The use of a Multi-morbidity Index (MMI) in Patients Receiving Home Parenteral Nutrition (HPN)

Authors: Michael M. Rothkopf, MD[1]; Zachary S. Rothkopf, MD[2]; Mohan D. Pant, PhD, Pstat[3]; Rebecca Brown, RDN, CNSC[4]; Jamie Haselhorst, RDN, LD, CNSC[4]; Francine Gagliardotto, RPh[4]; Debbie Stevenson, MS, RDN[4], Andrew DePalma[4], Michael Saracco[5]

1. Rutgers/New Jersey Medical School, Newark, NJ

2. St. Luke's University Hospital Bethlehem, PA

3. Eastern Virginia Medical School, Norfolk, VA

4. Amerita, Inc, Greenwood Village, CO

5. Sea Meadows, LLC, Brick, NJ

Abstract

Introduction: Although HPN patients often have concomitant medical conditions, little has been done to assess the role of multi-morbidity in relation to HPN care (1-3). A validated method for determining multi-morbidity in HPN patients could be beneficial in determining the needs and risks for each HPN patient.

We previously studied the effect of a multidisciplinary nutritional support team (MNST) on quality improvement HPN care (QIP-PN) (4). In a secondary analysis, we explored the options for measuring multi-morbidity of patients in the QIP-PN study. In this report, we describe the results of a pilot study on measuring multi-morbidity in HPN patients to determine its value in HPN care.

Objective: Determine the role of multi-morbidity scoring in HPN care.

Methods: 60 HPN patients (30 study patients and 30 case-matched controls) were reviewed for demographics, CIRS Score, number of PN formula changes, hospitalizations and hospital length of stay. Histograms were produced to visually examine the data and cutoffs were selected for CIRS scores based on this information. A matrix plot was drawn showing Spearman correlations among the three variables of interest. The data was then subjected to Kruskal-Wallis and Wilcoxon Rank Sum Tests and Negative Binomial Regression Models to determine if the groups differed significantly.

Results: 28 patients had CIRS scores <17, while 32 patients had CIRS scores ≥17. The results of negative binomial regression indicate that the number of hospitalizations was a significant predictor of total hospital LOS at the 5% alpha level and that the total hospital LOS of patients with a CIRS Score <17 was significantly different from that of patients with a CIRS≥17 at 5% alpha level.

Conclusion: We found the CIRS method was well suited to use in HPN patients. It was easy to learn and perform. It provided a single variable which could be used a summary statement of patient multimorbidity. When the CIRS data on 60 long term HPN patients was analyzed, a trend emerged wherein a higher CIRS score was associated with greater hospital LOS. This approach requires greater study and validation.

Abstract Word Count = 384

Key Messages Box:

1. What is already known on this topic?
   The risk of HPN complications is known to relate to patient demographics, length of functional bowel, duration of HPN therapy and macronutrient content. A validated method for determining multi-morbidity in HPN patients could be beneficial in determining the needs of and risk for each HPN patient.

2. What this study adds.
   The study the explores the role of measuring multi-morbidity scoring in HPN care to determine the risk of adverse effects during therapy.

3. How this study might affect research, practice or policy?
   The study suggests that using CIRS scoring for HPN patients could help healthcare providers and payors allocate resources based on risk analysis.

Introduction:

HPN patients often have concomitant medical conditions that impact their care and confound outcomes. The existence of multi-morbidity in HPN patients may increase their risk for serious complications (i.e. catheter-related bloodstream infections (CRBSIs), venous thrombosis, metabolic imbalances, bone disease, kidney stones, and liver disease). However, research has yet to address the role of multi-morbidity in relation to HPN risk.

The risk of HPN complications varies widely. Previous studies have suggested a relationship to patient demographics, length of functional bowel, duration of HPN therapy and macronutrient content (1,2). These risks can be reduced by careful monitoring (3).

