The St. Vincent's Congestive Heart Failure Comprehensive Care Clinic: Pilot Study

Authors: John W Davis, BA[1,2], Frederick S. Ditmars, BS[1*], Gabrielle Manno, BS[1*], Jacob Moran, BS[1*], Jenna Reisler[1*], Khaled Chatila, MD[1,3,4], Norman M Farr, MD, MPH[1,3], Wissam Khalife, MD[1,4], Robert D Thomas, JD, MBA, PhD[2]

[] Corresponding Author
*Listed alphabetically with equal contributions
[1]School of Medicine, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston
[2]School of Public and Population Health Sciences, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston
[3]Department of Internal Medicine, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston
[4]Division of Cardiology, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston

COI Disclosure:
Davis reports serving as an independent consultant with GE Healthcare, which did not contribute to the design or otherwise participate in the study. Otherwise, there are no disclosures.

Funding:
John W Davis is the Principal Investigator and received funding for this project through the University of Texas President's Cabinet Award, a local foundation in Galveston, Texas. The project also received funding from the Sealy and Smith Foundation and the McGovern Academy (William Osler Society).

ABSTRACT
Introduction: Post-hospitalization heart failure (HF) disease management represents an important area of focus in preventing morbidity, mortality, and excess healthcare costs. Disease management clinics have been historically successful in reducing complications, but complication reduction in the uninsured setting has not been thoroughly examined. The purpose of this project is to conduct a post-hospitalization disease management clinic pilot study of uninsured HF patients.
Methods: This is a pilot study of HF patients following a recent hospitalization (within 30 days). Uninsured patients were offered enrollment in the disease management clinic during or immediately following hospitalization for a primary HF diagnosis at University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston. The enrollment period was from January 2021 - December 2021. The disease management program included twice-weekly visits with a variety of healthcare professionals, including nurses, physicians, occupational therapists, social workers, pharmacists, and counselors. Patients were scheduled for a maximum of 16 visits (2 months of follow-up) post-hospitalization before returning to usual care. Patients who attended at least the introductory appointment and one follow-up appointment within 30 days of discharge were considered enrolled. The

primary outcome is 30-day readmission, while secondary outcomes included feasibility measures (proportion enrolled, number of visits attended).
Results: Of 59 patients referred, 47 (80%) were enrolled. Just 4 patients (8.5%, 95% CI: 2.5%, 20.5%) were readmitted at 30 days, while 4 of 12 (33%, 95% CI: 13.6%, 61.2%) were readmitted at 30 days in those who did not enroll. Program participants were readmitted significantly less frequently than national readmission rate estimates (23%, p=0.02).
Conclusion: The CHFC3 program is feasible and holds promise for materially reducing 30-day readmissions for HF complications in the uninsured. A randomized controlled trial is warranted to further explore this intervention.

INTRODUCTION

Heart Failure (HF) hospitalization and readmissions remain a leading cause of morbidity, mortality, and cost-burden for the US healthcare system. It is estimated 35% of all 30-day readmissions reported to CMS are HF patients.[1] HF readmissions are particularly concerning for patients with no insurance due to the significant cost. Figures generated from the local health system (University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston, UTMB) suggest that each readmission of an uninsured person results in approximately $12,500 in losses.

National estimates for 30-day readmission rates for HF range from 18-23%, on average.[2] Fingar et al.[2] estimated that 23% of all HF admissions were readmitted within 30 days, making HF the most common cause for 30-day readmissions of all diagnoses. They reported that the uninsured were readmitted at similar rates (17%). Interventions such as disease management clinics, nurse home visits, and nurse-care clinics decrease HF readmissions,[3] but these programs can be costly to implement and maintain. The purpose of this study was to design a self-sustaining program to reduce readmissions in an uninsured patient population. We designed an interprofessional clinic, interspersed with vitals surveillance visits, aimed at reducing preventable causes of HF

readmission. Because this program's sustainability is contingent on its cost-savings to the health system, the goal was that financial losses prevented should be at least equivalent to the expense of program operations to maintain viability. Here, we report the findings from this community program.

METHODS

Setting. St. Vincent's Free Clinic (STVC) in Galveston Texas is sponsored by UTMB and provides free care to over 3,500 patients annually.[4] It is staffed entirely by volunteers, in addition to one paid nurse and medical provider. Services include, but are not limited to, primary care, case management (food/housing services), counseling, nutrition, pharmacist consultation, respiratory care, occupational/physical therapy, and social work services.

