Title:

Comparison of Care Utilization and Institutional Death Rates among Older Adults according to Different Types of Home Care Facilities: a retrospective cohort study in Fukuoka, Japan

Authors: *

1. Sung-A Kim, MPH (Corresponding author)
   Department of Health Care Administration and Management, Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Kyushu University
   Mailing address: Department of Health Care Administration and Management, Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Kyushu University
   3-1-1 Maidashi, Higashi-ku, Fukuoka 812-8582, Japan
   Tel: +81-92-642-6707 Fax: +81-92-642-6707
   E-mail address: kj61444@naver.com
2. Akira Babazono, MD, MS, PhD
   Department of Health Care Administration and Management, Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan
   E-mail address: babazono@hcam.med.kyushu-u.ac.jp
3. Aziz Jamal, MHltSc
   (1) Department of Health Care Administration and Management, Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Kyushu University
   (2) Health Administration Program, Department of International Business & Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Selangor Campus, Malaysia.
   E-mail address: azizabduls.jamal@gmail.com
4. Yunfei Li, MS
   Department of Health Care Administration and Management, Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Kyushu University
   E-mail address: yunfei.li90@gmail.com
5. Ning Liu, MBA, MPH
   Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Kitakyushu, Japan
   E-mail address: ningningu@gmail.com

Abstract:

Objective We compared the use of various care services and institutional deaths in older adults among these facility types.

Design This was a retrospective cohort study.

Methods We used administrative claim data from April 2014 to March 2017. The study participants comprised Fukuoka Prefecture residents aged 75 and older with certified care needs of level 3 or more in April 2014 and who received home care services during the study period. Participants were divided into 4 groups according to the facility type from which they received home care services: General Clinics, Home Care Support Clinics and hospitals (HCSCs), Enhanced HCSCs with beds and Enhanced HCSCs without beds. The outcomes were utilization of medical and long-term care services and the incidence of institutional deaths. We constructed generalized linear regression models. The evaluated potential risk factors were sex, age, care needs levels, and Charlson comorbidity index (CCI) scores.

Results The numbers of inpatient care days were 54.3 days, 70.0 days, 64.7 days, and 75.1 days for users of enhanced HCSCs with beds, enhanced HCSCs without beds, HCSCs, and general clinics, respectively. While the number of home care days were 63.8 days, 50.9 days, 57.8 days, and 29.0 days, respectively. The odds of institutional death in general clinic users were 2.32 times higher ($P<0.001$) than users of enhanced HCSCs with beds.

Conclusions Participants who used enhanced HCSCs with beds had reduced inpatient care utilization, increased home care utilization, increased home-based end-of-life care utilization, and fewer institutional deaths. These findings suggest that hospitalizations and institutional deaths could be reduced by further expanding the role of enhanced HCSCs with beds. Our study provides useful information for further investigations of home care for older adults as part of community-based integrated care.

Strengths and limitations of this study

1. This was a retrospective cohort study including 18,347 participants.
2. We followed up participants for 3 years.
3. We considered the level of care needs and Charlson comorbidity index as confounders. Despite that, the inclusion of these variables did not provide detailed information about living conditions that reflect family structure and characteristics of living.
4. We calculated the number of years that participants lived during the study period, and the annual utilization rates per person-year of observation were estimated.
5. There were no clinical data for individual participants because this study focused on the types of healthcare facilities that provide home care.

INTRODUCTION

In 2012, approximately 800 million adults, comprising 11% of the global population, were aged 65 and older.[1] This demographic is projected to reach 1.4 billion by 2030, and will exceed 2 billion around 2050.[2] Japan is presently the world's most aged society with adults aged 65 and older accounting for 22.6% of its population in 2010, and this proportion is expected to surpass 30% in 2025.[3] Notably, the post-World War II baby-boomer generation in Japan will reach the age of 75 in 2025, thereby imposing a heavy financial burden on the nation's social security system.[4,5]