An accurate, validated method for determining multi-morbidity in HPN patients would be beneficial for practitioners, researchers and payors. A multi-morbidity index (MMI) could be utilized to better determine the needs of each HPN patient. It could improve communication between providers, better allocate patient care resources and more clearly communicate the complexity of care to payors. From a research perspective, a validated HPN multi-morbidity index could assist in comparisons of patient outcomes, utilization and QOL studies.

We previously studied the effect of a multidisciplinary nutritional support team (MNST) on quality improvement HPN care (QIP-PN) (4). In a secondary analysis, we explored the options for measuring multi-morbidity of patients in the QIP-PN study. In this paper, we describe the results of a pilot study on measuring multi-morbidity in HPN patients.

Choice of Multi-Morbidity Index (MMI)

More than 30 methods currently exist for the measurement of multi-morbidity. However, there is no universally agreed measure that defines multimorbidity (Stirland ref). Most MMIs utilize disease counts (5-18). Other MMIs use diagnostic groups/clusters or drug counts (19-26), while one index used physiologic data from pulmonary function testing, imaging and laboratory results (27).

To select a multimorbidity tool for this study, we reviewed the literature and the current available options. MMIs which utilized disease counts were eliminated because the selected comorbidities (i.e. Myocardial Infarction, Congestive Heart Failure, Peripheral Vascular Disease, Cerebrovascular Disease, Dementia, COPD, etc) were not generally applicable to the HPN population. Similarly, MMIs that utilized drug counts and physiologic parameters were deemed less applicable to HPN. Among those that used diagnostic groups or clusters, we eliminated those that were primarily focused on the elderly because the majority of HPN patients are younger than 65 (28).

We also utilized the Stirland, et al guide to assist in selecting a MMI for research studies (29). The guide asks researchers to identify the reasons for studying multimorbidity, the exposure variables and measured outcomes. The guide provides benchmarks for comparing inputs, usage and performance of different MMIs to determine a suitable tool.

At the conclusion of this process, we selected the Cumulative Illness Rating Scale (CIRS) as the multimorbidity tool for this study. CIRS is frequently cited as a well-validated and reliable index (30). It has been shown to be useful for studies determining risks of mortality, re-admission, or future morbidity (31). Of particular interest, the CIRS can be used to quantify chronic disease burden and act as a prognosticator for patient outcome. For example, lower post intubation CIRS scores increased the likelihood of patients' discharge to home (32).

The CIRS index determines risk by rating the severity of comorbidity in each of 15 body systems: cardiac, vascular, hematological, respiratory, otorhinolaryngological, ophthalmological, upper gastrointestinal, lower gastrointestinal, hepatic and pancreatic, renal, genitourinary, musculoskeletal/tegmental, neurologic, endocrine/metabolic/breast and psychiatric. A weighted severity score in each system ranges from 0 to 4.

A value of 0 denoted no problem, healed or minor injuries, past childhood illnesses, minor surgery, uncomplicated healed fractures and other past problems which healed without sequela. A value of 1 denoted current medical conditions that caused mild discomfort or disability, or with occasional exacerbations. A value of 1 could also be used to indicate conditions that have a minor impact on morbidity and medical problems that are not currently active but were significant problems in the past. A value of 2 denoted current medical conditions that require daily treatment or first line therapy. A value of 2 could also be used to indicate conditions with a moderate disability or morbidity.

A value of 3 denoted current medical conditions that were chronic and/or not controlled with first line therapy. Such conditions would be expected to produce significant disability. A value of 4 denoted current medical conditions that were severe. This included any acute condition that requires immediate treatment, organ failure, severe sensory impairment, severely affected quality of life and severe impairment in function.

For malignancies: A value of 1 denoted cancer diagnosed in the remote past without evidence of recurrence or sequela in the past 10 years. A value of 1 could also be used to indicate skin cancer operated in the past without major sequela, other than melanoma. A value of 2 denoted no evidence of recurrence or sequela in the past 5 years. A value of 3 denoted the use of chemotherapy, radiation or hormonal therapy in the past 5 years. A value of 4 denoted recurrent malignancy or metastasis (other than to lymph glands) or palliative treatment stage.