Subjects. Patients were identified by UTMB staff from UTMB prior to discharge as: 1) uninsured and 2) admitted for a HF diagnosis-related group (either reduced or preserved ejection fraction). Patients were discharged from January 4-December 23, 2021, and subsequently offered enrollment in this program. All patients who attended at least the enrollment visit and a subsequent visit (at least two visits) within 30 days post-discharge were considered enrolled.

Ethics. The program was determined to be IRB-exempt by the University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston Institutional Review Board. Because the target cohort is a vulnerable population of uninsured adults, we felt it was unethical to pursue a more rigorous design. Because this program became the clinic's standard of care, consent was only obtained insofar as for receiving medical services at the clinic. After the cohort was identified, patient identifiers were removed for data collection and analysis.

Procedure

The program included twice-weekly surveillance at the St. Vincent's Clinic for vitals and medication adherence. Within 3 days of hospital discharge, patients were scheduled to receive interprofessional care every Wednesday at STVC over a period of 60 days. Patients deemed “low risk” by their provider were eligible to decrease their visit frequency to weekly after 30 days. Risk was determined according to each patients’ primary care provider’s judgment. Patients were provided free medications, food, and transportation as needed.

At Visit 1, patients were queried on their interest in participation in CHFC3. The program provided free medications to all patients, consistent with the services provided to all other patients at St. Vincent’s. Patients’ vitals were measured at each visit and labs were collected weekly. The recommended schedule for interprofessional activities appears in **Table 1.**

Measures

Demographic and baseline medical characteristics were collected **(see Table 2).** Patients also were queried about transportation and food insecurity, specifically as to whether transportation unavailability had precluded them from attending medical visits and whether they had ever had to go without food because of financial reasons.

Outcomes

The primary outcomes were participation (measured by number of visits) and readmission at 30 days. Enrollment was defined as at least two visits in the program within two weeks of discharge. Patient history at 30 days after discharge were coded as readmitted for any reason (or died, with or without hospitalization) or not readmitted. Patients’ medical records were queried for any hospitalization

or use of the emergency department, and findings were verbally confirmed with the patient at each visit. If patients missed their appointment, they were contacted by phone, text, email, or through the medical record (i.e., MyChart) to ascertain their admission status.

Statistical Analysis

In order to assess program feasibility, enrollment and participation (count of visits) were obtained. Possible selection bias was estimated by assessing differences in baseline characteristics (i.e., age, sex, severity of disease) by enrollment using measures of association (phi and eta). We also compared patients' baseline characteristics by readmission status using bivariate and multivariable regression.

To evaluate program 30-day readmission rates, first, the proportion of patients readmitted was compared to local (UTMB) rates. UTMB data indicate overall readmission rates in HF remained consistent with national rates throughout the pandemic (19.8%, 262/1326 during the 2020-21 pandemic era and 19.9% IN 2017-2019), suggesting it was reasonable to assess our program against previous years' estimates. Second, the crude proportion of patients readmitted within 30 days who did not enroll (0 or 1 visit) versus those who enrolled (2+ visits) was compared using Fisher exact test. Third, the association between enrollment and readmission was examined when controlling for disease severity with logistic regression. All analysis was performed in SAS (Version 9.4, Cary NC).[5]

RESULTS

From January-December 2021, there were 88 uninsured patients admitted to UTMB facilities for a primary diagnosis of HF, though patients admitted to League City (n=29) were not initially eligible for referral at program initiation. Ultimately 61 eligible patients (including 2 from the League City campus) were referred to STVC for care, of whom 59 (97%) received at least one documented contact from the program. There are no data or information available for the 2 (3%) patients who were referred but not contacted.

Of those 59 patients referred and contacted, 47 (79.7%) completed at least two visits in the program, 3 (5.1%) attended just one visit, and 9 (15.3%) never attended any appointment (n=47 enrolled, n=12 not enrolled). The mean number of visits attended by patients who enrolled was 8.3 (95% CI: 7.2, 9.4), and ranged from 2 to 16 visits. **Table 3** shows baseline sample characteristics by patients' enrollment status. There were no suspected confounders that were meaningfully associated with enrollment (phi$\geq$0.20) or readmission (see **Table 4**), with the possible exception of disease severity.

