Prevalence of multimorbidity combinations and their association with medical costs and poor health among U.S. adults

Nicholas K. Schiltz, PhD[1]

[1]Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, USA
[2]Department of Population & Quantitative Health Sciences, Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, Cleveland, Ohio, USA

[3]Center for Community Health Integration, Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, Cleveland, Ohio, USA

*** Correspondence:**
Nicholas K. Schiltz, PhD
Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing, Case Western Reserve University
10900 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, OH 44106
Phone: 216-368-5626; Email: nks8@case.edu

Word Count: 2328

Conflicts of Interest: This project was supported in part by NIH/NCATS CTSA KL2TR002547.

The author has no other conflicts to disclose.

Financial Disclosure: No financial disclosures were reported by the author of this paper.

ABSTRACT

Background: Multimorbidity is common, but the prevalence and burden of the specific combinations of co-occurring disease has not been systematically examined at the population level in the U.S. The objective was to identify and measure the burden of highly prevalent combinations of chronic conditions treated among adults in the United States.

Methods: Cross-sectional analysis of U.S. households in the Medical Expenditure Panel Survey (MEPS), 2016–2019, a large nationally-representative sample of the community-dwelling population. Association rule mining was used to identify the most common combinations of 20 chronic conditions that have high relevance, impact, and prevalence in primary care. The main measures and outcomes were annual treated prevalence, total medical expenditures, and perceived fair/poor health.

Results: Frequent pattern mining yielded 259 unique combinations of chronic disease, including 77 two-way (dyad), 134 three-way (triad), 47 four-way, and one five-way combinations that are treated in one million or more U.S. adults. {Hypertension & Hyperlipidemia} was the most common two-way combination. The combination of {Diabetes & Arthritis & Cardiovascular disease} was associated with the highest median annual medical expenditures ($23,850, [Interquartile range: $11,593 – $44,616]), and the combination of {Diabetes & Arthritis & Asthma/COPD} had the highest age-race-sex adjusted odds ratio of fair/poor self-rated health (adjusted odd ratio: 6.9, [95%CI: 5.4 – 8.8]).

Conclusion: This study demonstrates that many multimorbidity combinations are highly prevalent among U.S. adults, yet most research and practice-guidelines remain single disease focused. Highly prevalent and burdensome multimorbidity combinations could be prioritized for evidence-based research on optimal prevention and treatment strategies.

INTRODUCTION

An estimated 42% percent of American adults suffer from multiple chronic conditions (i.e. multimorbidity).[1] Persons with multimorbidity are at higher mortality rates, lower health-related quality life, increased healthcare use, and are at higher risk for many poor health outcome events including adverse drug events.[2–6] While numerous data exist on the prevalence of single chronic conditions[1,7], much less is known about the prevalence of *specific combinations* of multimorbidity. Most prevalence studies of multimorbidity are based on counts of conditions.[8,9] Studies that have examined the prevalence of specific combinations of multimorbidity in the US have been mostly limited to dyad and triad combinations,[10–13] a small number of conditions,[14,15] conducted in a specific sub-populations[11] or geographic areas,[16] or limited to older adults.[14,17]

The prevalence of specific combinations of multimorbidity of the general community-dwelling adult population has not been established comprehensively in the United States. The US Department of Health and Human Services' strategic framework on multimorbidity identified understanding the epidemiology of constellations of multiple chronic conditions as one of its top research goals.[18] More recently, the Academy of Medical Sciences (United Kingdom) listed identifying trends and patterns of multimorbidity, and the specific clusters that cause the greatest burden as its top two goals in multimorbidity research.[19] Evidence about which conditions most commonly co-occur together and their impact on outcomes can help inform decisions about how to optimize prevention and treatment strategies, and design health systems to offer more holistic care rather the usual practice of treating one condition at a time.[19–22] Further, measuring the impact of multimorbidity based on counts of conditions or weighted scores may miss important heterogeneity, because the specific combinations of chronic disease matter in terms of health

outcomes[23] including mortality and poor health,[5] ADL/IADL limitations,[15,24] cost and utilization,[6] and quality of care.[25]

The goal of this study was to identify and rank the most frequent multi-way (two-way, three-way, four-way, etc...) combinations of multimorbidity treated among adults in the United States. An innovative machine learning algorithm –association rule mining – was used to identify all combinations of multimorbidity occurring in one million or more U.S. adults. The association with average and median per capita direct medical expenditures and perceived fair or poor health status was also examined, to identify combinations associated with the most burden.