The weighted severity ratings are observer dependent. There is no standardized method regarding what constitutes a 0 vs 4. Because of observer variability, there are concerns regarding the reproducibility of CIRS scoring. Some studies have found that resultant CIRS scores for a patient can differ based on the users background (eg pulmonologist vs oncologist) (33). However, the reason for these discordances can be as simple as one user overlooking a minor comorbidity while the other gives more weight to that same comorbidity. In this pilot study, we controlled for this by using a multidisciplinary team to score CIRS on our patients.

Pilot Study

Research Question:

This pilot study was intended to answer a research question regarding the value of measuring multi-morbidity in patients receiving HPN. Specifically, does multi-morbidity translate into greater resource utilization or increased adverse outcomes in HPN care? Further, can quantification of multi-morbidity help predict the need for additional resources or the risk of adverse outcomes? Lastly, can multi-morbidity indexes be a component of a more comprehensive risk assessment tool for HPN care?

Methods:

This pilot study was performed as a secondary analysis of data from the quality improvement study of patients on home PN (QIP-PN) (4). The protocol was granted Institutional Review Board (IRB) exemption under NIH guidelines (45CFR 46.104(d)(2)) by the Western IRB on September 4, 2019.

Study groups: The QIP-PN study was performed at Amerita, Inc., a national home infusion organization (Amerita). All HPN patients treated by Amerita branches were considered for the study. To achieve the desired patient enrollment, 7 branches were selected as "study branches" based upon their volume of long-term HPN (>90 days of therapy) cases. The study was divided into 3 phases for data review (phases 1a and 1b), observation (phase 2) and intervention (phase 3) (Figure 1). All long-term HPN patients treated at study branches were offered study participation of whom 75 signed consent forms. Treating physician study participation agreements were signed for 42 patients who comprised the study group, 30 of whom completed phase 3 (Figure 1). A random sample of 30 long-term HPN patients treated at the study branches comprised the case-matched control group (control).

Study Interventions: During the intervention phase, all study patients were reviewed in virtual weekly conferences by a multidisciplinary nutrition support team (MNST), consisting of a physician nutrition expert (PNE), certified nutrition support clinicians (CNSC; RD, RN, RPh) and administrators.

MSNT meetings discussed each patient case in an "open-book" environment. That is, members had access to the patient's electronic clinical chart when cases were discussed. Recommendations for PN formula changes, laboratory studies, infusion cycle, catheter care and patient monitoring were made by the MNST and recorded. Recommendations for HPN care modification were provided to the patient's treating physician by an Amerita branch clinician. HPN care parameters and adverse outcomes were recorded.

Multimorbidity Assessment: MNST members received training on the CIRS rating scale, using the method according to DeGroot et al (34). MNST members analyzed comorbidities on each study patient (n = 30) and case-matched control (n = 30). At least one MNST member had full access to the electronic medical record during the CIRS scoring sessions. This included hospital discharge notes, homecare admission notes, regular physician and nursing notes, medication reconciliations, emergency department visits, treatment plans, care summaries and other available data. At least one MNST member had direct management experience with the patient. The patient was presented to the MNST by a team member who had previous personal experience with the patient, beginning with a brief history of their case and HPN care. A review of known conditions in each of 15 systems was performed. Each system received a weighted score of 0-4, as described above. A CIRS-specific spreadsheet was

developed which calculated the total CIRS score for each patient and control. Performance of the CIRS scoring analysis took approximately 30 minutes per case (figure 2).

Results:

The study patients average age was 57.43 years. Twenty-two (73.3%) were female and 8 (26.7%) were male. In the 30 case-matched controls, the average age was 54.9 years. Twenty-four (80.0%) were female and 6 (20.0%) were male. The CIRS score among study patients ranged from 10-25 with a mean of 17.4 +/- 3.81 16.5 +/- 3.82, respectively. CIRS score among case-matched control patients ranged from 9-24. The mean score was 16.5 +/- 3.82 (Table 1).