Japan's health insurance system categorizes older adults aged 65–74 as "early-stage elderly" and those aged 75 and older as "latter-stage elderly", and their out-of-pocket copayment rates are set at 20% and 10%, respectively.[6] The average annual medical expenditure in 2018 was 553,000 yen for early-stage elderly patients and 910,000 yen (1.6 times higher) for latter-stage elderly patients.[7] In contrast, the average annual long-term care (LTC) expenditure was 50,000 yen for early-stage elderly patients and 480,000 yen (over 10 times higher) for latter-stage elderly patients.[7] Latter-stage elderly patients tend to be relatively frail and have multiple chronic conditions that require the use of both medical and LTC services.[8,9] In order to efficiently provide integrated care for these individuals, Japan implemented the Community-based Integrated Care System (CICS) with the aim of changing the conventional hospital-centered healthcare delivery system to one that is focused on patient residences and local facilities.[10] The CICS comprehensively provides home care, medical care, and LTC services in addition to preventive care and daily living support to enable older adults to age in place until the end of life, even when they become increasingly care dependen.[11] There is therefore a need to ensure the availability of 24-hour, 365-day care services to monitor and manage any sudden changes in these older adults' health statuses.

The proportion of home deaths in Japan exceeded 80% in 1951, with only 9% of deaths occurring at medical institutions.[12] This trend was reversed in 1976, with the institutional death rate reaching 75.8% in 2016.[12] With current trends, almost half a million people will be unable to receive end-of-life care at a medical institution in 2030, even if the number of home deaths increases by a

factor of 1.5.[13] To resolve this issue, Japan introduced Home Care-Support Clinics/Hospitals (HCSCs) that provide 24-hour home care and home-visit nursing care in 2006.[14] Furthermore, 2012 saw the institutionalization of “enhanced HCSCs”, which fulfill more stringent criteria such as having 3 or more full-time doctors on staff, 5 or more cases of emergency home care treatments, and 2 or more cases of end-of-life care within the past year.[14] HCSCs that qualify for this “enhanced” designation receive higher reimbursements than conventional HCSCs.[14] At present, general clinics, HCSCs, and enhanced HCSCs are authorized to provide insurance-covered home care. As enhanced HCSCs are further subcategorized into those with beds and those without beds,[14] there are currently 4 types of home care facilities available in Japan.

The proportion of adults aged 75 and older in Japan is expected to reach 18.1% in 2025,[3] and optimizing the CICS may help to provide solutions for problems faced by aging societies in Japan and throughout the world. To improve the circumstances where older adults can continue living at home, it is necessary to first ascertain how different facilities in the current home care delivery system influence the use of medical and LTC services. Previous studies have shown that increasing integrated care and home care can reduce hospitalization durations in older patients.[15-22] However, it remains unclear as to whether specific measures to strengthen the home care delivery system, such as the introduction of HCSCs and enhanced HCSCs, have affected the places where older adults receive end-of-life care or their utilization of various care services.

This study examined the influence of the home care delivery system on end-of-life care in adults aged 75 and older. We comparatively examined home-based end-of-life care utilization, institutional deaths, and the use of medical and LTC services among older adults who received home care services from 4 different facility types (enhanced HCSCs with beds, enhanced HCSCs without beds, HCSCs, and general clinics).

METHODS

Database

The study was conducted using data from a medical claims database and an LTC insurance claims database provided by the Fukuoka Prefecture Association of Latter-stage Elderly Healthcare. Medical claims include information on patient characteristics, medical treatments, disease diagnoses, and medical expenditures of all individuals who have received insurance-covered care.[23] LTC insurance refers to public insurance for older adults aged 65 and older, and adults aged 40 and older with specific diseases. These claims include information on LTC service utilization and the corresponding expenditures for all individuals with certified care needs. Under the LTC insurance system, care needs are categorized into 7 levels (support needs levels 1–2 and, care needs levels 1–5), with increasing levels signifying higher degrees of dependence.[23]

Study Design

This retrospective cohort study used data from April 2014 to March 2017. The study participants consisted of Fukuoka Prefecture residents aged 75 and older with certified care needs of level 3 or more in April 2014, and who received home care services during the study period. Participants were divided into 4 groups according to the facility type from which they received home care services: Group A (enhanced HCSCs with beds), Group B (enhanced HCSCs without beds), Group C (HCSCs), and Group D (general clinics).

We analyzed the participants who died during the 3-year study period to compare their home-based end-of-life care utilization and place of death among the groups. The use of home-based end-of-life care was identified using claims records of additional fees specifically for these services. The place of death was categorized as “medical institution” for participants who had been recorded as having died in a hospital or clinic in the claims data. The institutional death rate was calculated as the percentage of participants who died in a medical institution among all participants who died during the study period.