METHODS

Design, Setting, and Participants

This study was a cross-sectional analysis of the 2016 – 2019 Medical Expenditure Panel Survey Household Component (MEPS). The MEPS is a large-scale panel survey of a nationally representative sample of households in the United States and is administered by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ).[26] The MEPS collects data at the person-level on numerous topics including medical expenditures, utilization, medical conditions, health status, and demographics. Interviews are conducted in-person using computer-assisted personal interview (CAPI) technology. This study included all adults age 18 and older with non-zero weights. Subjects with missing data on self-reported health or expenditures were excluded ($n \leq 10$). The final unweighted sample was 89,947 adults (Supplementary Figure 1).

Ethics Statement

The MEPS data used in this study is publicly available and de-identified. The Case Western Reserve University Institutional Review Board reviewed the protocol for this study and deemed it to be exempt under U.S. federal law.

Measures

Health conditions were self-reported through open-ended questions about conditions reported to be associated with health care events.[27] The respondents verbatim text responses were coded according to the International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD-10-CM). Treatment of these conditions may have been received through inpatient stays, outpatient or office-based visits, emergency department visits, home health care, or prescribed medications. Chronic conditions were then classified into one of 20 chronic conditions used in recent studies of multimorbidity, because of their high relevance, impact, and prevalence among primary care clientele.[28,29] A list of each chronic condition categories and corresponding ICD-10-CM codes is included in the appendix (Supplementary Table 1).

Perceived health was assessed by asking respondents to rate their health as excellent (1), very good (2), good (3), fair (4), or poor (5). A response of fair or poor was categorized as fair/poor perceived health.

Medical expenditures were defined as the sum of direct payments for care provided during the year, including out-of-pocket payments and payments by private insurance, Medicaid, Medicare, and other sources. Expenditure data were collected in the MEPS through both self-report and through data collected from the respondents' physicians, hospitals, and pharmacies, when available. The MEPS provides imputed values when data are missing or payments are made under capitated plans.[30] Expenditures were adjusted for annual inflation and are reported in terms

of 2019 dollars using the Personal Consumption Expenditure Health Price Index from the Bureau of Economic Analysis.[31]

Statistical Analysis:

Association Rule Mining (ARM) was used to identify the frequent multi-way combinations of chronic disease.[32] ARM is a machine learning method originally developed by computer scientists to find items commonly purchased together in the same transaction, but has since been extended to other applications, including medicine and bioinformatics,[33,34] as well as studies of multimorbidity.[35–38] The method was applied here by treating each subject in the study data as the "transaction," and each chronic condition as the "items" to find the most frequently co-occurring combinations out of the 1,048,576 (2^{20}) possible combinations of 20 conditions. The minimum support (prevalence) threshold was set at 0.20% for the initial pass, and then after applying survey weights, any combinations with a point estimate of less than one million adults (~0.40% of the U.S. adult population) was dropped.

The MEPS uses a complex stratified random sampling design. Design-based survey methods (i.e. Taylor series estimation) were used to account for stratification and clustering effects when estimating variances.[39] Survey weights were divided by four to produce all study results in terms of annual values. Person-level weights were applied to get the average annual estimated number and percent of persons with a disease combination and 95% confidence interval. The median and average annual per capita medical expenditures and percent self-reporting fair/poor health status was calculated for each combination after applying weights.

To identify specific combinations associated with the highest average cost and perceived poor health burden, we filtered out combinations that were redundant in that they offered little new

information on the outcome measure over a more parsimonious (i.e. superset) combination, using a minimum improvement criteria of 10%.[38,40]

The age-race-sex adjusted odds ratio of fair/poor health status was estimated for each disease combination using survey weighted generalized linear regression with a logit link function. The adjustment variables were age as a continuous variable with splines, race (Hispanic, non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic black, non-Hispanic Asian, and other), and sex.

Data pre-processing was performed using SAS version 9.4 for Windows. The analysis was conducted using R version 4.1.0, RStudio (v. 1.4.1717), and R packages: arules (v. 1.6-8) and survey (v. 4.1-1).[41,42]

RESULTS

The total weighted study population was 249.2 million adults age 18 and older, with 82.0 million (32.9%) reporting receiving treatment for two or more conditions (Table 1) in a single year. 51.7 million (20.7%) adults have three or more conditions, and 30.6 million (12.3%) have 4 or more conditions. A dose response increase is evident between number of chronic conditions and the percentage reporting fair/poor perceived health and average annual medical expenditures. The prevalence of multimorbidity is highest in those age 65 and older, however, the absolute number of people with 2 or more conditions was higher in those under 65.