In the study group, 9 patients had short bowel syndrome (SBS). Four (4) had Crohn's disease related intestinal failure, without SBS. Three (3) had pancreatic cancer. Five (5) had other gastrointestinal tract cancers (esophageal, gastric, anal). Three (3) had gastroparesis. Two (2) had chronic small bowel obstruction. One (1) had celiac disease. One (1) had colitis. In addition to their primary diagnosis, 7 patients had enteric fistulae (Table 2).

Five (5) case-matched control patients had short bowel syndrome (SBS). Four (4) had Crohn's disease – related intestinal failure. Four (4) had gastrointestinal tract cancers (small bowel, cholangiocarcinoma, colon). One (1) had fallopian tube cancer. Two (2) had gastroparesis. Four (4) had chronic small bowel obstruction. One (1) had celiac disease. One (1) had combined variable immune deficiency (CVID) (Table 2).

Readmission and hospitalization rate per patients in the study group were 0.13 and 0.37 over the 90-day study period. The same data in control group patients were 0.23 readmission rate and 0.67 hospitalization rate. The average length of hospital stay between study and control group patients was 6.27 and 7.65 days during the study period, respectively (Table 3).

After the study group and case-matched controls data was comingled, the mean CIRS score was 17.0 ± 3.85. This permitted us to separate patients into those with CIRS scores above or below the mean. Roughly half of the patients fell into each group: 32 (53%) above and 28 (47%) below the mean (Table 4).

Data was compared for the number of PN formula changes, total hospitalizations, and hospital length of stay during the 90-day study period between patients with a CIRS score above or below the mean. Patients with CIRS equal to or above the mean had 367 PN formula changes, 19 total hospitalizations and length of stay of 122 days during the study period. Patients with CIRS below the mean had 297 PN formula changes, 10 total hospitalizations and length of stay of 100 days during the study period. The difference in total hospitalizations among the comingled data stratified by CIRS score above and below the mean was statistically significant (p=0.02) (Table 4).

Discussion:

In this paper, we explored the possibility of utilizing multi-morbidity tools to help assess and compare patient receiving HPN therapy. We sought to determine whether measurement of multi-morbidity could identify patients who would require greater HPN resource utilization.

We utilized the number of parenteral nutrition formula changes as a surrogate marker for HPN resource utilization. Such an approach has validity because the number of PN formula changes reflects patient stability, laboratory results, changes in clinical condition and potential for adverse outcomes.

Furthermore, we sought to determine whether multi morbidity scores could predict patients who are at higher or lower risk for adverse outcomes in HPN care. For this determination, we examined total hospitalization and length of hospital stay as end points. This approach has validity because patients with more adverse outcomes can be expected to have a higher number of hospitalizations and greater lengths of stay.

A literature review of the available methods for multi morbidity scoring resulted in our determining the applicability of these methods for the HPN population. At the end of this review, we selected the CIRS method as being most applicable for HPN care. We utilized Stirland's guide to selecting a multimorbidity index for research studies, based on the reasons for studying multimorbidity, the exposure variables and measured outcomes. The CIRS index is not limited to specific conditions (i.e. Myocardial Infarction, Congestive Heart Failure, Peripheral Vascular Disease, Cerebrovascular Disease, Dementia, COPD, etc), many of which may not be present in HPN patients. MMIs that utilized drug counts and physiologic parameters were deemed less applicable to HPN. Furthermore, we eliminated MMIs that were primarily focused on the elderly.

The application of a CIRS scoring system to HPN patients yielded some valuable insights. Training of our multidisciplinary nutritional support team on the CIRS method was relatively straightforward. Our methodology was facilitated by the fact that the same group of individuals performed the CIRS scoring on each patient and control. At least one member of our team had full access to the EMR chart for each patient. Other members had personal experience with the patient's HPN care which provided clinical information that may not have been available in the electronic record. The CIRS scoring process consumed approximately 30 minutes of MNST time per patient.

The results of the pilot study uncovered a possible relationship between higher multimorbidity scores and utilization, hospitalization and hospital length of stay. A significant difference was found in the occurrence of total hospitalizations and elevated CIRS scores.

