Session 4G: Improving Data Analysis Using a Health Equity Lens

Moderator:
Rebecca Sheppard; FSA, MAAA, MHS

Presenters:
Rachele Hendricks-Sturrup; DHSc, MSc, MA
Julia Lerche; FSA, MAAA, MSPH

American Academy of Actuaries
Health Practice Council—Health Equity Committee

Monday, June 24, 2024, 3:45–4:45 p.m. EDT
Active participation in the Society of Actuaries is an important aspect of membership. While the positive contributions of professional societies and associations are well-recognized and encouraged, association activities are vulnerable to close antitrust scrutiny. By their very nature, associations bring together industry competitors and other market participants. The United States antitrust laws aim to protect consumers by preserving the free economy and prohibiting anti-competitive business practices; they promote competition. There are both state and federal antitrust laws, although state antitrust laws closely follow federal law. The Sherman Act, is the primary U.S. antitrust law pertaining to association activities. The Sherman Act prohibits every contract, combination or conspiracy that places an unreasonable restraint on trade. There are, however, some activities that are illegal under all circumstances, such as price fixing, market allocation and collusive bidding.

There is no safe harbor under the antitrust law for professional association activities. Therefore, association meeting participants should refrain from discussing any activity that could potentially be construed as having an anti-competitive effect. Discussions relating to product or service pricing, market allocations, membership restrictions, product standardization or other conditions on trade could arguably be perceived as a restraint on trade and may expose the SOA and its members to antitrust enforcement procedures.

While participating in all SOA in person meetings, webinars, teleconferences or side discussions, you should avoid discussing competitively sensitive information with competitors and follow these guidelines:

- **Do not** discuss prices for services or products or anything else that might affect prices.
- **Do not** discuss what you or other entities plan to do in a particular geographic or product markets or with particular customers.
- **Do not** speak on behalf of the SOA or any of its committees unless specifically authorized to do so.
- **Do** leave a meeting where any anticompetitive pricing or market allocation discussion occurs.
- **Do** alert SOA staff and/or legal counsel to any concerning discussions.
- **Do** consult with legal counsel before raising any matter or making a statement that may involve competitively sensitive information.

Adherence to these guidelines involves not only avoidance of antitrust violations, but avoidance of behavior which might be so construed. These guidelines only provide an overview of prohibited activities. SOA legal counsel reviews meeting agenda and materials as deemed appropriate and any discussion that departs from the formal agenda should be scrutinized carefully. Antitrust compliance is everyone’s responsibility; however, please seek legal counsel if you have any questions or concerns.
Presentation Disclaimer

Presentations are intended for educational purposes only and do not replace independent professional judgment. Statements of fact and opinions expressed are those of the participants individually and, unless expressly stated to the contrary, are not the opinion or position of the Society of Actuaries, its cosponsors or its committees. The Society of Actuaries does not endorse or approve, and assumes no responsibility for, the content, accuracy or completeness of the information presented. Attendees should note that the sessions are audio-recorded and may be published in various media, including print, audio and video formats without further notice.
About the Academy

The American Academy of Actuaries is a 20,000-member professional association whose mission is to serve the public and the U.S. actuarial profession. For more than 50 years, the Academy has assisted public policymakers on all levels by providing leadership, objective expertise, and actuarial advice on risk and financial security issues.

The Academy also sets qualification, practice, and professionalism standards for actuaries in the United States.

For more information, please visit:

www.actuary.org
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• The Academy operates in compliance with the requirements of applicable law, including federal antitrust laws. The Academy’s antitrust policy is available online at https://www.actuary.org/content/academy-antitrust-policy.
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American Academy of Actuaries
Health Equity Committee

• Created to contribute actuarial perspective to health equity

• Focus:
  ➢ Evaluate actuarial practices in the context of health equity
  ➢ Educate actuaries and other stakeholders on health equity issues
  ➢ Apply an equity lens when considering the impact of current or proposed health care policies

• Published issue briefs that explore health equity topics in actuarial practice

• Held a symposium focused on equity-enhancing benefits in the employer coverage space
Definitions used by the Health Equity Committee

• **Health Equity:** Everyone has a fair and just opportunity to be as healthy as possible. This requires removing obstacles to health such as poverty, discrimination, and their consequences, including powerlessness and lack of access to good jobs with fair pay, quality education and housing, safe environments, and health care.