Frequent pattern mining yielded 259 unique combinations of chronic disease, including 77 two-way, 134 three-way, 47 four-way, and one five-way combinations that affect one million or more of the weighted study population. The top 10 of these multi-way combinations, ranked by prevalence are shown in Table 2, and the full table is included in the supplementary material

(Supplementary Table 2). There are eight combinations that affect 10 million or more adults, 32 combinations that affect 5 million or more adults, and 129 that affect 2 million or more adults per year. There were not any six-way or higher combinations that met the minimum prevalence threshold.

Figure 1 shows the most prevalent combinations along with their associated total medical expenditures (in billions of U.S. Dollars) and percent of the population reporting poor perceived health. Combinations of conditions and corresponding prevalence estimates represent "at least", rather than "exactly." For example, an estimated 30.8 million people (12.4%, 95%CI: 12.0 - 12.8%) of the U.S. adult population are treated for *at least* {Hypertension & Hyperlipidemia} – the most common combination (Table 2). An estimated 11.5 million people (4.6%, 95%CI: 4.4% – 4.9%) have *at least* {Hypertension & Hyperlipidemia & Diabetes} – the most common 3-way combination, and fifth most common combination overall. These 11.5 million are a subset of the 30.8 million with at least hypertension & hyperlipidemia. {Hypertension & Hyperlipidemia & Musculoskeletal & Diabetes & Arthritis} was the most common 5-way combination, and had the highest observed-to-expected ratio of 77.0 (70.2 – 84.3). Combinations including hypertension and/or hyperlipidemia plus another condition comprise the majority of the most prevalent combinations. An alternate version of the analysis excluding hypertension and hyperlipidemia is included in the supplement (Supplementary Figure 2).

Figure 2 shows specific combinations of multimorbidity that ranked in either the top 20 in terms of average medical expenditures or perceived poor health. A total of 28 combinations met either criteria, and 12 met both. The combination {Diabetes & Urinary problems & Cardiovascular disease} had the highest average annual medical expenditures per capita ($35,782, 95%CI: $31,129 – $40,435). This was 2.1 times higher than the average for having any three or more

chronic conditions ($16,819). Average expenditures were higher than median expenditures across the board, indicating the right-skewed nature of expenditures. The combination of {Diabetes & Asthma/COPD & Cardiovascular disease} was most associated with perceived fair/poor health status with an adjusted odds ratio of 6.9 (5.4 – 8.8) (Figure 2). The 62.9% reporting fair/poor health was 2.1 times higher than the average percent reporting fair/poor health among those with any three or more chronic conditions. Diabetes (17 times), cardiovascular disease (11), and Asthma/COPD (9) appear most frequently in the figure.

DISCUSSION

This study combined data mining with survey epidemiology to comprehensively identify and estimate the treatment prevalence of the most frequent combinations of multimorbidity in the United States. This analysis showed that certain multimorbidity combinations of disease are not idiosyncratic, but actually quite common in the US, occurring in one million or more adults.

Despite the high prevalence of these disease combinations, most evidence-based practice guidelines are single-disease focused.[43] This relegates managing people with multimorbidity, who represent the majority of people presenting for primary care,[44,45] to the "art" of medicine, and has led to largely untargeted global interventions that show limited or no effect in clinical trials.[46] While general approaches for complex patients exist including geriatric care teams,[47] the Age-Friendly Health Systems 4M model of care,[48] and deprescribing guidelines (e.g. Beers Criteria and STOPP/START),[49,50] significant evidence gaps remain especially when it comes to specific guidelines for managing patients with specific combinations of conditions. The overall optimal treatment plan for a given patient with multimorbidity is unlikely to be the linear combination of the best treatment for each individual condition.[51] Further, adhering to multiple,

sometimes conflicting, guidelines for multiple individual diseases is burdensome[52] and conveys considerable iatrogenic risk to the patient.[21,53] The highly prevalent combinations identified in this study could be prioritized for future observational and intervention research.

Strengths

This study has several strengths. First, it represents the most comprehensive attempt to identify the prevalence of multimorbidity combinations in the general adult population in the United States. A nationally representative sample was used to identify the combinations and estimate the prevalence using survey-weighted techniques. The MEPS database is also unique in its condition enumeration approach, which allows for a more comprehensive capture of different chronic conditions. While most national surveys only ask questions on a fixed number of diseases, the MEPS uses open-ended responses and reconciliation between utilization records. Administrative sources like claims data would also be able to capture a comprehensive set of conditions, but these would be limited to patients for a given payer and would not capture the uninsured. Electronic health records are typically limited to a single health care system, and are not nationally-representative.