Next, we examined the number of days that participants received inpatient care, outpatient care, and home care among the groups. The expenditures for inpatient care, outpatient care, home care, and LTC services were also calculated for each group.

Information was obtained on participant sex, age, care needs levels, and Charlson comorbidity index (CCI) scores. Age was divided into 4 categories (75–79, 80–84, 85–89, and ≥90 years). The care needs levels included in our analysis were levels 3, 4, and 5 (with level 5 representing the highest level of dependence). CCI scores, which indicate the weighted number of concomitant diseases in an individual, were divided into 3 categories (0–2, 3–4, and ≥5).

Statistical Analysis

The distributions of sex, age, care needs levels, CCI, and death were examined across the groups. In addition, the inter-group differences in home-based end-of-life care utilization and institutional death among those who died during the study period were examined. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare these differences.

We constructed multivariable logistic regression models to evaluate the influence of home care facility type on home-based end-of-life care utilization and institutional death. The models' dependent variables were the use or non-use of home-based end-of-life care and death at a medical institution or another location. The exposure of interest was the home care facility type, with Group A (enhanced HCSCs with beds) as the reference category. The covariates were sex, age, care needs levels, and CCI. The odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals were estimated.

Next, we calculated the mean annual days of inpatient care, outpatient care, and home care, as well as the mean annual expenditures for inpatient care, outpatient care, home care, and LTC among the groups. The inter-group differences were compared using analysis of variance. Each participant's service utilization was calculated over the number of years that he/she lived during the study period, and the annual utilization rates per person-year of observation were estimated. This method allowed the inclusion of data from participants who had died, which was useful because of the study

population comprised individuals with an elevated mortality risk due to advanced age and high care needs.

To evaluate the influence of home care facility type on the use of medical and LTC services, we constructed generalized linear regression models. The models' dependent variables were the days of inpatient care, outpatient care, and home care, as well as the expenditures for inpatient care, outpatient care, home care, and LTC. The exposure of interest was the home care facility type. The covariates were sex, age, care needs levels, CCI, death, and the number of years the participants lived. The marginal means of the dependent variables were calculated to indicate the estimated values of the care days and expenditures of the various care services. These were calculated by substituting the means of the estimates into the generalized linear regression models on the assumption that the value of each covariate is a mean.

SQL server 2014 was used to extract the data and STATA version 14.2 was used for all analyses.

RESULTS

The participants' characteristics are summarized in Table 1. There were 18,347 participants, with 2,509 in Group A, 825 in Group B, 6,218 in Group C, and 8,795 in Group D. We observed significant inter-group differences in sex (P=0.002), age (P<0.001), and CCI (P<0.008). However, there were no significant differences in care needs levels (P=0.816) and death (P<0.669). Groups A and B tended to have higher CCI and older age than Groups C and D. During the 3-year study period, 54% of the participants died; Group A had the highest proportion of deaths (59.9%). Among the participants who died, there were significant inter-group differences in home-based end-of-life care utilization and institutional deaths. Group A had the highest home-based end-of-life care utilization rate (57.4%) and the lowest institutional death rate (25.6%). The home-based end-of-life care utilization rate increased (in order) across Groups A, B, C, and D, but this order was reversed for the institutional death rate.

Table 2 shows the multivariate logistic regression analysis results of the associations of home

care facility type with home-based end-of-life care utilization and institutional death among participants who died during the study period. Relative to Group A, Group D had the lowest odds of using home-based end-of-life care (OR = 0.13; $P<0.001$) and the highest odds of institutional death (OR = 2.32; $P<0.001$).

The distribution of medical and LTC service utilization per person-year across the groups is shown in Table 3. The mean total numbers of care days used by the participants were similar among the groups. However, there were significant inter-group differences when these numbers of days were categorized into inpatient care, outpatient care, and home care. The mean annual number of inpatient care days was highest in Group D (34.0 days), followed by Group B (33.0 days), Group C (29.6 days), and Group A (26.6 days). The mean annual number of outpatient care days was also highest in Group D (18.5 days), followed by Group A (10.1 days), Group C (9.8 days), and Group B (8.5 days). The mean annual number of home care days was highest in Group A (31.1 days), followed by Group C (27.2 days), Group B (24.9 days), and Group D (13.3 days). The mean annual inpatient care expenditure was highest in Group B ($9,822.8) and lowest in Group A ($7,661.7). The mean annual outpatient care expenditure was highest in Group D ($1,109.3) and lowest in Group C ($675.2). The mean annual home care expenditure was highest in Group A ($6,122.2) and lowest in Group D ($1,627.7). The mean annual LTC expenditure was highest in Group A ($30,252.7) and lowest in Group D ($26,688.6).