• **Health Disparities:** Differences in health or its key determinants that adversely affect marginalized or excluded groups. Disparities in health and in the key determinants of health are the metric for assessing progress toward health equity.

• **Social Determinants of Health:** Nonmedical factors such as employment, income, housing, transportation, child care, education, discrimination, and the quality of the places where people live, work, learn, and play, which influence health.

Why actuaries care about health equity

• Key health decision-makers rely on actuaries for advice
• Unique skillset to quantify costs of health disparities to the health care system
• Commitment to identifying and addressing issues on behalf of the public interest
• Desire to explore and understand whether any actuarial practices inadvertently lead to or exacerbate health disparities and inefficient use of health care dollars
• Potential to use actuarial principles to reduce health disparities and improve health outcomes
The intersection of data analysis and health equity

• Data come from various sources: claims data, clinical data, self-reported data, census data, financial data, etc.
• Data are heavily relied on in analysis: pricing, forecasting, reserving, risk adjustment accruals, population management programs, provider contracting, etc.
• Data analysis drives decisions which impact health outcomes
• Key take-aways for today’s discussion:
  • Consider bias in the data
  • Incorporate data empathy
  • Understand the limitations of the data
The intersection of data analysis and health equity: Bias

• All data have bias
  • Important to understand embedded bias and determine whether/how it impacts results
  • Make adjustments, if needed, to mitigate bias

• Important to incorporate qualitative data to better understand quantitative data

• A population sample may not be representative and generalizable

• The use of averages may mask important information that could be gleaned from analysis of the sub-populations
The intersection of data analysis and health equity: Empathy

- Data elements represent people and their experiences
  - Important to use a human-centered approach to analyzing data
- Data empathy:
  - Allows for a more holistic analysis and interpretation of data
  - Acknowledges the subjective element of the data collection process
  - Leads to more effective and meaningful results, better decision-making
The intersection of data analysis and health equity: Limitations

• Claims data:
  • Only reflects claims of those using the health care system
  • For historically marginalized groups, claims understates risk, unmet needs
  • Does not include key information needed to measure disparities

• Combining data from other sources could be helpful; e.g., enrollment data, clinical data, real-world data, and social risk indices
  • Need to understand the bias, limitations, risks of other data sources
Stakeholder Perspectives and Policy Considerations for Novel Applications and Developments in Health Research

Rachele Hendricks-Sturrup, DHSc, MSc, MA
Research Director, Real-World Evidence
healthpolicy.duke.edu
Overview of Real-World Data Sources

## Intervention Effectiveness in the Real-World

Understanding real-world effectiveness requires real-world data.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences between efficacy and effectiveness studies</th>
<th>Efficacy study</th>
<th>Effectiveness study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Does the intervention work under ideal circumstance?</td>
<td>Does the intervention work in real-world practice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Resource-intensive ‘ideal setting’</td>
<td>Real-world everyday clinical setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study population</td>
<td>Highly selected, homogenous population</td>
<td>Heterogeneous population Few to no exclusion criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providers</td>
<td>Highly experienced and trained</td>
<td>Representative usual providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Strictly enforced and standardized No concurrent interventions</td>
<td>Applied with flexibility Concurrent interventions and cross-over permitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Singal, Amit G MD, MS1,2; Higgins, Peter D R MD, PhD3; Waljee, Akbar K MD, MS3,4. A Primer on Effectiveness and Efficacy Trials. Clinical and Translational Gastroenterology: January 2014 - Volume 5 - Issue 1 - p e45 doi: 10.1038/ctg.2013.13
Like regulatory settings, data are the cornerstone for actuarial science and the practice of pricing health plans (e.g., projecting health care spending, creating health plan benefit designs, calculating premiums, and developing models to assess risk).

Yet, data from a variety of traditional and non-traditional sources may be presented to health actuaries in practice, despite their concerns about data privacy, bias, etc., and downstream implications for beneficiaries.