Readmissions. Readmissions within 30 days of discharge were 8.5% (4/47,95%CI:2.5%,20.5%) among enrolled and 33.3% (4/12,95%CI:13.6%,61.2%) among the unenrolled. The readmission rate of participants was significantly less than the national estimate (8.5% with CHFC3 vs. 23% national[2], p=0.02). Readmission also were significantly greater in unenrolled patients. Unadjusted odds of readmission were reduced by 81% (OR=0.19, 95% CI: 0.04, 0.90) in the enrolled versus unenrolled group.

Because program effectiveness might reflect severity of disease, if patients who did not enroll had more severe disease or complications and those patients were more likely to be readmitted, the third analysis compared enrollment with readmission while controlling for disease severity. A simple severity index was created (NYHA Class IV or EF $\leq$15%). In the adjusted analysis, enrollment had a 79% reduction in odds of readmission at 30 days (OR=0.21, 95% CI: 0.04, 1.06). Although the effect was non-significant and the severity index had a large effect (OR=3.01, 95% CI: 0.33, 27.86). There was little change in the association between enrollment and readmission with (OR=0.21) and without (OR=0.19) adjustment for severity, suggesting that effect estimates were not due to disease severity differences.

DISCUSSION

This program was designed to create a new, cost-effective disease management clinic in an uninsured population. It was made possible by healthcare professionals volunteering their time, which is remarkable. Patients who enrolled were significantly less likely to readmit at 30 days than national averages, despite higher social determinants of health burden and significant disease burden. Generalizations from this pilot are limited by selection bias and cohort characteristics when compared to the national population, but it provides support for more robustly evaluating this model. A comparable reduction in readmissions at our institution (from 262 to 92) would ***save approximately 2.12M dollars annually.*** Thus, it would be a self-sustaining program, funded from the cost savings to the health system. The effect of enrollment appeared to

be stable when controlling for disease severity, suggesting that the program may significantly reduce hospitalizations at 30 days post-discharge.

Thus, the program appears potentially effective and possibly self-sustaining. While scalability of the program with twice-weekly visits may be of concern for most major health systems, half of these visits were purely surveillance of vital signs. These will be shifted to nurse and telephone visits in future studies, and a randomized-controlled trial pilot evaluating the program is planned.

Limitations

Because this study did not have a control group, effectiveness could not cannot be estimated. However, observed rates of enrollment and 30-day readmissions inform feasibility for future studies. There also may have been selection bias in who chooses to attend CHFC3 versus those who do not enroll. While results did not seem to be the result of disease severity differences in enrollment, a usual care group might have offered better comparison.

CONCLUSION

The CHFC3 program appears feasible and possibly effective in reducing HF readmissions at 30 days. More investigation is needed to assess whether the program is scalable and effective in both the insured and uninsured. A randomized controlled trial pilot analyzing this program seems warranted.

REFERENCES

1. Khan MS, Sreenivasan J, Lateef N, et al. Trends in 30- and 90-Day Readmission Rates for Heart Failure. *Circ Heart Fail*. 2021;14(4):e008335. doi:10.1161/CIRCHEARTFAILURE.121.008335

2. Fingar K, Barrett M, Jiang J. A Comparison of All-Cause 7-Day and 30-Day Readmissions, 2014 #230. Published October 2017. Accessed November 27, 2021. https://www.hcup-us.ahrq.gov/reports/statbriefs/sb230-7-Day-Versus-30-Day-Readmissions.jsp

3. Van Spall HGC, Rahman T, Mytton O, et al. Comparative effectiveness of transitional care services in patients discharged from the hospital with heart failure: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2017;19(11):1427-1443. doi:10.1002/ejhf.765

4. Reisler JD, Ditmars FS, Davis JW. Addressing a National Health Crisis: A Student-Run Congestive Heart Failure Clinic for Underserved Patients. *Acad Med*. Published online November 9, 2021. doi:10.1097/ACM.0000000000004380

5. SAS Institute, Inc. *Base SAS® 9.4 Procedures Guide: Statistical Procedures.*; 2016.

Table 1: Weekly Activity Cadence

WEEK/VISIT	ACTIVITY
1-1	Medical evaluation with care provider, Vitals/Labs
1-2	Vitals review, medication adherence review
2-1	Occupational Therapy Initial Evaluation, Case Management (Social Work), Counseling (Psychologist), Vitals/Labs
2-2	Vitals review, medication adherence review
3-1	Pharmacist Consultation, Nutrition Consultation, Vitals/Labs
3-2	Vitals review, medication adherence review
4-1	Nurse visit, Vitals/Labs, Ad-Hoc Visits with other disciplines
4-2	Vitals review, medication adherence review
5-1	Medical evaluation (option for ‘graduation if deemed medically appropriate’), Vitals/Labs
5-2	Vitals review, medication adherence review
6-1 – 8-2	Repeat from 2-1 to 4-2