Table 4 shows the marginal means estimated from the generalized linear regression models that evaluated the associations of home care facility type with medical and LTC service utilization. The number of inpatient care days was highest in Group D (75.1 days), followed by Group B (70.0 days), Group C (64.7 days), and Group A (54.3 days). The number of outpatient care days was also highest in Group D (40.4 days), followed by Group C (21.2 days), Group A (21.1 days), and Group B (17.0 days). In contrast, the number of home care days was highest in Group A (63.8 days), followed by Group C (57.8 days), Group B (50.9 days), and Group D (29.0 days). Inpatient care expenditure was highest in Group B ($20,767.7), followed by Group D ($20,413.7), Group C ($17,606.3), and Group A

($15,523.3). Outpatient care expenditure was highest in Group D ($2,332.9), followed by Group A ($1,522.8), Group C ($1,500.6), and Group B ($1,455.5). Home care expenditure was highest in Group A ($12,747.4), followed by Group B ($10,790.1), Group C ($9,551.4), and Group D ($3,440.9). LTC expenditure was highest in Group A ($64,192.7), followed by Group C ($64,147.1), Group B ($62,003.3), and Group D ($58,186.0).

DISCUSSION

In this retrospective study of older home care service users with high care needs levels residing in Fukuoka Prefecture, we compared the utilization of medical and LTC services among 4 types of home care facilities. Participants who used enhanced HCSCs with beds had the highest number of home care days and the lowest number of inpatient care days per person-year. In contrast, participants who used general clinics had the lowest number of home care days and the highest number of inpatient and outpatient care days per person-year. These results corroborate previous findings that the integration of home care into community care by specialized clinics is effective in reducing hospitalization durations in older adults.[18,24]

A novel finding of this study is that the participants who used home care services from enhanced HCSCs with beds were most likely to receive end-of-life care at home and least likely to die at a medical institution. Specifically, the odds of institutional death in participants who used general clinics were 2.32 times higher than those who used enhanced HCSCs with beds, indicating that the latter are associated with reductions in institutional deaths. The Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare of Japan reported that the national institutional death rate in 2016 was 75.8%,[25] which was substantially higher than the corresponding rate of all our subjects (36.6%) and even the general clinic user group (44.3%). This suggests that older adults who use home care services are more likely to die at places other than medical institutions, such as at home or an LTC facility. Promoting the use of home care could, therefore, help to reduce the institutional death rate, as shown in a previous study.[26] Similarly, Sadamura and Babazono examined the correlation between LTC resources and place of death, and

found that collaborations among clinics to provide home-based medical and LTC services reduced institutional deaths.[27] Accordingly, this form of integrated care may be effective in providing home-based end-of-life care for older adults.

It is noteworthy that participants who used enhanced HCSCs with beds had a substantially lower number of inpatient care days, but a higher number of home care days than participants who used enhanced HCSCs without beds. This suggests that the presence or absence of beds in enhanced HCSCs affected the use of care, despite these facilities being otherwise functionally identical. Another notable result is that conventional HCSCs appeared to be more effective in providing home care than enhanced HCSCs without beds in the metrics of inpatient care and home care days. These findings indicate a need to review the current insurance system that reimburses enhanced HCSCs without beds more than conventional HCSCs for the same services.[14] In our study population, the users of enhanced HCSCs with beds had a higher utilization of home-based end-of-life care and a lower utilization of inpatient care despite having relatively high care needs levels. Among the home care facility types, those well-equipped to manage sudden changes in their patients' conditions may be able to provide high-quality home-based daily living support and reduce the length of hospitalizations. A point of concern is that there was no significant difference in inpatient care days between general clinics and enhanced HCSCs without beds, as the latter are not equipped with beds for stay. The prerequisites for receiving this status can be met not only by the home care facility itself, but also by collaborating with other clinics.[14] It is, therefore, possible that a proportion of the enhanced HCSCs without beds are not individual facilities, but instead comprise 2 or more clinics that have collaborated to satisfy the relevant criteria. Consequently, decisions on treatment strategies (such as hospitalization) at these facilities may involve several doctors rather than one doctor. Bynum et al. examined the effects of different primary care types on hospitalizations in a continuing care retirement community, and found that individuals who received primary care by doctors with 24-hour medical coverage had significantly fewer hospitalizations and emergency department visits than those who were served by external non-specific doctors.[24] In other words, the

