#### **Estimating the Impact of Self-Management Education, Influenza** 1

#### Vaccines, Nebulizers, and Spacers on Healthcare Utilization and 2

#### **Expenditures for Medicaid-Enrolled Children with Asthma** 3

4 5	Melike Yildirim, MS <sup>1</sup> , Paul Griffin, PhD <sup>2</sup> , Pinar Keskinocak, PhD <sup>1</sup> , Jean O'Connor, JD, MPH, DrPH <sup>3</sup> , Julie L Swann <sup>4*</sup>
6 7	<sup>1</sup> School of Industrial Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA
8 9	<sup>2</sup> Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, USA
10	<sup>3</sup> Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA
11 12	<sup>4</sup> Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina, USA
13	* Corresponding author E-mail: jlswann@ncsu.edu (JLS)
14	Introduction: We quantify the effect of a set of interventions including asthma
15	self-management education, influenza vaccination, spacers, and nebulizers on
16	healthcare utilization and expenditures for Medicaid-enrolled children with
17	asthma in New York and Michigan.
18	Methods: We obtained patients' data from Medicaid Analytic eXtract files and
19	evaluated patients with persistent asthma in 2010 and 2011. We used difference-
20	in-difference regression to quantify the effect of the intervention on the
21	probability of asthma-related healthcare utilization, asthma medication, and
22	utilization costs. We estimated the average change in outcome measures from
23	pre-intervention/intervention (2010) to post-intervention (2011) periods for the
24	intervention group by comparing this with the average change in the control
25	group over the same time horizon.
26	Results: All of the interventions reduced both utilization and asthma medication
27	costs. Asthma self-management education, nebulizer, and spacer interventions
28	NOTE: This prepcharepotiscopy observing the offermangen continents of the pay free new field and the state of

21.9% vs. 0.5-2.5% respectively) and inpatient (3.5-0.8%, 95%CI 2.1-4.9% vs.
0.4-1.2%, respectively) utilizations. Influenza vaccine decreased the probability
of primary care physician (6-3.5%, 95% CI 4.4-7.6% vs. 1.5-5.5%, respectively)
visit. The reductions varied by state and intervention.
Conclusions: Promoting asthma self-management education, influenza
vaccinations, nebulizers, and spacers can decrease the frequency of healthcare
utilization and asthma-related expenditures while improving medication
adherence.

### 50 Introduction

51 Asthma is a chronic inflammatory disease of the airways that causes wheezing, 52 breathlessness, and chest tightness (1). Asthma is one of the most common chronic 53 illnesses, affecting 8.3% of US children in 2016 (2). The estimated annual cost of asthma 54 treatment in the US was \$81.9 billion in 2013, with an average of \$3,728 per person (3). 55 Additionally, asthma is the third leading cause of pediatric hospitalization (4), and 56 children missed 13.8 million school days in 2013 due to asthma complications (5). 57 Asthma severity may change over time. However, with routine follow up visits to the 58 primary physician as well as careful adherence to medications and avoidance of asthma 59 triggers, patients can prevent and control asthma symptoms (6). If the patient has 60 uncontrolled asthma and the symptoms are present, it is crucial to optimize care (e.g., 61 asthma self-management education (AS-ME)).

Improvements to asthma treatment and education can reduce the frequency of related emergency department (ED) visits, missed school days, and hospitalizations. The Center for Disease and Control (CDC) prioritized several National Asthma Education and Prevention Program (NAEPP) recommendations in 6|18 initiative, which includes access and adherence to the appropriate asthma medications and devices and promotes AS-ME for individuals whose asthma is not well controlled (7).

A nebulizer is a device to deliver liquid medication to the lungs accurately, and spacers are recommended to use with inhalers to provide a required amount of medication, especially by children who have difficulty inhaling correctly. Proper usage of medications and required dose leads to a better response (8). Two types of medications (controllers and relievers) are commonly used for asthma treatments. Relievers work on acute symptoms and provide quick relief, whereas controller medications are used regularly to prevent asthma attacks. Improving adherence to asthma medications and

devices can reduce the utilization cost of visits due to fewer ED visits and hospitalizations
(9). For patients whose asthma remains uncontrolled despite medical management, ASME helps patients manage asthma triggers and symptoms and reduce asthma exacerbation
(10). Patients with asthma have an increased risk of severe symptoms with influenza. Flu
vaccines can decrease the risk of asthma attacks, which is triggered by flu infection (11).
Although clinical guidelines have recommended AS-ME and prescription of a spacer with
an inhaler (7), they are not widely implemented, and their net benefits are uncertain.

82 The objectives of this study were to: (i). predict the effects of asthma interventions 83 (AS-ME programs, influenza vaccination, nebulizer and spacer) on healthcare utilization 84 cost and asthma medication expenditures; (ii). evaluate the impacts of implementing the 85 recommended asthma interventions on the likelihood of asthma-related utilization (ED 86 visits, inpatient (IP) visits, and primary care physician (PCP) visits). Our study has several 87 strengths. We use the difference-in-difference method, which allows us to predict the net 88 effect of interventions while controlling for various time-dependent factors. We also 89 analyze several types of interventions (AS-ME, influenza vaccination, nebulizer and 90 spacer) used by children in two Medicaid programs across several performance measures. 91 The results provide insight for programs considering such interventions.