Multimorbidity adds a degree of complexity to the care of patients receiving HPN. It can impact the use of healthcare resources, such that patients with more medical conditions require more assistance with HPN, more frequent home visits, lab work and hospitalizations. The degree of multimorbidity also places additional responsibility on the care team as they are required to factor the interactions of non-nutritional conditions and treatments with the PN therapy. HPN outcomes research suffers from a lack of standardization for multimorbidity measurement HPN patients which often leads to a comparison of "apples and oranges".

Our pilot study applied the CIRS method to a group of HPN patients who were already under study as part of a corporate quality improvement initiative (QIP-PN). We found the CIRS method was well suited

to use in HPN patients. It was easy to learn and perform. It provided a single variable which could be used a summary statement of the patient's multimorbidity.

When the CIRS data on our long term HPN patients was analyzed, a trend emerged wherein a higher CIRS score was associated with greater resource HPN utilization and adverse events. This approach requires greater study and validation.

References:

1. Wu G, Jiang Y, Zhu X, Jin D, Han Y, Han J, Wu Z, Wu Z. Prevalence and risk factors for complications in adult patients with short bowel syndrome receiving long-term home parenteral nutrition. Asia Pac J Clin Nutr. 2017;26(4):591-597. doi: 10.6133/apjcn.082016.08. PMID: 28582806.

2. Peyret B, Collardeau S, Touzet S, Loras-Duclaux I, Yantren H, Michalski MC, Chaix J, Restier-Miron L, Bouvier R, Lachaux A, Peretti N. Prevalence of liver complications in children receiving long-term parenteral nutrition. Eur J Clin Nutr. 2011 Jun;65(6):743-9. doi: 10.1038/ejcn.2011.26. Epub 2011 Mar 23. PMID: 21427734.

3. Hartl WH, Jauch KW, Parhofer K, Rittler P; Working group for developing the guidelines for parenteral nutrition of The German Association for Nutritional Medicine. Complications and monitoring - Guidelines on Parenteral Nutrition, Chapter 11. *Ger Med Sci*. 2009;7:Doc17

4. Rothkopf M, Pant M, Brown R*, et al.* Impact of a multidisciplinary nutritional support team on quality improvement for patients receiving home parenteral nutrition. *BMJ Nutrition, Prevention & Health* 2022;5:doi: 10.1136/bmjnph-2022-000484

5. Wei MY, Kawachi I, Okereke OI, Mukamal KJ. Diverse Cumulative Impact of Chronic Diseases on Physical Health-Related Quality of Life: Implications for a Measure of Multimorbidity. *Am J Epidemiol* 2016;184:357-65

6. Hong CS, Atlas SJ, Ashburner JM, et al. Evaluating a Model to Predict Primary Care Physician-Defined Complexity in a Large Academic Primary Care Practice-Based Research Network. *J Gen Intern Med* 2015;30:1741-7

7. Min L, Wenger N, Walling AM, et al. When comorbidity, aging, and complexity of primary care meet: development and validation of the Geriatric CompleXity of Care Index. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2013;61:542-50

8. Mukherjee B, Ou H-T, Wang F, Erickson SR. A new comorbidity index: the health-related quality of life comorbidity index. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011;64:309-19. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.01.025

9. Bayliss EA, Ellis JL, Steiner JF. Subjective assessments of comorbidity correlate with quality of life health outcomes: initial validation of a comorbidity assessment instrument. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2005;3:51

10. Selim AJ, Fincke G, Ren XS, et al. Comorbidity assessments based on patient report: results from the Veterans Health Study. *J Ambul Care Manage* 2004;27:281-95

11. Byles JE, D'Este C, Parkinson L, O'Connell R, Treloar C. Single index of multimorbidity did not predict multiple outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2005;58:997-1005; Tooth L, Hockey R, Byles J, Dobson A. Weighted multimorbidity indexes predicted mortality, health service use, and health-related quality of life in older women. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008;61:151-9.