decentralization of healthcare provision can be reduced when one doctor is in charge of providing primary care for older community-dwelling adults. This can improve the quality of care and lower the number of hospitalizations and overall healthcare utilization rates. Based on these findings, we propose that the home care delivery system should limit the “enhanced” status to clinics with beds. However, there are no differences in home care fees between facilities with and without collaborations under Japan’s current medical fee schedule. In order to expand the role of enhanced HCSCs, it is necessary to not only consider the presence or absence of beds, but also the presence or absence of collaborations with other clinics when examining the differences among HCSCs.

This study has several limitations. First, the study was conducted using only Fukuoka Prefecture residents, thereby limiting the generalizability of our findings. However, this prefecture has a high number of hospital beds and high medical expenditures per person, and the results of this study may be overestimated. Second, our data did not include detailed information about living conditions that reflect family structure and characteristics of living, which can influence the choice of home care facilities. Third, although the statistical analyses incorporated characteristics such as sex, age, care needs levels, and CCI, the diseases of each participant were not taken into consideration. Moreover, there were no clinical data (e.g., disease progression or laboratory test results) for individual participants because this study focused on the types of healthcare facilities that provide home care. Finally, we used care needs levels as a covariate, but could not account for any changes in these levels during the study period. However, using the care needs levels and CCI at the start of the study provided insight into the participants’ baseline disease severity.

Here, we examined the effects of home care in Japan’s CICS on the use of medical and LTC services, the use of home-based end-of-life care, and the place of death in older community-dwelling adults. We also confirmed the important role of enhanced HCSCs with beds in providing home care services. Currently, there are 7,629 clinics with beds in Japan, and approximately 100,000 beds are in operation. Of these, 46% are used for emergency care and 37% provide transitional care for hospital-discharged patients before being transferred to home or an LTC facility.[28] Approximately

60% of those occupying these beds are aged 75 and older.[28] In order to optimize the provision of home care in a CICS, there is a need to consider functional changes in clinics with beds. The promotion of integrated community care is regarded as a viable solution for aging societies in many countries. To support this increasing need for community care, the World Health Organization published *Integrated care for older people: guidelines on community-level interventions to manage declines in intrinsic capacity* in 2017.[29] These guidelines emphasize a need for comprehensive community-based strategies and primary care-level interventions to prevent diminishing capacity, and are consistent with our study's conclusion that HCSCs with beds play an integral role as the main healthcare facilities for providing home care within a region. Japan is considering the further dissemination of CICS as a national policy. This would involve the construction of a large system by coordinating the resources from acute care hospitals, rehabilitation hospitals, LTC facilities, clinics with beds, primary healthcare clinics, and comprehensive support centers within a region. Consequently, there would be a need to clarify each facility's role in this system. Our study provides useful information for further investigations of home care for older adults as part of community-based integrated care.

Acknowledgements The authors thank the Fukuoka Prefecture Association of Latter-Stage Elderly Healthcare for provision of the healthcare claims database.

Contributors SK lead the study design, conducted the literature search, extracted and analyzed the data, and wrote the manuscript. AB contributed to the study design, analysis and manuscript revision. AJ, YL and NL contributed to the study design and analysis.

Funding This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing interests None declared.

Patient consent for publication Not required.

Ethics approval This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Kyushu University (Clinical Bioethics Committee of the Graduate School of Healthcare Sciences, Kyushu University). (Approval No. 20209).

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data sharing statement No additional data are available.