Association rule mining allows for the identification of highly prevalent combinations in a quick and computationally efficient manner, while filtering out combinations that have no observations or are sparse. While our study only focused on combinations occurring in over 1 million adults, the method could also be used to identify higher order combinations by setting a lower prevalence thresholds. Association rule mining is still relatively uncommon in clinical and epidemiological studies. The method could be applied to other areas of research, for example identifying high-risk combinations of risk factors associated with mortality, social determinant of

health indicators associated with disparities, or prescription drug combinations associated with adverse drug events.

Limitations

MEPS provides accurate estimates of treated prevalence for chronic disease, but this is likely lower than the underlying population prevalence for some conditions, especially those that are less salient.[27] On the other hand, the focus on treated conditions represent those for which care decisions between multiple conditions may conflict. The MEPS includes community-dwelling subjects only, meaning institutionalized persons such as nursing home and assisted living residents are excluded. Estimates of total expenditures are typically lower than what is estimated from the National Health Expenditure Accounts (NHEA), because the MEPS does not include these institutionalized populations.[54] ICD-10 codes were classified into 20 primary-care relevant conditions using an established algorithm, but other classification systems may result in different combinations and prevalence estimates. Consensus on which conditions to include in measures of multimorbidity has not been established, and is a problem that continues to plague the field.[55]

CONCLUSIONS

This cross-sectional analysis of a nationally-representative survey showed that certain multimorbidity combinations of disease are quite common in the US, occurring in one million or more adults. The combinations reported here could be prioritized for evidence-based research and integration into practice guidelines, especially those most associated with poor health and high medical costs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project was supported in part by NIH/NCATS CTSA KL2TR002547. Its contents are solely the responsibility of the author and do not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH. NKS is the sole contributor that met all three ICJME requirements for authorship. He had full access to the data, and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis, and the entirety of the manuscript. NKS contributions include conceptualization, design of the study, statistical analysis, interpreting the data, and writing and revising the manuscript. This work has not been published or presented elsewhere, except as a preprint on the MedRxiv server. The author of this report has no financial conflicts of interest to disclose.

Data availability: This study uses openly available data from the Medical Expenditure Panel Survey. Available at: https://www.meps.ahrq.gov/mepsweb/data_stats/download_data_files.jsp. Requests to access the processed dataset used in analysis should contact the corresponding author.

REFERENCES

1. Buttorff C, Ruder T, Bauman M. *Multiple Chronic Conditions in the United States*. RAND Corporation; 2017. Accessed October 5, 2019. https://www.rand.org/pubs/tools/TL221.html

2. Fortin M, Bravo G, Hudon C, et al. Relationship between multimorbidity and health-related quality of life of patients in primary care. *Qual Life Res Int J Qual Life Asp Treat Care Rehabil*. 2006;15(1):83-91. doi:10.1007/s11136-005-8661-z

3. Gijsen R, Hoeymans N, Schellevis FG, Ruwaard D, Satariano WA, van den Bos GA. Causes and consequences of comorbidity: a review. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2001;54(7):661-674. doi:10.1016/s0895-4356(00)00363-2

4. Wolff JL, Starfield B, Anderson G. Prevalence, expenditures, and complications of multiple chronic conditions in the elderly. *Arch Intern Med*. 2002;162(20):2269-2276. doi:10.1001/archinte.162.20.2269

5. Koroukian SM, Schiltz N, Warner DF, et al. Combinations of Chronic Conditions, Functional Limitations, and Geriatric Syndromes that Predict Health Outcomes. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2016;31(6):630-637. doi:10.1007/s11606-016-3590-9

6. Schiltz NK, Warner DF, Sun J, et al. Identifying Specific Combinations of Multimorbidity that Contribute to Health Care Resource Utilization: An Analytic Approach. *Med Care*. 2017;55(3):276-284. doi:10.1097/MLR.0000000000000660

7. James SL, Abate D, Abate KH, et al. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 354 diseases and injuries for 195 countries and territories, 1990–2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *The Lancet*. 2018;392(10159):1789-1858. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32279-7

8. Fortin M, Stewart M, Poitras ME, Almirall J, Maddocks H. A Systematic Review of Prevalence Studies on Multimorbidity: Toward a More Uniform Methodology. *Ann Fam Med*. 2012;10(2):142-151. doi:10.1370/afm.1337