A thoughtful analysis on sourcing and leveraging RWD or alternative sources of data, which directly impact insurance beneficiary access to diagnosis and care, is warranted.
Use Case: Transthyretin Amyloidosis

- Amyloidosis is a rare and often fatal disease caused by an insoluble fibril known as amyloid.
  - There are over 30 precursor proteins known to date; amyloidosis typically arises from misfolded transthyretin or immunoglobulin light-chain aggregation.
- Transthyretin amyloidosis (ATTR) is a type of amyloidosis in which amyloid fibrils are produced due to precursor protein misfolding and precipitation in various tissues and organs, causing organ system (i.e., cardiovascular and nervous system) damage.
  - Misfolded precursor protein form cross-β-sheet-rich amyloid fibrils that accumulate in several tissues.
Hereditary ATTR

- Hereditary ATTR (hATTR) is an under-recognized, underdiagnosed, and often fatal genetic condition that disproportionately affects those of African, African-American and Afro-Caribbean descent and requires early diagnosis and treatment.

- Early clinical or molecular diagnosis of hATTR is key to prolonging life of those carrying a certain genetic variation of V122I (pV142I)-coupled with phenotypical expression.
  - Valine-to-isoleucine substitution at position 122 (TTR V122I; pV142I) in transthyretin (TTR)-derived fibrils.
  - The most common mutation associated with hATTR (Val122Ile) is present in ~3.4% of African Americans as part of the African diaspora.
  - 1.5 million individuals in the United States are hATTR carriers.
Transthyretin amyloid cardiomyopathy (ATTR-CM)

- ATTR-CM is a potentially fatal disease that affects the heart muscle; heart failure is common.
- A late diagnosis of ATTR-CM could mean having 2-3 years of remaining life expectancy.
- The greatest frequency of the TTR V122I (pV142I) allele is present in countries along coastal West Africa.

Image credit: Jacobson et al., 2016
• The Amyloidosis Research Consortium, in partnership with QualityMetric and Global Perspectives, developed and validated a patient focused and derived ATTR Quality of Life PRO tool.

• Published in 2023.
Leveraging Amyloidosis African American Patients Stories

• Prior work and African American amyloidosis patient stories have highlighted important themes on which to build and that likely capture the range of lived experiences among populations managing genetic diseases and their comorbidities:
  • Access to clinical, molecular diagnostic testing for \textit{TTR} mutations, as lack of access to testing may hinder prior/initial authorization for pharmacogenomic treatment for health-compromised patients with hATTR.
  • Diagnosed populations may lose life insurance coverage, especially if molecularly diagnosed (i.e., genetic testing) during late disease stages.
  • Access to follow-up testing and/or care (i.e., tissue biopsy, echocardiogram, cardiac magnetic resonance imaging, radionuclide imaging, technetium pyrophosphate scan, etc.).
  • Lack of personal and family understanding of amyloidosis.
Leveraging Amyloidosis African American Patients Stories

• Struggle to maintain and active lifestyle in later life.
• Clinical signs tend to include a mixture of carpal tunnel syndrome, arrhythmia, gastrointestinal issues, and common signs of heart failure.
• Underdiagnosis of the disease in African American populations results in late-stage diagnosis, contributing to poor outcomes and prognosis due to poor stabilization that is needed to seek and engage in preventive care.
• Chronic, acute, and prolonged stress, including general malaise, affects day-to-day life functioning and increases risk of mental illness (e.g., depression, anxiety, etc.).
• Fragmented, under-resourced, under-educated, and underprepared health systems and healthcare providers contribute to delayed diagnosis.
Rethinking Quality of Life Data Based Patient Experiences

- PROMIS®, PRO-CTCAE, and ATTR-QOL are PRO tools currently used to quantify amyloidosis patient-reported outcomes.
- Yet, none of these tools presently contain domains focused on:
  - Access to molecular testing
  - Access to non-health insurance following testing
  - Follow-up testing and/or care
  - Concern about late-stage diagnosis and poor symptom stabilization
  - Experiences navigating complex health systems that contribute to delayed diagnosis
- It is important for the actuarial science community to consider this real-world context, particularly where “quality of life” measures are considered and late-stage disease diagnoses and care are more likely due to structural inequities in the health system.
Questions? Contact Me!

Email: Rachele.hendricks.sturrup@duke.edu
North Carolina Medicaid: Leveraging Actuarial Analysis to Advance Health Equity

Julia Lerche; FSA, MAAA, MSPH
Objectives of Analysis

• Leverage actuarial tools to identify disparities and support data driven solutions.
  − Testing ability to leverage available data and analysis used for MCO risk adjustment model calibration to identify potential disparities
  − Initial pass to identify research questions for further analysis
    • Opportunities for deeper dive to validate drivers of disparities
    • Inform development of interventions for addressing inequities

• Assess impact of capitation rate setting and risk adjustment methodologies on health equity.