12. Carey IM, Shah SM, Harris T, DeWilde S, Cook DG. A new simple primary care morbidity score predicted mortality and better explains between practice variations than the Charlson index. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2013;66:436-44

13. Crabtree HL, Gray CS, Hildreth AJ, O'Connell JE, Brown J. The Comorbidity Symptom Scale: a combined disease inventory and assessment of symptom severity. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2000;48:1674-8

14. Wister AV, Levasseur M, Griffith LE, Fyffe I. Estimating multiple morbidity disease burden among older persons: a convergent construct validity study to discriminate among six chronic illness measures, CCHS 2008/09. *BMC Geriatr* 2015;15:12.

15. Bernabeu-Wittel M, Ollero-Baturone M, Moreno-Gaviño L, et al. Development of a new predictive model for polypathological patients. The PROFUND index. *Eur J Intern Med* 2011;22:311-7

16. Stanley J, Sarfati D. The new measuring multimorbidity index predicted mortality better than Charlson and Elixhauser indices among the general population. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2017;92:99-110.

17.Lorem GF, Schirmer H, Emaus N. Health impact index. Development and validation of a method for classifying comorbid disease measured against self-reported health. *PLoS One* 2016;11:e0148830. doi:10.1371/journal.pone

18. Pati S, Hussain MA, Swain S, et al. Development and Validation of a Questionnaire to Assess Multimorbidity in Primary Care: An Indian Experience. *Biomed Res Int* 2016;2016:6582487

19. Farley JF, Harley CR, Devine JW. A comparison of comorbidity measurements to predict healthcare expenditures. *Am J Manag Care* 2006;12:110-9.

20. Pope GC, Kautter J, Ellis RP, et al. Risk adjustment of Medicare capitation payments using the CMS-HCC model. *Health Care Financ Rev* 2004;25:119-41.

21. Starfield B, Weiner J, Mumford L, Steinwachs D. Ambulatory care groups: a categorization of diagnoses for research and management. *Health Serv Res* 1991;26:53-74.

22. Linn BS, Linn MW, Gurel L. Cumulative illness rating scale. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1968;16:622-6. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.1968.tb02103.x

23. Brettschneider C, Leicht H, Bickel H, et al, MultiCare Study Group. Relative impact of multimorbid chronic conditions on healthrelated quality of life--results from the MultiCare Cohort Study. *PLoS One* 2013

24. 8:e66742.; Robusto F, Lepore V, D'Ettorre A, et al. The Drug Derived Complexity Index (DDCI) Predicts Mortality, Unplanned Hospitalization and Hospital Readmissions at the Population Level. *PLoS One* 2016;11:e0149203.

25. Dong YH, Chang CH, Shau WY, Kuo RN, Lai MS, Chan KA. Development and validation of a pharmacy-based comorbidity measure in a population-based automated health care database. *Pharmacotherapy* 2013;33:126-36.

26. George J, Vuong T, Bailey MJ, Kong DC, Marriott JL, Stewart K. Development and validation of the medication-based disease burden index. *Ann Pharmacother* 2006;40:645-50

27. Newman AB, Boudreau RM, Naydeck BL, Fried LF, Harris TB. A physiologic index of comorbidity: relationship to mortality and disability. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2008;63:603-9.

28. Mundi MS, Prevalence of Home Parenteral, NCP, 2017

29. 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 Feb 18;368:m160. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m160. Erratum in: BMJ. 2020 Sep 30;370:m3668. PMID: 32071114; PMCID: PMC7190061.

30. Beloosesky Y, Weiss A, Mansur N. Validity of the Medication-based Disease Burden Index compared with the Charlson Comorbidity Index and the Cumulative Illness Rating Scale for geriatrics: a cohort study. Drugs Aging. 2011 Dec 1;28(12):1007-14. doi: 10.2165/11597040-000000000-00000. PMID: 22117098.

31. de Groot V, Beckerman H, Lankhorst GJ, Bouter LM. How to measure comorbidity. a critical review of available methods. J Clin Epidemiol. 2003 Mar;56(3):221-9. doi: 10.1016/s0895-4356(02)00585-1. PMID: 12725876.