9. Salive ME. Multimorbidity in Older Adults. *Epidemiol Rev*. 2013;35(1):75-83. doi:10.1093/epirev/mxs009

10. Lochner KA, Cox CS. Prevalence of multiple chronic conditions among Medicare beneficiaries, United States, 2010. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2013;10:E61. doi:10.5888/pcd10.120137

11. Steinman MA, Lee SJ, Boscardin WJ, et al. Patterns of Multimorbidity in Elderly Veterans. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2012;60(10):1872-1880. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2012.04158.x

12. Garin N, Koyanagi A, Chatterji S, et al. Global Multimorbidity Patterns: A Cross-Sectional, Population-Based, Multi-Country Study. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2016;71(2):205-214. doi:10.1093/gerona/glv128

13. Ward BW. Prevalence of Multiple Chronic Conditions Among US Adults: Estimates From the National Health Interview Survey, 2010. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2013;10. doi:10.5888/pcd10.120203

14. Weiss CO, Boyd CM, Yu Q, Wolff JL, Leff B. Patterns of Prevalent Major Chronic Disease Among Older Adults in the United States. *JAMA*. 2007;298(10):1158-1162. doi:10.1001/jama.298.10.1160-b

15. Quiñones AR, Markwardt S, Botoseneanu A. Multimorbidity Combinations and Disability in Older Adults. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2016;71(6):823-830. doi:10.1093/gerona/glw035

16. Rocca WA, Boyd CM, Grossardt BR, et al. Prevalence of Multimorbidity in a Geographically Defined American Population: Patterns by Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2014;89(10):1336-1349. doi:10.1016/j.mayocp.2014.07.010

17. Koroukian SM, Schiltz NK, Warner DF, et al. Multimorbidity: constellations of conditions across subgroups of midlife and older individuals, and related Medicare expenditures. *J Comorbidity*. 2017;7(1):33-43. doi:10.15256/joc.2017.7.91

18. Parekh AK, Goodman RA, Gordon C, Koh HK. Managing Multiple Chronic Conditions: A Strategic Framework for Improving Health Outcomes and Quality of Life. *Public Health Rep*. 2011;126(4):460-471. doi:10.1177/003335491112600403

19. Academy of Medical Sciences. *Multimorbidity: A Priority for Global Health Research*.; 2018. Accessed October 3, 2019. https://acmedsci.ac.uk/policy/policy-projects/multimorbidity

20. Tinetti ME, Fried TR, Boyd CM. Designing Health Care for the Most Common Chronic Condition—Multimorbidity. *JAMA*. 2012;307(23):2493-2494. doi:10.1001/jama.2012.5265

21. Tinetti ME, Bogardus ST, Agostini JV. Potential pitfalls of disease-specific guidelines for patients with multiple conditions. *N Engl J Med*. 2004;351(27):2870-2874. doi:10.1056/NEJMsb042458

22. Parekh AK, Kronick R, Tavenner M. Optimizing health for persons with multiple chronic conditions. *JAMA*. 2014;312(12):1199-1200. doi:10.1001/jama.2014.10181

23. Vogeli C, Shields AE, Lee TA, et al. Multiple chronic conditions: prevalence, health consequences, and implications for quality, care management, and costs. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2007;22 Suppl 3:391-395. doi:10.1007/s11606-007-0322-1

24. Quiñones AR, Markwardt S, Thielke S, Rostant O, Vásquez E, Botoseneanu A. Prospective Disability in Different Combinations of Somatic and Mental Multimorbidity. *J Gerontol Ser A*. 2018;73(2):204-210. doi:10.1093/gerona/glx100

25. Valderas JM, Gangannagaripalli J, Nolte E, et al. Quality of care assessment for people with multimorbidity. *J Intern Med*. 2019;285(3):289-300. doi:10.1111/joim.12881

26. Cohen J. *Methodology Report #1: Design and Methods of the Medical Expenditure Panel Survey Household Component*. Agency for Health Care Policy and Research; 1997. Accessed October 26, 2014. http://meps.ahrq.gov/data_files/publications/mr1/mr1.shtml

27. Machlin S, Cohen J, Elixhauser A, Beauregard K, Steiner C. Sensitivity of Household Reported Medical Conditions in the Medical Expenditure Panel Survey: *Med Care*. 2009;47(6):618-625. doi:10.1097/MLR.0b013e318195fa79

28. Nicholson K, Bauer M, Terry AL, Fortin M, Williamson T, Thind A. The multimorbidity cluster analysis tool: identifying combinations and permutations of multiple chronic diseases using a record-level computational analysis. *BMJ Health Care Inform*. 2017;24(4):339-343. doi:10.14236/jhi.v24i4.962