### 92 Methods

# 93 Data and Study Population

We evaluated claims data from children in New York and Michigan aged 0-17 with persistent asthma in 2010 and 2011 in the Medicaid program. Patients were Medicaideligible and enrolled for the entire 24 months. Based on slightly modified (12) criteria defined by Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set (HEDIS), we defined persistent asthma patients as those who have at least one prescription of asthma controller

99 medication or at least one ED visit or hospitalization, or at least three outpatient visits 100 with a primary diagnosis of asthma. We used HEDIS's definition for controller 101 medication (including anti-asthmatic combinations, antibody inhibitors, inhaled 102 corticosteroids, inhaled steroid combinations, leukotriene modifiers, mast cell stabilizers, 103 and methylxanthines) (13). We classified patients with diagnoses of asthma using the 104 ICD-9 (493.XX) codes. We identified 59,685 and 14,358 patients, respectively, in NY 105 and MI.

We selected New York and Michigan from a set of ten states (Texas, New York,
California, Florida, North Carolina, Alabama, Ohio, Illinois, Montano, and Michigan)
with a high number of claims for AS-ME in 2010. We chose MI and NY because they
also had high utilization of spacers and nebulizers, and they have different characteristics
for comparison purposes.

We utilized all patients' data, asthma-related expenditures, utilizations, and interventions in 2010 and 2011 from Medicaid Analytic eXtract (MAX) files. We obtained the urban, suburban, and rural classification of each zip code from the 2010 Census data (14).

115 We examined four interventions: AS-ME, influenza vaccine, nebulizer, or spacer 116 interventions in 2010. We evaluated one intervention effect in each model. We defined 117 four treatment subpopulations, i.e., one for each intervention: i) AS-ME intervention 118 patients - had at least one claim file with the procedure of AS-ME in 2010 with a primary 119 diagnosis code for asthma, ii) influenza intervention patients - had a prescription of 120 influenza vaccine in 2010, iii) spacer intervention patients - had at least one prescription 121 for a spacer (spacer with and without a mask or holding chamber) in 2010, iv) nebulizer 122 intervention patients - had at least one prescription for a nebulizer in 2010, and v) patients 123 who did not receive the specified intervention in either year. For example, the control

population of AS-ME consisted of the patients who did not receive AS-ME in 2010 and
2011. Similarly, each intervention population had corresponding control groups (four
control populations: AS-ME, influenza vaccine, nebulizer, and spacer controls).
Patients were excluded from our analysis if they received asthma-related home

visits in 2010 or 2011. We dropped intervention related utilizations and costs (e.g., visits

129 for AS-ME) from the data.

#### 130 Dependent Variables

We focus on utilization associated with active management of asthma, such as in a primary care setting. We are also concerned with the most expensive visits, including those in the ED and IP setting. The focus on these three categories is consistent with several other papers (15-17). ED, IP, and PCP visits were defined as asthma visits if the primary diagnosis code was asthma. From this point on, we denote asthma-related visits as including ED, IP, and PCP visits unless otherwise stated. We define PCP visits with a place of service code as an "office" or "outpatient hospital."

The dependent variables consisted of the probability of ED, PCP, and IP visit, utilization expenditures per person per year, and asthma medication expenditures per person per year. We denote utilization expenditures as the combined expenditure for ED, PCP, and IP visits.

We calculate medication costs from the expenditures for controllers and quick reliever medications. For all interventions except seasonal influenza, we consider the intervention and the post-intervention time intervals as the entire calendar year (2010 and 2011, respectively). We assumed that the flu season occurred in the first and last quarters of the calendar year.

### 147 Model Covariates

148 Each model consisted of a set of independent variables that we evaluated under three 149 categories (demographic characteristics, utilization, and medication adherence). We 150 classified a demographic group as urban, suburban, or rural location. We used two age 151 groups: 0 to 8 years old or 9 to 17 years old. We defined the asthma medication ratio 152 (AMR) (18) for an individual as the ratio of controller medications to total asthma 153 medications. We calculated the use of appropriate medications for people with asthma 154 (ASM) (18) as "1" for children who filled at least one prescription in a calendar year for 155 an asthma controller medication and "0" otherwise. We use medication management for 156 people with asthma (MMA) as another measure that assesses the patients who remained 157 with controller medications at least 50% of their treatment time (18). We used four 158 utilization variables, the number of IP, PCP, ED visits, and non-asthma-related ED visits 159 each year as independent variables.

160 We analyzed four separate difference-in-difference regression models for each of 161 the dependent variables to estimate the effects of nebulizers, spacers, and AS-ME. We 162 use dependent variables of ED utilization indicator, IP utilization indicator, utilization 163 expenditures, and asthma medication expenditures per person per year. We estimated the 164 effect of influenza vaccines on the PCP utilization indicator, utilization expenditures, and 165 medication expenditure outcome variables. We used asthma medication expenditures in 166 the analysis of NY, and because of insufficient data in MI, we excluded medication 167 expenditures from those models.

We added covariates to each regression model to control for other factors that were not affected by the intervention (19). We included medication adherence, demographic characteristics, and intervention variables in all of the regression models, regardless of the dependent variable. We incorporated utilization variables in the models

if they were not related directly to the outcome variable. We dropped non-significantterms from the regressions through a backward stepwise method.

