratio (95% CI)	P value
Procedures						
Aggressive care[d]						
Death at acute-care hospitals[e]					1.32 (1.21–1.44)	<0.001
Chemotherapy*					1.25 (1.17–1.34)	<0.001
ICU care or life-sustaining treatments*					1.01 (0.95–1.08)	0.71
Palliative care[d]						
Hospice care†					2.31 (2.07–2.59)	<0.001
Palliative team consultation†					0.98 (0.87–1.09)	0.66
Opioid use†					1.07 (1.03–1.11)	<0.001
Physician home care†					0.90 (0.84–0.98)	0.01
Non-indicator procedures[d]						
Total parenteral nutrition†			1.33 (1.27–1.38)	<0.001	1.39 (1.33–1.44)	<0.001
Dialysis†			1.47 (1.26–1.71)	<0.001	1.50 (1.29–1.73)	<0.001
Blood transfusion†			1.33 (1.27–1.39)	<0.001	1.35 (1.29–1.41)	<0.001
Rehabilitation†			1.32 (1.26–1.39)	<0.001	1.35 (1.29–1.41)	<0.001
Surgery†			1.32 (1.19–1.46)	<0.001	1.31 (1.18–1.45)	<0.001
Radiotherapy†			1.32 (1.23–1.43)	<0.001	1.34 (1.25–1.44)	<0.001
Chemotherapy‡			1.14 (1.09–1.18)	<0.001	1.15 (1.11–1.20)	<0.001
ICU care or life-sustaining treatments‡			1.55 (1.38–1.75)	<0.001	1.54 (1.37–1.73)	<0.001
Hospital characteristics						
Teaching hospital[f]	0.99 (0.94–1.04)	0.69	0.92 (0.88–0.97)	0.001	0.97 (0.93–1.01)	0.18
Urban location[g]	1.31 (1.25–1.37)	<0.001	1.30 (1.25–1.36)	<0.001	1.22 (1.17–1.27)	<0.001
Ownership[h]						
Public	0.94 (0.88–1.00)	0.05	0.93 (0.89–0.99)	0.01	0.93 (0.88–0.98)	0.004
Private	0.96 (0.91–1.02)	0.16	0.91 (0.87–0.96)	<0.001	0.91 (0.86–0.95)	<0.001
Model fit statistics						
Akaike Information Criterion	94455		93513		93216	

*Identified during the last month of life. †Identified during the last 3 months. ‡Identified during the last 2 months prior to the month in which the patient died. Referent categories: [a] <65 years, [b] lung, [c] 0–1, [d] non-use of each of the procedures unless otherwise indicated, [e] home or hospice, [f] non-teaching, [g] rural, [h] governmental.

CI, confidence interval; ICU, intensive care unit.