Table 2: Key Measures

Measure	***Description***	***Visit 1-1***	***Visit 5-1***	***Visit 8-1***	***Weekly***	***Every Visit***
Basic Metabolic Panel	Kidney function, sodium of key interest	X	X	X	X	
Brain Natriuretic Peptide (BNP)	Measure of atrial stretch, correlates with increased volume	X	X	X		
Weight	Weight, in pounds	X	X	X	X	X
Blood pressure	Systolic and Diastolic, mmHg	X	X	X	X	X
Heart Rate	Beats per minute	X	X	X	X	X
O2 Saturation	% Saturation	X	X	X	X	X
Respiration Rate	Breaths per minute	X	X	X	X	X
Age	Age in years	X	X	X		
Sex	Male, Female, Other	X	X	X		
NYHA Functional Class	I (no limitations), II (mild), III (moderate), IV (severe)	X	X	X		
History of Diabetes Mellitus	Yes/No (A1C >6.5%)	X		X		
History of Food Insecurity	Any versus none	X				
History of Transportation Insecurity	Any versus none	X				

Table 3: Patient Characteristics by Enrollment Status

	Not Enrolled (N=12)	**Enrolled (N=47)**	**Overall (N=59)**	**Phi/Eta Coefficient (N=59)**
Age				
Median [Min, Max]	54.5 [36.0, 65.0]	52.0 [23.0, 78.0]	53.0 [23.0, 78.0]	0.03
Race/Ethnicity				
Non-Hispanic Black	1 (8.3%)	14 (29.8%)	15 (25.4%)	
Non-Hispanic White	7 (58.3%)	18 (38.3%)	25 (42.4%)	
White Hispanic	3 (25.0%)	15 (31.9%)	18 (30.5%)	
Unknown	1 (8.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.7%)	0.16
Sex				
Female	6 (50.0%)	14 (29.8%)	20 (33.9%)	0.17
BMI (kg)				
Median [Min, Max]	31.0 [20.0, 67.8]	29.9 [21.6, 66.7]	29.9 [20.0, 67.8]	-0.09
NYHA Class				
Class I	1 (8.3%)	4 (8.5%)	5 (8.5%)	
Class II	0 (0%)	8 (17.0%)	8 (13.6%)	
Class III – IV	9 (90.0%)	35 (74.5%)	44 (77.2%)	
Unknown	2 (16.7%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.4%)	0.19
History of Diabetes Mellitus (A1C >= 6.5%)				
Yes	6 (50.0%)	24 (51.1%)	30 (50.8%)	
Not screened	2 (16.7%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.4%)	-0.07

Discharge Ejection Fraction				
Median [Min, Max]	30.0 [15.0, 65.0]	25.0 [10.0, 65.0]	25.0 [10.0, 65.0]	
Not acquired	3 (25.0%)	0 (0%)	3 (5.1%)	0.11
HFpEF				
Preserved EF	3 (25.0%)	7 (14.9%)	10 (16.9%)	-0.11
Serum NT pro-BNP (mg/dL)				
Median [Min, Max]	1440 [294, 6050]	2410 [70.0, 18600]	2220 [70.0, 18600]	
Not acquired	4 (33.3%)	2 (4.3%)	6 (10.2%)	0.13
Creatinine (mg/dL)				
Median [Min, Max]	1.08 [0.700, 1.98]	1.18 [0.420, 3.86]	1.17 [0.420, 3.86]	
Not acquired	3 (25.0%)	1 (2.1%)	4 (6.8%)	0.09
History of Food Insecurity				
Yes	4 (33.3%)	21 (44.7%)	25 (42.4%)	0.09
History of Transportation Insecurity				
Yes	4 (33.3%)	15 (31.9%)	19 (32.2%)	-0.01
Current Smoking				
Smoker	7 (58.3%)	23 (48.9%)	30 (50.8%)	-0.08
Alcohol Consumption Frequency				
Multiple times per week or daily	3 (25.0%)	16 (34.0%)	19 (32.2%)	0.08