### 174 Regression Methods

175 We used difference-in-difference (DiD) regression to estimate the intervention's effect 176 on the probability of asthma-related healthcare utilization and asthma medication and 177 utilization expenditures. We provide parallel trend lines, which show the changes in 178 outcome variables from 2010 to 2011, in Figures 1 and 2 for AS-ME (please refer to 179 Supplementary Figures S1 and S6 for other interventions). For intervention groups, we 180 assessed the average change in outcome measures from pre-intervention/intervention 181 (2010) to post-intervention (2011) periods by comparing this with the average change in 182 the control group over the same time horizon. [Figures 1 and 2 near here]

DiD regression required three specific dummy variables, which were related to time and population. We defined a binary intervention variable for each intervention model, which was "1" for the intervention group and "0" for the control group. The year indicator was "1" for 2011 and "0" for 2010. The interaction term represented the interaction between the intervention and the year covariates. The interaction term was defined as the DiD estimator ( $\rho$ ) and predicted with the following equation:

189 
$$Y_i = \alpha + \beta I_i + \gamma t_i + \rho (I_i t_i) + \delta X_i + \varepsilon_i. (1)$$

In the equation, the subscript *i* represents the patient; I and t, respectively, represent intervention and time indicators;  $\alpha$  is the constant term and represents the intercept;  $\beta$  corresponds to the intervention group effect;  $\gamma$  is time trend for intervention and control groups;  $\rho$  is the estimator of the intervention effect;  $\delta$  is the effect of timevarying covariates; and  $\varepsilon$  is the error term. The DiD estimator was calculated from:

195 
$$\rho = (E[Y_i | I=1, t=1] - E[Y_i | I=1, t=0]) - (E[Y_i | I=0, t=1] - E[Y_i | I=0, t=0]).$$
(2)

The calculation was obtained by subtracting the change in outcomes for the control group from the change in outcomes for the intervention group over time (20). We used a linear probability model with the untransformed binary outcome variable, and we used an ordinary least squares regression model to estimate log-transformed (natural log) continuous response variables. In order to deal with the log transformation of zero cost values, we added a constant amount of \$1 to annual utilization and medication costs before the transformation.

The coefficient of the interaction term represents the effect of an intervention on 203 204 the outcome variable. Linear probability models can be interpreted directly as the 205 probability of ED, IP, or PCP utilization changes of the intervention population from pre-206 to post-intervention, over the control group changes. When the interaction term increases 207 from 0 to 1 and all the other variables remained constant, the (DiD estimator  $\times$  100) shows 208 the percentage change to the probability of having at least one visit to the specified 209 department, which was indicated as the response variable. In the log-transformed 210 response variable model, if the interaction term increased from 0 to 1 and all the other variables remain constant ( $e^{DiD \text{ estimator}} - 1$ ) × 100 (for more information, see (21)), this 211 212 indicates the percentage of expenditure changes. Negative terms indicate a reduction in 213 expenditures or probability, and a positive sign indicates the opposite. The percentage 214 changes represent the reduction from 2010 to 2011 in the intervention population over 215 the changes in the control population.

#### 216 Results

We summarize descriptive results in Tables 1 and 2 [Tables 1 and 2 near here] for the intervention and control populations. Patients that received interventions were more likely

to be younger children, more likely to live in urban or suburban areas, and are likely tohave received some other preventive intervention.

221 For patients who received any intervention, their 2010 utilization cost was 1.37 222 times higher than those who received none. In comparison to the control, their probability 223 of ED, IP, and PCP utilization was 41% higher, 122% higher, and 55% lower in 2010. 224 For each intervention and each outcome variable, we estimated the intervention 225 effect for patients who received an intervention in 2010. For all interventions in both 226 states, we find that the utilization cost decreased after the intervention, which is illustrated 227 in Figures 3 and 4. These figures convert the DiD estimator to the % of change values 228 provided from Tables S1 and S2 (see Supplementary file). We discuss results specific to 229 each intervention below.

# 230 AS-ME

In the data, patients who were in the intervention group for AS-ME showed a significant reduction in ED utilization from 2010 to 2011. For example, the intervention group made 0.82 ED visits in MI and 0.55 in NY on average in 2010, while in 2011, their average number of ED visits decreased to 0.41 in MI and 0.43 in NY. On the other hand, the AS-ME control population had similar average ED utilization per patient in both 2010 and 2011.

Regression results show that AS-ME decreased the probability of ED utilization by 13.4% in MI and 6% in NY and IP utilization by 2.2% in MI and 3.5% in NY. Figures 3 and 4 summarize the results, showing that AS-ME decreased the utilization cost by 16.9% (i.e., = $(e^{-0.185}-1) \times 100$ , using coefficient -0.185 from Table S2) for NY and 64.6% for MI patients. The NY data shows that AS-ME reduced asthma medication expenditures (controller plus reliever expenditures) by 15.04%. [Figures 3 and 4 near here]

### 243 Influenza Vaccine

From descriptive data, patients in the intervention group had 26.4% and 23.8% (0.78 control vs. 1.06 intervention and 1.47 control vs. 1.93 intervention) higher PCP utilization than the control populations, respectively, in NY and MI in 2010. Both the control and intervention populations had decreased mean PCP utilization in 2011. On the other hand, the intervention for influenza vaccine had decrease average IP utilization per patient in NY and MI by 50% (0.06 to 0.03 in NY and 0.04 to 0.02 in MI) from 2010 to 2011.

Regression results estimate that patients who received the influenza vaccine in 251 2010 reduced their utilization expenditures by 16.4% in NY and 14.8% in MI. The 252 vaccination was associated with a 6% (NY) and 3.5% (MI) lower probability of a PCP 253 visit. Furthermore, the influenza vaccine decreased asthma medication expenditures by 254 15.6% in NY (Figures 1 and 2).