29. Nicholson K, Terry AL, Fortin M, Williamson T, Bauer M, Thind A. Prevalence, characteristics, and patterns of patients with multimorbidity in primary care: a retrospective cohort analysis in Canada. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2019;69(686):e647-e656. doi:10.3399/bjgp19X704657

30. Machlin, S, Dougherty D. Overview of Methodology for Imputing Missing Expenditure Data in the Medical Expenditure Panel Survey. Published online March 2007. http://www.meps.ahrq.gov/mepsweb/data_files/publications/ mr19/mr19.pdf

31. Dunn A, Grosse SD, Zuvekas SH. Adjusting Health Expenditures for Inflation: A Review of Measures for Health Services Research in the United States. *Health Serv Res*. 2018;53(1):175-196. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.12612

32. Agrawal R, Srikant R. Fast algorithms for mining association rules. In: *Proc. of 20th Intl. Conf. on VLDB*. ; 1994:487-499.

33. Brin S, Motwani R, Ullman JD, Tsur S. Dynamic Itemset Counting and Implication Rules for Market Basket Data. In: *Proceedings of the 1997 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*. SIGMOD ’97. ACM; 1997:255-264. doi:10.1145/253260.253325

34. Solanki SK, Patel JT. A Survey on Association Rule Mining. In: *2015 Fifth International Conference on Advanced Computing Communication Technologies*. ; 2015:212-216. doi:10.1109/ACCT.2015.69

35. Held FP, Blyth F, Gnjidic D, et al. Association Rules Analysis of Comorbidity and Multimorbidity: The Concord Health and Aging in Men Project. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2016;71(5):625-631. doi:10.1093/gerona/glv181

36. Zemedikun DT, Gray LJ, Khunti K, Davies MJ, Dhalwani NN. Patterns of Multimorbidity in Middle-Aged and Older Adults: An Analysis of the UK Biobank Data. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2018;93(7):857-866. doi:10.1016/j.mayocp.2018.02.012

37. Zheng C, Xu R. The Alzheimer's comorbidity phenome: mining from a large patient database and phenome-driven genetics prediction. *JAMIA Open*. 2019;2(1):131-138. doi:10.1093/jamiaopen/ooy050

38. Ho VP, Schiltz NK, Reimer AP, Madigan EA, Koroukian SM. High-Risk Comorbidity Combinations in Older Patients Undergoing Emergency General Surgery: COMORBIDITY COMBINATIONS IN EMERGENCY SURGERY. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2019;67(3):503-510. doi:10.1111/jgs.15682

39. Lumley T. *Complex Surveys: A Guide to Analysis Using R*. Wiley; 2010.

40. Bayardo RJ, Agrawal R, Gunopulos D. Constraint-based rule mining in large, dense databases. In: *Proceedings 15th International Conference on Data Engineering (Cat. No.99CB36337)*. IEEE; 1999:188-197. doi:10.1109/ICDE.1999.754924

41. Hahsler M, Buchta C, Gruen B, Hornik K, Borgelt C. *Arules: Mining Association Rules and Frequent Itemsets*.; 2016. Accessed January 31, 2017. https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/arules/index.html

42. Lumley T. Analysis of complex survey samples. *J Stat Softw*. 2004;9(1):1-19.

43. Muth C, Blom JW, Smith SM, et al. Evidence supporting the best clinical management of patients with multimorbidity and polypharmacy: a systematic guideline review and expert consensus. *J Intern Med*. 2019;285(3):272-288. doi:10.1111/joim.12842

44. Fortin M, Bravo G, Hudon C, Vanasse A, Lapointe L. Prevalence of multimorbidity among adults seen in family practice. *Ann Fam Med*. 2005;3(3):223-228. doi:10.1370/afm.272

45. Mokraoui NM, Haggerty J, Almirall J, Fortin M. Prevalence of self-reported multimorbidity in the general population and in primary care practices: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Res Notes*. 2016;9:314. doi:10.1186/s13104-016-2121-4

46. Smith SM, Wallace E, O'Dowd T, Fortin M. Interventions for improving outcomes in patients with multimorbidity in primary care and community settings. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2021;1:CD006560. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006560.pub4

47. Zeiss AM, Steffen AM. Interdisciplinary health care teams: The basic unit of geriatric care. In: *The Practical Handbook of Clinical Gerontology*. Sage Publications, Inc; 1996:423-450.