Table 4: Patient Characteristics by Readmission Status

	Readmitted (N=4)	**Not Readmitted (N=43)**	**Overall (N=47)**	**Phi or Eta**
HFpEF				
HFpEF	2 (50.0%)	5 (11.6%)	7 (14.9%)	-0.30
BMI (kg)				
Median [Min, Max]	42.6 [22.0, 51.7]	29.6 [21.6, 66.7]	29.9 [21.6, 66.7]	-0.24
NYHA Class				
Class I	0 (0%)	4 (9.3%)	4 (8.5%)	
Class II	1 (25.0%)	7 (16.3%)	8 (17.0%)	
Class III-IV	3 (75.0%)	32 (74.4%)	35 (74.4%)	0.05
History of Diabetes Mellitus (A1C >= 6.5%)				
Yes	2 (50.0%)	22 (51.2%)	24 (51.1%)	0.01
Discharge Ejection Fraction				
Median [Min, Max]	47.5 [15.0, 60.0]	25.0 [10.0, 65.0]	25.0 [10.0, 65.0]	-0.22
Baseline sodium				
Median [Min, Max]	138 [133, 140]	137 [130, 142]	137 [130, 142]	
Not acquired	0 (0%)	1 (2.3%)	1 (2.1%)	-0.05
Baseline Heart Rate				
Median [Min, Max]	82.5 [67.0, 98.0]	85.0 [59.0, 137]	85.0 [59.0, 137]	
Not acquired	0 (0%)	1 (2.3%)	1 (2.1%)	0.06
Baseline SpO2				
Median [Min, Max]	96.5 [95.0, 100]	98.0 [88.0, 100]	97.5 [88.0, 100]	
Not acquired	0 (0%)	1 (2.3%)	1 (2.1%)	-0.02
Baseline Systolic BP				
Median [Min, Max]	115 [95.0, 118]	117 [90.0, 174]	117 [90.0, 174]	
Not acquired	0 (0%)	1 (2.3%)	1 (2.1%)	0.16

Baseline Diastolic BP				
Median [Min, Max]	79.5 [70.0, 88.0]	77.0 [51.0, 113]	77.0 [51.0, 113]	
Not acquired	0 (0%)	1 (2.3%)	1 (2.1%)	0.02
SGLT2 Prescription*				
Taking	1 (50.0%)	24 (63.2%)	25 (62.5%)	0.03
ARNI Prescription*				
Taking	0 (0%)	3 (7.9%)	3 (7.5%)	0.08
ACE/ARB Prescription*				
Taking	2 (100%)	26 (68.4%)	28 (70.0%)	0.12
MRA Prescription*				
Checked	1 (50.0%)	26 (68.4%)	27 (67.5%)	0.09
Beta Blocker Prescription*				
Taking	2 (100%)	35 (92.1%)	37 (92.5%)	0.09
Statin Prescription*				
Taking	2 (100%)	26 (68.4%)	28 (70.0%)	0.08
Creatinine (mg/dL)				
Median [Min, Max]	1.94 [1.06, 3.18]	1.16 [0.420, 3.86]	1.18 [0.420, 3.86]	
Not acquired	0 (0%)	1 (2.3%)	1 (2.1%)	-0.30
Serum NT pro-BNP (mg/dL)				
Median [Min, Max]	1900 [175, 3500]	2790 [70.0, 18600]	2410 [70.0, 18600]	
Not acquired	0 (0%)	2 (4.7%)	2 (4.3%)	0.15
History of Food Insecurity				
Yes	2 (50.0%)	19 (44.2%)	21 (44.7%)	-0.03
History of Transportation Insecurity				
Yes	2 (50.0%)	13 (30.2%)	15 (31.9%)	-0.12
Current Smoking				
Smoker	2 (50.0%)	21 (48.8%)	23 (48.9%)	-0.01
Current Alcohol Consumption Frequency				
Multiple times per week or daily	2 (50.0%)	14 (32.6%)	16 (34.0%)	-0.10

Number Visits Completed				
Median [Min, Max]	11.0 [4.00, 16.0]	8.00 [2.00, 16.0]	8.00 [2.00, 16.0]	-0.18
30-Day Emergency Department Admission				
Yes	4 (100%)	4 (9.3%)	8 (17.0%)	-0.67

**Indicates statistics taken from HFrEF sub-cohort (no HFpEF patients)*