#### 255 Nebulizer

Descriptive data from Tables 1 and 2 show that the mean ED utilization reduced 45% in MI (76% in NY) in the intervention population, which is 0.50 vs. 0.12 (0.60 vs. 0.33), respectively, in 2010 and 2011. The nebulizer control population had 11% (0.18 vs. 0.16 in NY and 0.62 vs. 0.55 in MI) difference in mean ED utilization compared to the intervention population in both states.

From the regression models, the 2011 reduction of the predicted ED utilization probability was 20.8% in MI and 12.4% in NY with the nebulizer intervention. In addition, nebulizers reduced the likelihood of IP utilization by 1.6% and 0.8%, respectively, in MI and NY. [Figures 1 and 2 near here] Nebulizers decreased the utilization cost around 11% in both states and medication cost 6% in NY.

266 Spacer

267 In both states, the intervention population for spacers reduced their mean ED and IP 268 utilization from 2010 to 2011 more than the reduction of the control group. 269 The mean ED utilization was reduced 20% (12.7%) for the intervention population (0.35 270 vs. 0.28 in MI and 0.55 vs. 0.48 in NY) in MI (NY) versus 13.9% (0%) in the control 271 population (0.36 vs. 0.31 in MI and 0.33 vs. 0.33 in NY). Similarly, the reduction of mean 272 IP utilization was 43.8% (0.16 vs. 0.09) and 40% (0.05 vs. 0.03) for the intervention 273 population, whereas, it was 16.7% (0.06 vs. 0.05) and 25% (0.04 vs. 0.03) for the control 274 population, respectively, in NY and MI (Tables 1 and 2).

Having a spacer decreased medication and utilization expenditures. The reduction of ED and IP utilization probability was around 1% in MI and 2% in NY. A spacer decreased the utilization cost by 10.6% for NY and 15.7% for MI patients.

# 278 Discussion

All the interventions reduced the annual utilization and asthma medication expenditures per intervention patient. AS-ME, nebulizer, and spacer interventions reduced the probability of ED and IP utilization. Influenza vaccines decreased the likelihood of PCP utilization. In short, all of the interventions had positive impacts on more than one measure of outcomes or cost. This is true even when controlling for other interventions that a patient had, which commonly occurred and when controlling for regression to the mean through the difference-in-difference approach.

The percentages of expenditure reductions were consistent for the two states for influenza vaccine (15% in MI and 16% in NY) and nebulizer (11% in MI and NY) models. The spacer intervention population showed similar reductions for two states (16% in MI and 11% in NY). However, AS-ME results showed a 65% expenditure reduction in MI and a 17% reduction in NY.

291 A difference between programs is one potential explanation. AS-ME 292 implementation processes differ from many perspectives; however, we can observe only 293 some of them from claims data (e.g., place of service, provider). Specifically, 77% of AS-294 ME claims in NY were in a Physician's office, whereas most of them (65%) in MI took place in outpatient hospitals. In NY, pediatricians (70%) were commonly responsible for 295 296 AS-ME while in MI, the primary care physicians (60%) were. Additionally, intervention 297 populations in NY and MI were different based on their average utilizations in 2010. In 298 these states, AS-ME may have been given to different patient groups based on the severity 299 of asthma. Some of these differences may have been due to differences in procedure 300 coding systems, state regulations, or rules that determined the target populations for the

301 interventions.

In most cases, the reductions in the probability of healthcare utilization are consistent from state to state. The results from nebulizer utilization models showed that with the nebulizer intervention, NY patients were five times more likely to decrease IP utilization and 1.7 times less likely to reduce ED utilization compared to the MI intervention patients. This suggests that there may be a shifting of healthcare resources, e.g., a proportion of IP visits are handled in the ED, and ED visits are reduced with more PCP visits.

309 Our results on AS-ME are consistent with previous studies. AS-ME can reduce 310 ED and IP utilization (22-25), decrease the cost of utilization, improve medication 311 adherence (ASM, AMR, MMA in Tables 1 and 2), and reduce asthma medication costs, 312 which can be caused by excessive use of relievers. Lower AMRs indicate the possibility 313 of higher consumption of relievers. AS-ME improves controller adherence since MMA 314 increases with AS-ME patients more than control patients. Whereas, the number of claims

drops for short-acting inhaled beta-agonists (SABA), which is associated with increasedAMR.

The results show that the effect of nebulizer and spacer in the treatment of asthma was similar to other studies (26,27). There was limited evidence for the impact either way of the influenza vaccine on asthma exacerbations in pediatric asthma patients (28). Further, some studies showed no effect from the influenza vaccine on health outcomes for children with asthma (29-31). However, a flu infection can trigger asthma attacks and a need for quick relievers (12). Patients who received an influenza vaccine may decrease their medication costs due to an influenza case averted or shortened by the vaccine.

324 The raw data in Tables 1 and 2 showed that the percentage reduction in "average" 325 IP visits is more significant than the percentage reduction in "average" ED visits for some 326 interventions (nebulizer for both states and AS-ME in NY). However, Figures 3 and 4 327 showed that the percentage probability of a reduction in IP utilization is lower than the 328 percentage probability of a reduction in ED visits. There may be a couple of reasons for 329 this. An important one is that the regressions that we use in this study account for other 330 covariates. As mentioned earlier, there may also be additional differences in 331 implementation in the specific states or for a given intervention.

Influenza vaccines (\$12.45-\$32.47 (32)) and spacers (\$4-\$30 (33)) are not costly investments. While AS-ME interventions are more costly, the AS-ME intervention population had the highest utilization expenditure reduction compared to the other intervention populations.

