

Questionable care in Australia: moving from reporting to action

Stephen Duckett



@stephenjduckett

Questionable care:
Avoiding ineffective treatment


Stephen Duckett and Peter Breadon

Outline

1. So much work, so little action
2. The variation continuum
3. Looking at the problem sideways
4. Care which is *prima facie* questionable
5. A strategy

20th birthday coming up

Figure 1 Standardised Rate Ratios for Various Operations in the Statistical Local Areas in Victoria, Compared to the Rate Ratios for All Victoria




The dog in the night-time - 1

Inspector Gregory: “Is there any other point to which you would wish to draw my attention?”

Holmes: “To the curious incident of the dog in the night-time.”

Gregory: “The dog did nothing in the night-time.”

Holmes: “That was the curious incident.”



The dog in the night-time - 2

CHAPTER 7

The Dog in the Night-time: Medical Practice Variations and Health Policy

Robert G. Evans


Evans, R. G. (1990) 'The dog in the night-time: Medical practice variations and health policy', in *The challenges of medical practice variations*, T. F. Andersen and G. Mooney, Eds., MacMillan Press, p 117-152

INTRODUCTION


Knowing is not the same as doing. The most striking fact about the large and extensively documented variations in patterns of medical practice, throughout the developed world, is the minimal impact this information has had on health policy.

For many years, students of health care utilisation have been demonstrating that per capita rates of surgical procedures, hospital utilisation and medical service use vary widely across large and small geographic areas, and that servicing patterns for particular conditions vary among both institutions and individual practitioners. These differences, moreover, do not appear to be explicable in terms of the needs or characteristics of the populations served – or, at least, such explanations have not been found.

Most variation analyses look at geographic variation and find large disparities ...




... but that doesn't tell you much



There's little clarity about when variation is legitimate
That has made it difficult to develop effective policy

Even if you knew which variation was not legitimate,
what are the mechanisms for doing something about it?

The dog in the night time - 3




<http://quoteinvestigator.com/2017/03/23/same/>



Where people are operated on	
Area	Hospital
Area 1	Hospital 1
Area 2	Hospital 2
Area 3	Hospital 3
Area 4	Hospital 4
Area 5	Hospital x
Area x	


Someone to be held accountable

- Admire the problem
- What is good, what is bad?
- No accountability mechanism
- Not even in NSW or Qld which have/had area health authorities



Area	Where people live
Area 1	
Area 2	
Area 3	
Area 4	
Area 5	
Area x	

Increasing certainty that variation can identify inappropriate care



We analyse 5 'do-not-dos' and 3 'do-not-do routinely' treatments from NICE, MSAC and Prasad

Do-not-dos:


- Vertebroplasty for osteoporotic vertebral fractures
- Arthroscopic lavage or debridement for OA of the knee
- Laparoscopic uterine nerve ablation for chronic pelvic pain
- Removing healthy ovaries during a hysterectomy
- HBOT for a range of conditions (inc. osteomyelitis, cancer, and non-diabetic wounds and ulcers)

Do-not-do routinely:


- Fundoplication for gastro-intestinal reflux
- Episiotomy for spontaneous vaginal births
- Amniotomy to augment a normal delivery

Patients with 'legitimizing' diagnoses are excluded

Do-not-do procedures, Australia, 2010-11




A large proportion of relevant patients have do-not-dos




In almost all states, do-not-do treatments are concentrated in a minority of hospitals

Proportion of hospitals providing do-not-do treatments




There are outliers with troubling patterns of care

Proportion of relevant patients getting do-not-do procedure



Proportion of relevant patients getting do-not-do routinely procedure




Information gap 1: What not to do


- There is a huge volume of evidence
- Guidance focuses on what to do, is of variable quality, is inconsistent & hard to use
- 50+ organisations work on disinvestment and their approaches are largely uncoordinated and inconsistent

PubMed articles, 1994-2013


Articles (million)



Quality indicators for Australian clinical practice guidelines, 2005-2013




Articles (thousand)



Source: National Health and Medical Research Council

Information gap 2: Who's doing what

Proportion of board members Victorian LHNs, views on own network relative to average Victorian network




Notes: $n = 233$, 70% response rate, 96% of networks included

Source: Bismark et al (2013)

Accountability gap


Recommendation 3: clinical reviews with consequences



Recommendation 4: Improve variation measurement

- Find more do-not-dos elsewhere (e.g. Cochrane) and add more do-not-do routinely treatments
- Link patient separations to
 - analyse treatments that should not be given first-line
 - adjust for readmissions
 - allow better adjustments for morbidity
- Link to PBS and MBS data to acute data to allow measurement of more do-not-dos (e.g. primary care do-not-dos, polypharmacy, patients not getting routine first-line drug therapies)
- Pilot morbidity database for GP care in a few PHNs – collect data as part of MBS billing

Many more NICE do-not-dos can be measured with data we already collect



Some of our choices

- How much 'benefit of doubt' to give?
 - Is a 'Do Not Do' a 'Never Do'?
- Who should initiate investigation for potentially inappropriate care?
- Is it OK for private hospital to be the focus (vs surgeon)
- When should private insurers be able to deny payment?
 - When ACSQHC makes a determination?
 - When clinical review makes a determination?
 - When hospital fails to respond to external review?

What hospitals might do:

- Table the Grattan report for discussion with the relevant clinical governance group:
 - Do they think any of the DNDs or DNDRs are an issue in your hospital?
 - There are other issues we didn't look at which are prominent in the public debate (e.g. diagnostic test use). Are they relevant?
- How robust are your clinical governance processes?
 - Is appropriateness of care being systematically monitored?
 - What are the accountability mechanisms for clinical choices?
- NB: I don't think there are big savings for hospitals here
- NB: I do think this will be an increasing clinical governance issue
- And ***holding hospitals to account*** should be on the state agenda too