48. Mate KS, Berman A, Laderman M, Kabcenell A, Fulmer T. Creating Age-Friendly Health Systems – A vision for better care of older adults. *Healthcare*. 2018;6(1):4-6. doi:10.1016/j.hjdsi.2017.05.005

49. O'Mahony D, O'Sullivan D, Byrne S, O'Connor MN, Ryan C, Gallagher P. STOPP/START criteria for potentially inappropriate prescribing in older people: version 2. *Age Ageing*. 2015;44(2):213-218. doi:10.1093/ageing/afu145

50. 2019 American Geriatrics Society Beers Criteria® Update Expert Panel. American Geriatrics Society 2019 Updated AGS Beers Criteria® for Potentially Inappropriate Medication Use in Older Adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2019;67(4):674-694. doi:10.1111/jgs.15767

51. Boyd CM, Kent DM. Evidence-Based Medicine and the Hard Problem of Multimorbidity. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2014;29(4):552-553. doi:10.1007/s11606-013-2658-z

52. Buffel du Vaure C, Ravaud P, Baron G, Barnes C, Gilberg S, Boutron I. Potential workload in applying clinical practice guidelines for patients with chronic conditions and multimorbidity: a systematic analysis. *BMJ Open*. 2016;6(3):e010119. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2015-010119

53. Boyd CM, Darer J, Boult C, Fried LP, Boult L, Wu AW. Clinical Practice Guidelines and Quality of Care for Older Patients With Multiple Comorbid Diseases: Implications for Pay for Performance. *JAMA*. 2005;294(6):716-724. doi:10.1001/jama.294.6.716

54. Bernard D, Cowan C, Selden T, Cai L, Catlin A, Heffler S. Reconciling medical expenditure estimates from the MEPS and NHEA, 2007. *Medicare Medicaid Res Rev*. 2012;2(4):mmrr.002.04.a09. doi:10.5600/mmrr.002.04.a09

55. Stirland LE, González-Saavedra L, Mullin DS, Ritchie CW, Muniz-Terrera G, Russ TC. Measuring multimorbidity beyond counting diseases: systematic review of community and population studies and guide to index choice. *BMJ*. 2020;368:m160. doi:10.1136/bmj.m160

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1: Highly prevalent specific combinations of multimorbidity and associated cost and perceived poor health. The figure shows combinations of primary-care relevant conditions with an estimated prevalence of 5 million or more adults in the United States. Data source: the 2016-2019 Medical Expenditure Panel Survey (MEPS). Weighted estimates and 95% confidence intervals were calculated by applying population weights using Taylor-series methods (i.e. complex survey methods) to account for the complex sampling design of the MEPS. Weighted estimates have been annualized by taking the average over the four-year study period. X-axes for prevalence and cost are on the logarithmic scale. Results are sorted by prevalence. Cost is measured as total annual medical expenditures, and perceived health is an answer of "fair" or "poor" on a 5-point question asking respondents to rank their overall health.

Figure 2: Specific combinations of multimorbidity ranked highest in terms of average cost or perceived poor health. The figure shows the specific combinations of multimorbidity that ranked in the top 20 in terms of highest average cost per person or top 20 highest percentage with self-reported poor health. A total of 28 conditions met either criterion, with 12 meeting both. Data source: 2016-2019 Medical Expenditure Panel Survey (MEPS). Weighted estimates and 95% confidence intervals were calculated by applying population weights using Taylor-series methods (i.e. complex survey methods) to account for the complex sampling design of the MEPS. Weighted estimates have been annualized by taking the average over the four-year study period. Adjusted odds ratios were calculated using log-binomial models adjusting for age, race,

and sex, and Taylor-series methods for standard errors. X-axes are on the logarithmic scale, and results are sorted by prevalence.

Table 1: Number of Chronic Conditions Treated among U.S. Adults by Population Characteristics