We did not use matching methods to create a control group because of two reasons. First, even if control and intervention populations do not have similar preintervention means, DiD models can generate unbiased estimates (34). Secondly, matching the control and intervention population can lead to a biased assessment because

regression to the mean occurred when the population was selected for a higher/lowerthan-average in the first measurement (2010) (35). The matched population will tend to regress to the population mean in the second year (2011).

343 The study has limitations. The data analysis started in 2016 with the latest 344 available MAX data from 2010 and 2011. The results of models depended on the 345 available data. We were only able to control for certain factors, and it is possible that 346 unobserved factors could affect the expenditures or utilizations. However, DiD is a useful 347 tool because it eliminates the need to control all confounding variables (19). In this study, 348 we consider both population differences (demographics, medication adherence, 349 utilization) and various interventions within the same model. The intervention and control 350 patients differed from each other based on the utilization of services in 2011. These 351 differences could have originated from the intervention and other factors (any other 352 asthma control efforts not seen in the data). We did not evaluate the effects of intervention 353 combinations (e.g., AS-ME + Spacer) due to the small sample sizes of the subpopulations. 354 Throughout the analysis, we did not specify the type of medication (controller, reliever) 355 obtained with the spacer and nebulizer. The HEDIS measure we use excludes systematic 356 corticosteroids, which could lead to a misestimation of medication costs.

We assume that the patients who have a claim for intervention indeed receive the intervention. On the other hand, patients defined for the control group never received that intervention, while some may have received it from other sources (e.g., spacer, influenza vaccine). We are accepting that uncertainty can exist, and we acknowledge that statistical analysis does not always indicate an essential relationship. The evaluation of observed results from clinical trials could give more precise estimates about effects and associations (36,37).

#### 364 Conclusions

Previous studies (17,22,25-29,31), literature reviews or meta-analysis (23,24,30), showed the impact of asthma interventions on a population by looking at them individually, which can lead to under- or over-estimating the set of effects taken in total. In this study, we consider both population differences (demographics, medication adherence, utilization) and various interventions within the same model in order to develop a better estimate of the overall effect of multiple interventions.

371 This analysis provides evidence to policymakers about the benefits of the 372 interventions of influenza vaccines, spacers, AS-ME, and nebulizers on health outcomes 373 of pediatric asthma patients. Influenza vaccines were shown to be the most effective 374 intervention on medication expenditures. AS-ME programs showed the highest 375 utilization expenditure reductions overall. AS-ME also improved medication adherence 376 and reduced asthma medication costs caused by the utilization of rescue medications. The 377 spacer and nebulizer decreased utilization expenditure, which was caused by the 378 reduction in the probability of ED and IP utilization. Although the percentage of patients 379 that benefited from the interventions were low, promoting these interventions in other 380 states or health systems could decrease the utilization cost and the frequency of healthcare 381 utilization by the sickest patients while improving medication compliance of patients.

382

383

384

385 386

387

388

389

390

391

392

# 393 **References**

394 1. American Academy of Allergy Asthma and Immunology. Asthma. Milwaukee, 395 WI: AAAAI; 2020. [accessed 2020 May 24]. https://www.aaaai.org/conditions-and-396 treatments/asthma. 397 American Academy of Allergy Asthma and Immunology. Asthma Statistics. 2. 398 Milwaukee, WI: AAAAI; 2020. [accessed 2020 May 24]. https://www.aaaai.org/about-399 aaaai/newsroom/asthma-statistics. 400 Nurmagambetov T, Kuwahara R, Garbe P. The Economic Burden of Asthma in 3. 401 the United States, 2008-2013. Ann Am Thorac Soc. 2018;15(3):348-56. 402 4. American Lung Association. Asthma and Children Fact Sheet. 2020. [accessed 403 2020 May 24]. https://www.lung.org/lung-health-diseases/lung-disease-404 lookup/asthma/learn-about-asthma/asthma-children-facts-sheet. 5. 405 Zahran HS, Bailey CM, Damon SA, Garbe PL, Breysse PN. Vital Signs: 406 Asthma in Children - United States, 2001-2016. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 407 2018;67(5):149-55. 408 6. King-Biggs MB. Asthma. Ann Intern Med. 2019;171(7):ITC49-ITC64. 409 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The 6/18 initiative: accelerating 7. 410 evidence into action. Atlanta, GA: CDC; 2016. [accessed 2020 May 24]. 411 www.cdc.gov/sixeighteen/. 412 Moore RH, Wood RA. Patient education: Asthma inhaler techniques in children 8. 413 (Beyond the Basics). Forthcoming. 414 9. George M, Bender B. New insights to improve treatment adherence in asthma 415 and COPD. Patient Prefer Adherence. 2019;13:1325-34. 416 Harver A, Kotses H. Asthma, health and society a public health perspective. 10. 417 New York: Springer; 2010. 418 11. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Flu and People with Asthma. 419 Atlanta, GA: CDC; 2019. [accessed 2020 May 24]. 420 https://www.cdc.gov/flu/highrisk/asthma.htm. 421 12. Wakefield DB, Cloutier MM. Modifications to HEDIS and CSTE algorithms 422 improve case recognition of pediatric asthma. Pediatr Pulmonol. 2006;41(10):962-71. 423 doi:10.1002/ppul.20476. 424 13. National Committee for Quality Assurance. HEDIS Measures. Washington, DC: 425 NCQA; 2020. [accessed 2020 July 24]