Open access

REFERENCES

1. Hope P, Bamford SM, Beales S, et al. Creating sustainable health and care system in ageing societies. Report of the Ageing Societies Working Group 2012. The Global Health Policy Summit; 2012.
2. United Nations. World population ageing 2015. New Work: United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division. 2015;ST/ESA/SER.A/390.
3. Cabinet Office. Heisei29nenban Koureishakai Hakusho. Koreikano jyoukyo (Annual Report on the Aging Society in 2017. The aging situation). https://www8.cao.go.jp/kourei/whitepaper/w-2017/zenbun/pdf/1s1s_01.pdf (Accessed May 20, 2020).
4. Rubenstein LZ. Falls in older people: epidemiology, risk factors and strategies for prevention. Age and Ageing. 2006;35 Suppl 2:ii37-ii41.
5. National Institute of Population and Social Security Research. Nihonno Shouraisuikei jinkou -Heisei29nen Suikei (The future population estimates in 2017). http://www.ipss.go.jp/pp-zenkoku/j/zenkoku2017/pp29_gaiyou.pdf (Accessed May 20, 2020).
6. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Wagakunino Kokuminminahoken Seido (The overview of Medical insurance system for elderly). 2006. https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/12400000/000377686.pdf (Accessed May 20, 2020).
7. Ministry of Finance. Shakaihoshouni tsuite (About Social Security). 2018. https://www.mof.go.jp/about_mof/councils/fiscal_system_council/sub-of_fiscal_system/proceedings/material/zaiseia301009/01.pdf (Accessed May 20, 2020).
8. Marengoni A, Angleman S, Melis R, et al. Aging with multimorbidity: a systematic review of the literature. Ageing Res Rev. 2011;10(4):430-9.
9. World Health Organization. Global status report on noncommunicable diseases 2014. World Health Organization Geneva. 2014.
10. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. 2015nenno Koureisha Kaigo -Koureishano Sonchouwo

Sasaeru Keano Kakuritsuni Mukete (Elderly Care in 2015 -Toward the Establishment of Care to Support the Dignity of Elderly Persons-). 2003. https://www.mhlw.go.jp/topics/kaigo/kentou/15kourei/3.html (Accessed May 20, 2020).

11. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Chiikihoukatsukea Kenkyukai Houkokusho (The study report of community-based integrated care systems).2019. https://www.mhlw.go.jp/houdou/2009/05/dl/ h0522-1.pdf (Accessed May 20, 2020).
12. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Jaitakuiryouno Genjyou (Current status of Homecare). 2016. https://www.mhlw.go.jp/file/05-Shingikai-10801000-Iseikyoku-Soumuka/0000129546.pdf. (Accessed May 20, 2020).
13. Miura H. Homecare for the Elderly. The Japan Geriatrics Society. 2013;50:164-7.
14. Ohta H. Current conditions and issues for home care support clinics. Japan Medical Association Journal. 2015;58:6-9.
15. Johri M, Beland F, Bergman H. International experiments in integrated care for the elderly: a synthesis of the evidence. Int J Geriatric Psychiatry. 2003;18(3):222-35.
16. Eklund K, Wilhelmson K. Outcomes of coordinated and integrated interventions targeting frail elderly people: a systematic review of randomised controlled trials. Health Soc Care Community. 2009;17(5):447-58.
17. Stewart MJ, Georgiou A, Westbrook JI. Successful integrating aged care services: a review of the evidence and tools emerging from a long-term care program. International journal of integrated care. 2013;13(1).
18. Rosenberg T. Acute hospital use, nursing home placement, and mortality in a frail community-dwelling cohort managed with Primary Integrated Interdisciplinary Elder Care at Home. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2012;60(7):1340-6.
19. Damery S, Flanagan S, Combes G. Does integrated care reduce hospital activity for patients with chronic diseases? An umbrella review of systematic reviews. BMJ Open. 2016;6(11):e011952.