Variable	No. in unweighted sample	Weighted No. of Adults	0 chronic conditions, Row %	1+ chronic conditions, Row %	2+ chronic conditions, Row %	3+ chronic conditions, Row %	4+ chronic conditions, Row %
Total	89,947	249,221,000	47.4%	52.6%	32.9%	20.7%	12.3%
Age Group							
18 - 39	17,745	94,573,000	73.9%	26.1%	7.9%	2.7%	0.9%
40 - 64	19,776	102,614,000	41.1%	58.9%	35.5%	20.0%	10.6%
65 and older	9,311	52,034,000	11.6%	88.4%	73.0%	54.9%	36.1%
Sex							
Male	21,671	120,330,000	52.4%	47.6%	29.9%	18.8%	10.7%
Female	25,161	128,891,000	42.7%	57.3%	35.7%	22.5%	13.7%
Race / Ethnicity							
Hispanic	12,841	40,533,000	63.3%	36.7%	19.5%	11.6%	6.2%
Non-Hispanic White only	21,164	156,551,000	40.7%	59.3%	38.4%	24.5%	14.9%
Non-Hispanic Black only	8,113	29,523,000	53.0%	47.0%	28.9%	18.0%	10.1%
Non-Hispanic Asian only	3,355	15,133,000	62.4%	37.6%	20.0%	11.3%	5.4%
Other or Multiple Race	1,359	7,481,000	47.8%	52.2%	32.7%	21.0%	12.8%
Self-rated Fair/Poor Health	7,201	31,085,000	19.0%	81.0%	64.6%	48.8%	34.3%
Per capita medical expenditures in 2019 dollars (Median, IQR)	---	---	$322 ($0 – $1,382)	$4,176 ($1,523 – $11,067)	$6,208 ($2,558 – $14,858)	$8,177 ($3,610 – $18,756)	$10,821 ($5,045 – $23,712)

Table 1 caption: Survey-weighted estimates from pooling the 2016-2019 Medical Expenditure Panel Survey. Weighted estimates have been annualized by taking the average over the four year study period. Row percentages are reported under each count of conditions column.

Table 2: **Specific combinations of multimorbidity among U.S. adults, ranked by treated prevalence**

Rank	Combination of Chronic Disease	No. of cond-itions	No. in unweighted sample	Weighted No. of Adults	Prevalence, % (95% CI)	Observed to Expected Ratio (95% CI)
1	Hypertension & Hyperlipidemia	2	11,967	30,805,000	12.4 (12.0 - 12.8)	2.7 (2.6 - 2.7)
2	Hypertension & Diabetes	2	6,980	16,535,000	6.6 (6.4 - 6.9)	2.6 (2.5 - 2.7)
3	Hypertension & Musculoskeletal condition	2	5,681	14,528,000	5.8 (5.6 - 6.1)	1.6 (1.6 - 1.7)
4	Hyperlipidemia & Diabetes	2	5,911	14,283,000	5.7 (5.5 - 6.0)	3.1 (3.0 - 3.2)
5	Hypertension & Hyperlipidemia & Diabetes	3	4,821	11,514,000	4.6 (4.4 - 4.9)	9.5 (9.3 - 9.8)
6	Hyperlipidemia & Musculoskeletal condition	2	4,315	11,278,000	4.5 (4.3 - 4.7)	1.7 (1.6 - 1.8)
7	Hypertension & Arthritis	2	4,390	10,701,000	4.3 (4.1 - 4.5)	2.3 (2.3 - 2.4)
8	Hypertension & Stomach problems	2	4,004	10,015,000	4.0 (3.8 - 4.3)	2.3 (2.2 - 2.4)
9	Hypertension & Cardiovascular disease	2	3,815	9,808,000	3.9 (3.7 - 4.1)	2.7 (2.6 - 2.8)
10	Hypertension & Urinary problems	2	3,552	9,110,000	3.7 (3.5 - 3.8)	2.0 (2.0 - 2.1)
…						
75	Hypertension & Hyperlipidemia & Musculoskeletal & Diabetes	4	3,103	2,983,000	3.0 (2.7 - 3.6)	16.5 (15.6 - 17.5)
…						
237	Hypertension & Hyperlipidemia & Musculoskeletal & Diabetes & Arthritis	5	461	1,094,000	1.1 (1.0 - 1.2)	77.0 (70.2 - 84.3)
…						
259	Depression/Anxiety & Asthma/COPD & Arthritis	3	422	1,002,000	1.0 (0.9 - 1.1)	8.3 (7.5 - 9.1)

Table 2 Caption: Specific multi-way combinations of chronic disease ranked by prevalence from the 2016-2019 Medical Expenditure Panel Survey (MEPS). For brevity only the top 10 combinations, plus the top four-way, five-way, and last ranked combination are shown. Full results are shown in Supplement Table 2. Weighted number and percent and 95% confidence intervals were calculated by applying population weights using Taylor-series methods (i.e. complex survey methods) to account for the complex sampling design of the MEPS. Weighted estimates have been annualized by taking the average over the four-year study period. The observed to expected ratio (also known as lift) is the observed prevalence of the combination divided by the expected prevalence of the combination if each disease within the combination were statistically independent.

Figure 1: Highly prevalent specific combinations of multimorbidity and associated cost and perceived poor health.



Figure 2: Specific combinations of multimorbidity ranked highest in terms of average cost or perceived poor health.