• Explore potential approaches to incorporating social risk factors in capitation rate setting and/or risk adjustment to ensure capitation payment methodology supports health equity goals
  − Review of risk adjustment model with equity lens and identify opportunities for improvement
### Data Details and Limitations

#### Data Sources
- **Demographic data**: NC Medicaid eligibility data, non-dual "Standard Plan" enrollees, excludes beneficiaries with IDD or severe behavioral health conditions, CY 2016 - 2019
- **Utilization metrics**: CY 2017 claims data
- **Condition prevalence and risk adjustment model comparisons**: CY 2016 data, CDPS+Rx with custom cost weights
- **Quality metrics and regression analysis**: CY 2019 data
- **Social Vulnerability Index and non-utilizer risk adjustment regression analysis**: CY 2019 data, CDPS+Rx with custom cost weights

#### Data Notes & Limitations
- **Included services**: general acute care, including prescription drugs, transportation, and behavioral health. Limited HCBS waiver services.
- **Considered age and disability distributions by race to understand potential influence on results; described differences but did not normalize for in all analyses**
- **Uses “older” data from prior to the Public Health Emergency**
- **Multi-race data not available**
- **Smaller populations for certain races and ethnicities limit conclusions**
- **Untested methodology, leads to more questions than answers at this stage**
- **Strong non-quantitative experience and perspective is needed to effectively interpret analyses**
Actual versus Predicted PMPM Costs

Compare actual to predicted cost, using CDPS+Rx and MRx risk scores to represent predicted costs. Reviewed by race, ethnicity, and region.

Observations

• Risk scores and costs were significantly lower for Black beneficiaries than for White beneficiaries
  • Risk scores for Black population were 4 – 15% lower than the average
  • Black population had lower PMPM spend than average for all population cohorts (ranging from 8 – 18% lower)

• Normalizing for condition and demographic mix, average cost for Black population was lower than predicted in the risk adjustment models
  • Risk adjustment model showed mild over-prediction of the cost of Black population and mild under-prediction of White population
  • Dynamic is greatest for children; less for disabled population

• American Indians have highest PMPM cost; actual expenditures are above those predicted by the model (though some may be driven by IHS reimbursement levels)

• Asian population has lowest per capita spend and lowest spend relative to expected

• LatinX population has lower PMPM spend than average and lower actual PMPM spend than predicted
  • Dynamic is greatest in TANF adult population
**Condition Prevalence and Service Utilization**

**Observations**

- Prevalence not as expected compared to other data sources
  - Diabetes prevalence in risk adjustment similar across all races; other population studies indicate higher incidence of diabetes among Black population
- Psychiatric prevalence notably higher for White members than other races, and especially low for Asian members
- Notable bias toward preventive care in White members, as compared to Black members
  - Similar patterns in each of non-disabled adults, non-disabled children, and disabled population
  - White population much higher Rx
  - White population higher Outpatient/Physician
  - Black population higher Emergency Room and Inpatient
- LatinX populations showed lower Rx, ER, primary/specialty care physician use. Higher IP and OP (non-disabled adults, disabled populations). Also higher Physician – FQHC, Other Clinic, Family Planning, Therapies

**Summary Example**

Difference in % of Members Compared to the All Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDPS+Rx Major Category</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Unreported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 15 to 24 Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 15 to 24 Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 44 Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 44 Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 45 to 64 Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 45 to 64 Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Category</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Unreported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cardiovascular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeletal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Nervous System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulmonary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastrointestinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metabolic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebrovascular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infectious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hematological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Normalized Utilization Relative to All Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COS</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Unreported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prescribed Drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician - Primary Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician - Specialty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Acute Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTSS HCBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other BH Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All COS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) Background

CDC/ATSDR Social Vulnerability Index (CDC/ATSDR SVI)
### Social Vulnerability Index & Non-Utilizer Regression Analysis

#### Approach

**Social Vulnerability Index (SVI)**
- Developed by the CDC, national, publicly available geographic-based index measuring social vulnerability.
- The CDC defined social vulnerability as “the demographic and socioeconomic factors that adversely affect communities that encounter hazards and other community-level stressors.”
- Includes four major themes:
  - Socioeconomic Status
  - Household Composition
  - Race/Ethnicity/Language
  - Housing/Transportation