20. Di Pollina L, Guessous I, Petoud V, et al. Integrated care at home reduces unnecessary hospitalizations of community-dwelling frail older adults: a prospective controlled trial. BMC Geriatr. 2017;17(1):53.
21. Ellis G, Whitehead MA, Robinson D, et al. Comprehensive geriatric assessment for older adults admitted to hospital: meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. BMJ. 2011;343:d6553.
22. Baxter S, Johnson M, Chambers D, et al. The effects of integrated care: a systematic review of UK and international evidence. BMC Health Serv Res. 2018;18(1):350.
23. Olivares-Tirado P, Tamiya N. Trends and Factors in Japan's Long-Term Care Insurance System: Japan's 10-year Experience. Springer. 2014.
24. Bynum J, Andrews A, Sharp S, et al. Fewer hospitalizations result when primary care is highly integrated into a continuing care retirement community. Health Affairs. 2011;30(5):975-84.
25. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Heisei28nen Jinkoudoutaitoukeino Gaikyou (Vital Statistics of Japan in 2018). https://www.mhlw.go.jp/toukei/saikin/hw/jinkou/kakutei16/index.html (Accessed May 20, 2020).
26. Kishida K, Tanigaki S. Jaitakushienshinryoujyoniyoru Mitorikazuni Eikyousuru Chiikitokusei (Regional characteristics that affect the number of end-of-life care provided by home care support clinics). Journal of health and welfare statistics. 2011;58:27-30.
27. Sadamura M, Babazono A. Kaigohokenseidouniyoru Kaigoshigenno Shihyouto siboubashotono Kanren (Relationship between long-term Care resource indicators by long-term Care insurance system and place of death. Journal of health and welfare statistics). 2005;52:8-14.
28. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Dai55kai Shakaihoshousingikai Iryoubukai: Yushoushinryoujyono Genjyouto Kadai (55th Social Security Council Medical Section: Current status and issues of clinics with beds). 2017. https://www.mhlw.go.jp/file/05-Shingikai-12601000-Seisakutoukatsukan-Sanjikanshitsu_Shakaihoshoutantou/0000184304.pdf (Accessed May 20, 2020).
29. World Health Organization. Integrated care for older people guidelines on community-level

interventions to manage declines in intrinsic capacity. World Health Organization Geneva; 2017.

Table 1. Participant characteristics according to home care facility type

	Total	Group A	Group B	Group C	Group D	*P* value
Number of participants	18,347	2,509 (13.7)	825 (4.5)	6,218 (33.9)	8,795 (47.9)	
Sex						
Men (%)	4,709 (25.7)	645 (25.7)	204 (24.7)	1,473 (23.7)	2,387 (27.1)	0.002
Women (%)	13,638 (74.3)	1,864 (74.3)	621 (75.3)	4,745 (76.3)	6,408 (72.9)	
Age, years						
Mean [SD]	87.5 [6.2]	87.8 [6.1]	88.1 [6.1]	87.7 [6.1]	87.1 [6.3]	
75–79 (%)	2,051 (11.2)	226 (9.0)	70 (8.5)	605 (9.7)	1,150 (13.1)	
80–84 (%)	4,035 (22.0)	542 (21.6)	167 (20.2)	1,388 (22.3)	1,938 (22.0)	<0.001
85–89 (%)	5,394 (29.4)	746 (29.7)	258 (31.3)	1,876 (30.2)	2,514 (28.6)	
≥90 (%)	6,867 (37.4)	955 (39.7)	330 (40.0)	2,349 (37.8)	3,193 (36.3)	
Care needs levels						
Level 3 (%)	5,081 (27.7)	582 (23.2)	227 (27.5)	1,739 (28.0)	2,533 (28.8)	
Level 4 (%)	6,804 (37.1)	882 (35.2)	281 (34.1)	2,341 (37.6)	3,300 (37.5)	0.816
Level 5 (%)	6,462 (35.2)	1,045 (41.6)	317 (38.4)	2,138 (34.4)	2,962 (33.7)	
Charlson comorbidity index						
0–2 (%)	4,115 (22.4)	507 (20.2)	144 (17.4)	1,331 (21.4)	2,133 (24.2)	
3–4 (%)	6,629 (36.1)	873 (34.8)	295 (35.8)	2,385 (38.4)	3,076 (35.0)	0.008
≥5 (%)	7,603 (41.5)	1,129 (45.0)	386 (46.8)	2,502 (40.2)	3,586 (40.8)	
Death						
Yes (%)	9,919 (54.1)	1,502 (59.9)	471 (57.1)	3,271 (52.6)	4,675 (53.2)	0.699
No (%)	8,428 (45.9)	1,007 (40.1)	354 (42.9)	2,947 (47.4)	4,120 (46.8)	
Number of deaths	9,919	1,502 (15.1)	471 (4.8)	3,271 (33.0)	4,675 (47.1)	
Home-based end-of-life care						
Yes (%)	3,103 (31.3)	862 (57.4)	220 (46.7)	1,285 (39.3)	736 (15.7)	<0.001
No (%)	6,816 (68.7)	640 (42.6)	251 (53.3)	1,986 (60.7)	3,939 (84.3)	
Institutional death						
Yes (%)	3.633 (36.6)	384 (25.6)	137 (29.1)	1,039 (31.8)	2,073 (44.3)	<0.001
No (%)	6,286 (63.4)	1,118 (74.4)	334 (70.9)	2,232 (68.2)	2,602 (55.7)	