U.S. Census Bureau. American Fact Finder. Suitland-Silver Hill, MD: USCB; 14. 426 427 2018. [accessed 2018 April 4]. 428 https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/searchresults.xhtml?refresh=t. 429 Trogdon JG, Nurmagambetov TA, Thompson HF. The economic implications of 15. 430 influenza vaccination for adults with asthma. Am J Prev Med. 2010;39(5):403-10. 431 16. Sabato K, Ward P, Hawk W, Gildengorin V, Asselin JM. Randomized 432 controlled trial of a breath-actuated nebulizer in pediatric asthma patients in the 433 emergency department. Respir Care. 2011;56(6):761-70. 434 17. Swann JL, Griffin PM, Keskinocak P, Bieder I, Yildirim FM, Nurmagambetov 435 T, et al. Return on investment of self-management education and home visits for 436 children with asthma. J Asthma. 2019:1-10. 437 18. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Quality Measures Summary. 438 Atlanta, GA: CDC; 2015. [accessed 2018 May 10]. 439 https://www.cdc.gov/asthma/pdfs/quality measures summary 3 18 15.pdf. 440 19. Lechner M. Estimation of Causal Effects by Difference-in-Difference Methods. 441 Hanover, MA: Now; 2010. p. 224. 442 20. Gertler P, World Bank. Impact evaluation in practice. Washington, D.C.: World 443 Bank; 2016. 444 21. Fox J. Applied regression analysis and generalized linear models. Third edition. 445 ed. Los Angeles: SAGE; 2016. xxiv, 791 pages p. 446 22. Woods ER, Bhaumik U, Sommer SJ, Ziniel SI, Kessler AJ, Chan E, et al. 447 Community asthma initiative: evaluation of a quality improvement program for 448 comprehensive asthma care. Pediatrics. 2012;129(3):465-72. doi:10.1542/peds.2010-449 3472. 450 Rangachari P, May KR, Stepleman LM, Tingen MS, Looney S, Liang Y, et al. 23. 451 Measurement of Key Constructs in a Holistic Framework for Assessing Self-452 Management Effectiveness of Pediatric Asthma. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 453 2019;16(17). 454 Hsu J, Wilhelm N, Lewis L, Herman E. Economic Evidence for US Asthma 24. 455 Self-Management Education and Home-Based Interventions. J Allergy Clin Immunol 456 Pract. 2016;4(6):1123-34 e27. 457 25. Campbell JD, Brooks M, Hosokawa P, Robinson J, Song L, Krieger J. 458 Community Health Worker Home Visits for Medicaid-Enrolled Children with Asthma: 459 Effects on Asthma Outcomes and Costs. Am J Public Health. 2015;105(11):2366-72.

All rights	racaricad	NIA		allowed	11/14/2011	normionion
All noms	reserven	13()	reuse	allowed		Dennission
7 41 1191100	100011000.		10000	anonoa	minour	

460 Mitselou N, Hedlin G, Hederos CA. Spacers versus nebulizers in treatment of 26. 461 acute asthma - a prospective randomized study in preschool children. J Asthma. 462 2016;53(10):1059-62. doi:10.1080/02770903.2016.1185114. 463 27. Magee JS, Jones SM, Ayers ME, Golden W, Vargas PA. Access to spacers and 464 peak flow meters among medicaid patients with asthma. J Asthma. 2002;39(8):687-91. 465 28. Ong BA, Forester J, Fallot A. Does influenza vaccination improve pediatric 466 asthma outcomes? J Asthma. 2009;46(5):477-80. 467 29. Greenhawt MJ. Influenza vaccination in asthmatic patients. J Allergy Clin 468 Immunol. 2014;133(4):1233-4. 469 30. Vasileiou E, Sheikh A, Butler C, El Ferkh K, von Wissmann B, McMenamin J, 470 et al. Effectiveness of Influenza Vaccines in Asthma: A Systematic Review and Meta-471 Analysis. Clin Infect Dis. 2017;65(8):1388-95. Friedman BC, Goldman RD. Influenza vaccination for children with asthma. 472 31. 473 Can Fam Physician. 2010;56(11):1137-9. 474 32. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Pediatric Influenza Vaccine Price 475 List. Atlanta, GA: CDC; 2020. [accessed 2020 May 23]. 476 https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/programs/vfc/awardees/vaccine-management/price-477 list/index.html#flu. 478 Family Practice Notebook. Spacer Devices for Asthma Inhalers. 2020. [accessed 33. 479 2020 May 23]. https://fpnotebook.com/lung/pharm/SpcrDvcsFrAsthmInhlrs.htm. 480 34. Angrist JD, Pischke J-S. Mostly harmless econometrics : an empiricist's 481 companion. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 2009. xiii, 373 pages p. 482 35. Daw JR, Hatfield LA. Matching and Regression to the Mean in Difference-in-483 Differences Analysis. Health Serv Res. 2018;53(6):4138-56. 484 36. Greenland S, Senn SJ, Rothman KJ, Carlin JB, Poole C, Goodman SN, et al. 485 Statistical tests, P values, confidence intervals, and power: a guide to misinterpretations. 486 European journal of epidemiology. 2016;31(4):337-50. 487 37. Wasserstein RL, Schirm AL, Lazar NA. Moving to a world beyond "p< 0.05". 488 Taylor & Francis; 2019. 489 490 491







Figure 2. Probability of utilization trendlines for AS-ME.