**Non-Utilizer**
- Identified members without any claims data in the defined period
- Designed to encourage health plans to engage members in proactive, preventive care

#### Findings & Results

**Social Vulnerability Index (SVI)**
- Focused on scenarios with good statistical significance
- Some scenarios of negative cost correlation as social vulnerability increases:
  - Race/ethnicity/language: TANF Child
  - Housing/transportation: TANF Child
- Some scenarios of positive cost correlation as social vulnerability increases:
  - Race/ethnicity/language: ABD
  - Socioeconomic status: TANF Child
- Due to observed lower costs with increased social vulnerability, implementing in risk adjustment would have an adverse impact

**Non-Utilizer**
- Incorporated in the Standard Plan risk adjustment model
- Reduces reimbursement for members not receiving services, increases reimbursement for members receiving services
- Improves model prediction, specifically for certain segments of the population
## Additional Research & Publications

### Research with Similar Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jacob Wallace, PhD (Yale)</th>
<th>Todd Gilmer, PhD &amp; Richard Kronick, PhD (UCSD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Adjustment And Promoting Health Equity In Population-Based Payment: Concepts And Evidence</strong>&lt;br&gt;• J Michael McWilliams; Gabe Weinreb; Lin Ding; Chima D Ndumele; Jacob Wallace&lt;br&gt;• Adding social risk factors to risk adjustment may be counterproductive&lt;br&gt;• Additional publications on related topics</td>
<td><strong>Updating the Chronic Illness and Disability Payment System</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Social Deprivation Index&lt;br&gt;• Majority of variables did not reach statistical significance&lt;br&gt;• Members living in higher social deprivation areas did not have consistently higher spend&lt;br&gt;• Discussion of alternative approaches to addressing social deprivation impacts on health care spending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Massachusetts Medicaid</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Determinants of Health in Managed Care Payment Formulas</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Arlene S. Ash, PhD; Eric O. Mick, ScD; Randall P. Ellis, PhD; Catarina I. Kiefe, PhD, MD; Jeroan J. Allison, MD, MS; and Melissa A. Clark, PhD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Geographic-based indicators and other social indicators&lt;br&gt;• Found an approach to incorporate social determinants of health variables into the risk adjustment model that eliminates or significantly reduces underpayments for several vulnerable populations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions to Inform Next Steps

• What were drivers of lower PMPM costs for Black, Asian and LatinX populations compared to average?
  • Were there significant differences in service utilization or types of services being utilized?
• Why were risk scores for Black, Asian and Latinx populations so much lower than the average?
  • Was condition prevalence being captured as expected?
  • What were the drivers of potential undercoding and/or underutilization of marginalized populations (especially primary care use) and how can it be addressed?
  • Was 12 month study period resulting in inequitable condition flagging?
  • How does access to care intersect with risk adjustment?
  • How does enrollment churn intersect with risk adjustment methodologies?
• What are broader implications for risk adjustment?
  • At MCO level?
  • When used for alternative payment approaches at provider level?
Appendix
Additional Analysis Details

SVI Regression Analysis

• Methodology:
  − Score assigned based on residential address at the county level. SAS geocoding also used to map at census tract level.
  − Explored variables as continuous, categorical, aggregate, themes
  − Grouped SVI scores into quartiles (lowest became the intercept)
  − Utilized P-value and Variance Inflation Factors to validate and interpret statistical results
  − P-Value is a measure of the statistical significance of variables in the regression model. The smaller P-Values represents stronger significance and the larger P-Values represents little to no significance.
  − Variance inflation factor (VIF) is a measure of multi-collinearity which is a statistical characteristic among predictors in a linear regression in which the contribution of the predictors to the dependent variable cannot be determined because the two predictors are highly correlated to one another. A VIF greater than 10 may imply the variable is highly correlated.

Non-Utilizer Regression Analysis

• Non-utilizer is defined consistent with the NC-specific metric added to the CDPS+Rx model, which is defined by not having any claims data except potentially the following categories of services:
  • Excluded Services (e.g. Dental and LEA/Children’s Developmental Services Agency [CDSA]), DME, Lab/X-ray, optical, eyeglass fitting, Dental (Limited), Family Planning Services, NEMT, Other Practitioner.
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