32. Frengley JD, Sansone GR, Kaner RJ. Chronic Comorbid Illnesses Predict the Clinical Course of 866 Patients Requiring Prolonged Mechanical Ventilation in a Long-Term, Acute-Care Hospital. *Journal of Intensive Care Medicine*. 2020;35(8):745-754. doi:10.1177/0885066618783175

33. Kirkhus L, Šaltytė Benth J, Grønberg BH, et al. Frailty identified by geriatric assessment is associated with poor functioning, high symptom burden and increased risk of physical decline in older cancer patients: Prospective observational study. *Palliative Medicine*. 2019;33(3):312-322. doi:10.1177/0269216319825972

34. de Groot V, Beckerman H, Lankhorst GJ, Bouter LM. How to measure comorbidity. a critical review of available methods. J Clin Epidemiol. 2003 Mar;56(3):221-9. doi: 10.1016/s0895-4356(02)00585-1. PMID: 12725876.

Table 1.

Demographic characteristics of study patients and case-matched controls. No significant demographic

Characteristic	Study Group, n=30	Case-Matched Controls, n=30
Male	26.7%	20%
Female	73.3%	80%
Age	57.4 ± 13.40	54.6 ± 19.48
Days on HPN Therapy	624.3 ± 1084.27	589.76 ± 1040.55
CIRS Score	17.4 ± 3.81	16.5 ± 3.82
Federal Payor	56%	73.33%

differences were identified between the groups. CIRS = cumulative illness rating scale

Table 2.

Primary Diagnosis		Study Group, n=30	Case-Matched Controls, n=30
Intestinal Failure (IF)		23	24
-Short Bowel Syndrome (SBS)		9	6
-Crohn's Disease-Related Intestinal Failure (CDIF)		4	4
-Complication of Bariatric Surgery		3	2
-Gastroparesis		3	4
-Chronic Bowel Obstruction		2	6
-Celiac Disease		1	1
-Colitis		1	1
Enteric Fistula		7	4
Gastrointestinal Cancers		3	5
Pancreatic Cancer		3	0
Fallopian Tube Cancer		1	1

Diagnostic categories of study patients and controls. Principal diagnosis listed in the electronic medical record (EMR) for study patients and case-matched controls. Most HPN patients in the study and case-matched control groups had intestinal failure as their reason for therapy (23). Intrabdominal/pelvic cancer accounted for the remainder.

Table 3.

Outcomes	Study Group, n=30	Case-Matched Controls, n=30
Total Adverse Outcomes	10	16
Access Device Occlusion	1	0
Emergency Room Visits	2	2
Unplanned Hospitalization	7	14
- PN-related Hospitalization	3	3
- PN-unrelated Hospitalization	4	11
Total Hospital Admissions	11	20
- Single Hospital Admission	3	8
- Double Hospital Admission	4	5
- Triple Hospital Admission	0	2
Readmission Rate	0.13	0.23
Hospitalization Rate per Patient	0.37	0.67
Total Hospital Length of Stay (LOS) Days	69	153
Average LOS Day	6.27	7.65

Adverse outcomes during a 90-day study period. Study patients had fewer total adverse outcomes and unplanned hospitalization than case-matched controls. Emergency department use was similar both groups. Study group patients had a lower hospitalization rate, readmission rate, total LOS and average LOS than case-matched controls. Note: LOS = length of stay, PN = parenteral nutrition.

Table 4.

	Comingled CIRS <17	Study CIRS <17	Control CIRS <17	Comingled CIRS ≥17	Study CIRS ≥17	Control CIRS ≥17
Patients	28	12	16	32	18	14
Number of PN Formula Changes	297	143	154	367	230	137
Total Hospitalizations	12	2	10	19*	9	10
Hospital Length of Stay	100	21	79	122	48	74

Homecare utilization, hospitalization and hospital length of stay during a 90-day study period. Comingled data of study patients and case-matched controls, stratified by CIRS scores. * p=0.02

Figure 2.



Figure 2. CIRS scoring method for patients on HPN.

Figure 1.



Figure 1. Flowsheet of patient selection and participation in the Amerita QIP-PN Study