Abbreviations: AS-ME – Asthma self-management education, ED – Emergency department, IP – Inpatient (hospitalization), PCP – Primary care physician



Figure 3. Summary results for intervention effects (New York).

Notes: Calculations performed with using Supplementary Tables S1 and S2. Utilizations are transformed to % changes by DiD estimator  $\times$  100 and costs are transformed with using  $e^{DiD \text{ estimator}} - 1 \times 100$ .

Abbreviations: AS-ME – Asthma self-management education, ED – Emergency department, IP – Inpatient (hospitalization), PCP – Primary care physician



Figure 4. Summary results for intervention effects (Michigan).

Notes: Calculations performed with using Supplementary Tables S1 and S2. Utilizations are transformed to % changes by DiD estimator  $\times$  100 and costs are transformed with using  $e^{DiD \text{ estimator}} - 1 \times 100$ .

Abbreviations: AS-ME – Asthma self-management education, ED – Emergency department, IP – Inpatient (hospitalization), PCP – Primary care physician

	AS-ME				Influenza Vaccine				
Population	Cor	Control Intervention			Co	ntrol	Interv	Intervention	
Year	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	
Number of patients	57804	57804	1566	1566	50948	50948	6856	6856	
Utilization (Mean, St	d)			I.					
ED visit per patient	0.35 (0.07)	0.35 (0.09)	0.55 (0.14)	0.43 (0.13)	0.36 (0.15)	0.36 (0.15)	0.27 (0.09)	0.28 (0.1)	
IP visit per patient	0.07 (0.003)	0.05 (0.002)	0.17 (0.008)	0.08 (0.003)	0.07 (0.004)	0.05 (0.003)	0.06 (0.005)	0.03 (0.002)	
PCP visit per patient	0.80 (0.20)	0.74 (0.14)	2.42 (1.02)	1.47 (0.78)	0.78 (0.19)	0.70 (0.18)	1.06 (0.21)	0.97 (0.14)	
Non-asthma ED visit per patient	0.93 (0.12)	0.89 (0.10)	0.97 (0.18)	0.86 (0.14)	0.91 (0.16)	0.89 (0.13)	1.05 (0.27)	0.95 (0.12)	
Medication Adherence	e (Mean.	Std)				I		I	
ASM	0.91 (0.009)	0.93 (0.011)	0.95 (0.02)	0.95 (0.04)	0.91 (0.08)	0.93 (0.004)	0.94 (0.01)	0.95 (0.005)	
AMR	0.65 (0.05)	0.66 (0.	0.65 (0.	0.67 (0.	0.64 (0.	0.65 (0.	0.69 (0.	0.70 (0. 06)	
MMA	0.37 (0.04)	0.40 (0.03)	0.36 (0.04)	0.42 (0.03)	0.36 (0.04)	0.40 (0.04)	0.39 (0.03)	0.44 (0.04)	
Demographic Charac	teristics (	%)							
Age 9 - 17	42.88	50.06	35.95	43.93	43.53	50.66	38.10	45.64	
Urban	53.83	53.83	50.21	50.21	54.58	54.58	48.25	48.25	
Suburban	22.17	22.17	21.23	21.23	21.42	21.42	27.75	27.75	
Intervention (%)									
Patient with Spacer	0.74	5.53	2.81	7.92	0.70	5.53	1.01	5.51	
Patient with Nebulizer	22.53	21.73	44.89	27.97	22.31	21.88	24.18	20.60	
Patient with Influenza Vaccine	11.86	11.46	13.73	12.52	0	8.45	100	33.78	
Patient with AS-ME	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	

# Table 1. Variable comparison for control and intervention (New York).

	Spacer				Nebulizer				
Population	Con	trol	Interv	rention	Co	ntrol	Interve	Intervention	
Year	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	
Number of patients	52655	52655	1814	1814	37256	37256	7989	7989	
Utilization (Mean, Std	)								
ED visit per patient	0.33	0.33	0.55	0.48	0.18	0.16	0.60	0.33	
r r r	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.13)	(0.11)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.27)	(0.12)	
IP visit per patient	0.06	0.05	0.16	0.09	0.03	0.02	0.11	0.07	
1 1	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.002	
								)	
PCP visit per patient	0.76	0.72	1.31	1.20	0.60	0.56	1.27	0.89	
	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.45)	(0.37)	(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.39)	(0.25)	
Non-asthma ED visit	0.89	0.87	1.32	1.13	0.79	0.79	1.20	1.00	
per patient	(0.17)	(0.12)	(0.37)	(0.35)	(0.14)	(0.12)	(0.51)	(0.47)	
Medication Adherence	e (Mean, Sta	<i>d</i> )							
ASM	0.92	0.93	0.85	0.89	0.95	0.96	0.87	0.91	
	(0.01)	(0.013)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.03)	
AMR	0.66	0.66	0.61	0.66	0.69	0.69	0.60	0.64	
	(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.07)	
MMA	0.36	0.40	0.36	0.39	0.37	0.42	0.36	0.40	
	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.04)	
Demographic Charact	eristics (%)								
Age 9 - 17	44.82	52.03	21.83	27.34	49.06	56.60	32.48	38.49	
Urban	52.56	52.56	59.65	59.65	49.38	49.38	56.67	56.67	
Suburban	23.44	23.44	16.35	16.35	26.62	26.62	19.33	19.33	
Intervention (%)									
Patient with Spacer	0	0	100	0	0.31	4.05	2.03	5.91	
Patient with	19.45	20.45	92.28	28.89	0	0	100	0	
Nebulizer									
Patient with	11.85	11.42	11.74	10.64	11.86	11.62	12.82	11.10	
Influenza Vaccine									
Patient with AS-ME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Table 1. Variable comparison for control and intervention (New York) (continued).