Table 2. Associations of home care facility type with home-based end-of-life care utilization and institutional death

	Home-based end-of-life care		Institutional death	
	Odds ratio (95% CI)	*P* value	Odds ratio (95% CI)	*P* value
Home care facility type				
Group A	Reference			
Group B	0.66 (0.53–0.82)	<0.001	1.17 (0.93–1.47)	0.19
Group C	0.47 (0.41–0.54)	<0.001	1.35 (1.18–1.56)	<0.001
Group D	0.13 (0.11–0.15)	<0.001	2.32 (2.03–2.65)	<0.001
Sex				
Men	Reference			
women	1.36 (1.22–1.51)	<0.001	0.75 (0.68–0.82)	<0.001
Age, years				
75–79 (%)	Reference			
80–84 (%)	1.11 (0.89–1.38)	0.34	1.05 (0.88–1.25)	0.58
85–89 (%)	1.34 (1.09–1.65)	<0.001	0.95 (0.81–1.13)	0.58
≥90 (%)	1.96 (1.61–2.39)	<0.001	0.74 (0.63–0.87)	<0.001
Care needs levels				
Level 3 (%)	Reference			
Level 4 (%)	1.31 (1.15-1.49)	<0.001	0.88 (0.79–0.98)	0.02
Level 5 (%)	1.94 (1.71–2.20)	<0.001	0.71 (0.63–0.79)	<0.001
Charlson comorbidity index				
0–2 (%)	Reference			
3–4 (%)	0.74 (0.65–0.84)	<0.001	1.25 (1.10–1.41)	<0.001
≥5 (%)	0.57 (0.50–0.64)	<0.001	1.51 (1.35–1.70)	<0.001

Table 3. Medical and long-term care utilization and expenditure per person-year according to home care facility type

	Group A	Group B	Group C	Group D	*P* value
Person-year	4955.1	1703.5	13667.8	18564.3	
Mean [SD]	2.0 [1.1]	2.1 [1.1]	2.2 [1.0]	2.1 [1.0]	
Rate per person-year					
Care days					
Inpatient care	26.6	33.0	29.6	34.0	<0.001
Outpatient care	10.1	8.5	9.8	18.5	<0.001
Home care	31.1	24.9	27.2	13.3	<0.001
Care expenditure					
Inpatient care	7661.7	9822.8	8024.9	9382.9	<0.001
Outpatient care	709.0	696.2	675.2	1109.3	<0.001
Home care	6122.2	5172.5	4365.2	1627.7	<0.001
Long-term care	30252.7	29153.8	29457.1	26688.6	<0.001

Table 4. Effect of home care facility type on medical and long-term care utilization and expenditure

	Group A	Group B	Group C	Group D
Care days				
Inpatient care	54.3 (50.2–58.3)	70.0 (61.0–78.9)	64.7 (61.6–67.8)	75.1 (71.9–78.3)
Outpatient care	21.1 (19.6–22.6)	17.0 (14.8–19.1)	21.2 (20.2–22.2)	40.4 (38.7–42.0)
Home care	63.8 (61.0–66.6)	50.9 (47.1–54.7)	57.8 (56.2–59.4)	29.0 (28.3–29.7)
Care expenditure				
Inpatient care	15523.3 (14558.7-16487.9)	20767.7 (18552.0–22983.3)	17606.3 (16898.2–18314.5)	20413.7 (19696.5–21131.0)
Outpatient care	1522.8 (1347.3-1698.3)	1455.5 (1170.8–1740.1)	1500.6 (1387.6–1613.5)	2332.9 (2180.7–2485.6)
Home care	12747.4 (12015.6–13479.1)	10790.1 (9730.2–11850.1)	9551.4 (9200.6–9902.2)	3440.9 (3322.2–3549.7)
Long-term care	64192.7 (63145.0–65240.4)	62003.3 (60279.2–63727.5)	64147.1 (63474.9–64819.3)	58186.0 (57652.6–58719.5)