Asthma medication ratio, ASM – Appropriate medications for people with asthma, AS-ME – Asthma self-management education, ED – Emergency department, IP – Inpatient (hospitalization), PCP – Primary care physician, Std – Standard deviation

	1								
		AS-	ME		Influenza Vaccine				
Population	Cor	ntrol	Interve	ention	Control		Interv	vention	
Year	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	
Number of patients	13643	13643	475	475	9517	9517	4126	4126	
Utilization (Mean, Std)									
ED visit per patient	0.36	0.32	0.82	0.41	0.40	0.35	0.28	0.25	
r r r	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.23)	(0.17)	(0.13)	(0.11)	(0.1)	(0.09)	
IP visit per patient	0.05	0.03	0.08	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.02	
1 1	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	
PCP visit per patient	1.61	1.30	2.21	1.35	1.47	1.22	1.93	1.49	
	(0.40)	(0.28)	(1.02)	(0.52)	(0.24)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.38)	
Non-asthma ED visit	1.00	0.86	1.26	1.34	0.98	0.84	1.05	0.90	
per patient	(0.15)	(0.10)	(0.22)	(0.14)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.32)	(0.31)	
Medication Adherence	(Mean, Sta	<i>l</i> )							
ASM	0.28	0.91	0.36	0.91	0.27	0.90	0.30	0.94	
	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.09)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.02)	(0.07)	(0.01)	
AMR	0.21	0.63	0.27	0.59	0.20	0.61	0.22	0.68	
	(0.01)	(0.09)	(0.02)	(0.1)	(0.01)	(0.12)	(0.01)	(0.15)	
MMA	0.11	0.34	0.16	0.45	0.11	0.33	0.13	0.35	
	(0.007)	(0.05)	(0.006)	(0.05)	(0.004)	(0.05)	(0.004)	(0.06)	
Demographic Character	ristics (%)								
Age 9 - 17	49.1	58.5	45.5	54.9	51.5	60.5	43.5	53.8	
Urban	43.0	43.0	39.6	39.6	45.4	45.4	37.7	37.7	
Suburban	45.7	45.7	48.6	48.6	43.7	43.7	50.4	50.4	
Intervention (%)									
Patient with Spacer	16.9	9.8	24.4	8.6	14.9	9.1	21.4	11.6	
Patient with Nebulizer	43.2	34.9	59.8	40.2	43.4	35.5	42.7	33.5	
Patient with Influenza	30.2	25.5	29.1	25.5	0	16.6	100	46.1	
Vaccine									
Patient with AS-ME	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	

Table 2. Variable comparison for control and intervention populations (Michigan).

	Spacer				Nebulizer				
Population	Control		Intervention		Control		Intervention		
Year	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	
Number of patients	10426	10426	1875	1875	5980	5980	2903	2903	
Utilization (Mean, Std)	I.						Į.		
ED visit per patient	0.36	0.31	0.35	0.28 (0.03)	0.62 (0.28)	0.55	0.50 (0.09)	0.12 (0.04)	
IP visit per patient	0.04 (0.002)	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.02 (0.002)	
PCP visit per patient	1.56 (0.41)	1.24 (0.38)	1.92 (0.4)	1.26 (0.22)	2.72 (1.02)	2.16 (0.81)	1.92 (0.52)	1.12 (0.37)	
Non-asthma ED visit per patient	0.94 (0.17)	0.81 (0.12)	1.11 (0.29)	0.42 (0.32)	0.62 (0.14)	0.52 (0.12)	1.13 (0.38)	1.23 (0.31)	
Medication Adherence (M	Iean, Std)							I	
ASM	0.27 (0.09)	0.90 (0.07)	0.38 (0.08)	0.95 (0.03)	0.30 (0.1)	0.99 (0.008)	0.28 (0.07)	0.95 (0.03)	
AMR	0.20 (0.01)	0.62 (0.07)	0.27 (0.01)	0.67 (0.08)	0.23 (0.01)	0.69 (0.09)	0.20 (0.01)	0.67 (0.1)	
MMA	0.11 (0.009)	0.34 (0.04)	0.17 (0.006)	0.34 (0.09)	0.12 (0.006)	0.36 (0.01)	0.12 (0.006)	0.35 (0.01)	
Demographic Characteri	stics (%)								
Age 9 - 17	54.5	63.7	31.9	42.5	58.8	68.5	43.6	53.1	
Urban	44.3	44.3	38.1	38.1	35.0	35.0	42.5	42.5	
Suburban	44.2	44.2	50.6	50.6	51.0	51.0	46.2	46.2	
Intervention (%)									
Patient with Spacer	0	0	100	0	14.7	7.6	20.5	9.6	
Patient with Nebulizer	41.1	33.6	49.2	34.5	0	0	100	0	
Patient with Influenza Vaccine	28.2	24.5	37.5	28.5	30.7	25.7	31.3	25.9	
Patient with AS-ME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Table 2. Variable comparison for control and intervention populations (Michigan) (continued).

Abbre viation

s: AMR – Asthma medication ratio, ASM – Appropriate medications for people with asthma, AS-ME – Asthma self-management education, ED – Emergency department, IP – Inpatient (hospitalization), PCP – Primary care physician, Std – Standard deviation