

Using Quality Improvement to Tackle Unwarranted Practice Variation

Sunitha V. Kaiser, MD, MSc,^a Matthew D. Garber, MD^b

As health care in the United States moves from quantity to quality, unwarranted practice variation has become a natural target for those wishing to improve care. Variation in provider practice should arise from personalizing care decisions on the basis of each patient's condition and personal preferences. "Unwarranted" variation refers to variation beyond what would be expected based on patient or population differences¹; it is due to non-evidence-based, inappropriate, and/or inefficient health care. Unwarranted variation in pediatrics has been demonstrated since the early 1900s, when Sir Allison Glover² compared pediatric tonsillectomy rates in geographically and demographically similar areas of England. He showed a >10-fold variation in rates and concluded, "A study of the geographical distribution [of tonsillectomy] in children discloses no correlation between any other factor, such as over-crowding, poverty, bad housing, or climate. In fact it defies any explanation, save that of variation of medical opinion on the indications."²

Despite broad dissemination of evidence-based guidelines for asthma management,³ unwarranted variation persists in care and outcomes for children treated in emergency departments and/or hospitalized for asthma. Studies have demonstrated wide variation in rates of diagnostic testing (eg, complete blood counts), interventions (eg, intravenous [IV] magnesium sulfate), transfer to ICUs, hospital readmissions, length of stay, and costs, even after correction for patient characteristics.⁴⁻⁷ This variation is largely due to the challenges of integrating guidelines into care, which may take up to 17 years.⁸

In this issue of *Hospital Pediatrics*, Khurana Hershey et al⁹ demonstrate that variation in asthma care continues to exist, reinforcing findings in earlier studies. They used the Ohio Pediatric Asthma Registry, a comprehensive statewide prospective study linking clinical, demographic, environmental, and health outcomes data from the 6 major children's hospitals in Ohio. The authors report wide variation in hospital-level rates of what they term "nonstandard" practices (eg, inpatient ipratropium, IV steroids, chest radiographs, antibiotics). Rates of these practices ranged from 20% to 93% across the 6 hospitals.

The authors also explored associations between provider practices and time until "physiologic readiness for discharge (PRD)," measured as hours from admission to first 4-hour albuterol spacing or discharge. They found that several practices were associated with shorter PRD (use of spot pulse oximetry) and longer PRD (continuous albuterol, IV steroids, antibiotics, chest radiographs). However, as the authors acknowledge, their analyses have a limitation. The authors had no ability to account for potential differences across hospitals in the severity of patients' asthma exacerbations because of the lack of standardized assessment tools. Consequently, their conclusions about

www.hospitalpediatrics.org

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1542/hpeds.2018-0060>

Copyright © 2018 by the American Academy of Pediatrics

Address correspondence to Sunitha V. Kaiser, MD, MSc, Department of Pediatrics, University of California, San Francisco, 550 16th St, Box 3214, San Francisco, CA 94158. E-mail: sunitha.kaiser@ucsf.edu

HOSPITAL PEDIATRICS (ISSN Numbers: Print, 2154-1663; Online, 2154-1671).



FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE: The authors have indicated they have no financial relationships relevant to this article to disclose.

FUNDING: No external funding.

POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST: The authors have indicated they have no potential conflicts of interest to disclose.

Drs Kaiser and Garber conceptualized the manuscript and drafted the initial manuscript; and both authors approved the final manuscript as submitted.

^aUniversity of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, California; and
^bUniversity of Florida, Jacksonville, Florida

relationships between practices and PRD may be due to confounding (eg, more severe patients get continuous albuterol and need longer hospital stays). This limits our ability to apply their findings to improve asthma care.

Nonetheless, the practice variation they demonstrate across 6 hospitals in a small geographic region is substantial and likely represents unwarranted variation. As a field, how are we to address unwarranted variation? Two national strategies attempt to incentivize providers and organizations to provide better care. Public performance reporting provides a reputational incentive to motivate practice change, and pay-for-performance provides a financial incentive. With >15 years of studies on these strategies, the public release of performance data does not appear to effectively alter consumer, health care provider, or organizational behavior.¹⁰ Paradoxically, public reporting may even encourage changes in documentation and coding without actual improvements in patient care.¹¹ A recent systematic review of pay-for-performance reveals scant benefit.¹² Additionally, pay-for-performance may exacerbate health care disparities by rewarding physicians who see healthier and wealthier patients, a problem termed the “reverse Robin Hood effect.”¹³

Is quality improvement (QI) up to the challenge of addressing unwarranted variation? The pediatric hospital medicine core competencies include continuous QI, cost-effective care, and evidence-based medicine. Indeed, exuberant espousal of these competencies defines us as a field. So, how have we leveraged this fervor? Single-center¹⁴ and multi-site¹⁵ QI projects across both academic and community hospital settings have demonstrated reductions in unwarranted variation and improvements in asthma care. The Value in Inpatient Pediatrics network combines centralized expertise in QI with the inherent motivation of pediatric hospitalists, many of whom practice in small community settings where resources are scarce and generally apportioned to the more lucrative adult services.¹⁶ The network has improved

unwarranted variation on the national scale for several common conditions, including bronchiolitis and community-acquired pneumonia.^{17,18}

QI shows promise for tackling unwarranted variation, but our current approaches most often focus on small-scale, local interventions and favor action over evidence.¹⁹ As the field looks forward and becomes better resourced for conducting QI, we should endeavor to improve our expertise and approaches to fully realize QI's potential for reducing unwarranted variation and achieving large-scale improvements in care for our patients. We propose 3 strategies for improving QI to achieve these goals.

IMPROVING QI STRATEGY 1: APPLY MORE RIGOROUS STUDY DESIGN

Most pediatric inpatient QI studies to date have used simple before-and-after studies. This approach can lead us to falsely attribute improvement to a QI intervention when in fact (1) it would have occurred without any QI intervention (because of secular trends in care), or (2) it is actually because of other factors, such as a less-severe mix of patients being cared for after the QI intervention began (case-mix differences). Simple before-and-after studies are sometimes adequate to justify local QI efforts, but they are rarely sufficient to support widespread initiatives because of the risks of expending tremendous resources without obtaining a benefit (and possibly introducing new problems).^{19,20} Cluster-randomized trials represent a rigorous way to study QI interventions, but other designs include stepped-wedge randomized trials, before-and-after designs with concurrent control groups, and time-series designs.¹⁹

IMPROVING QI STRATEGY 2: DETAIL IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

For QI interventions to have more widespread benefits for children, potential adopters need adequate guidance on exactly how to implement interventions

successfully. Implementation science can be used to provide frameworks and guidance on how to design and evaluate QI interventions to facilitate more successful uptake.²¹ Authors of QI reports and studies should better describe how they designed and implemented their interventions, what barriers they faced and how they were overcome, and which components of their intervention were most important in improving care.

IMPROVING QI STRATEGY 3: DETERMINE HOW TO SUSTAIN CHANGE

After initial gains are achieved with a QI intervention, improvements are often lost as attention shifts to other priorities and staff revert to the “old way” of doing things. Few pediatric QI interventions have examined outcomes >6 months after implementation.²² Although there are general frameworks for sustaining the benefits of QI interventions,²³ it is still unclear which strategies are most feasible and effective. Understanding this will require sustained data collection and monitoring.

Local QI interventions to standardize care are only a first step in addressing unwarranted practice variation. The next important steps are improving our QI strategies and reach. To achieve widespread improvements in child health, we must scale up QI interventions that prove effective. We urge QI leaders to develop further expertise to apply rigorous study designs (eg, include control units and sites), expand their efforts to include more settings (eg, an academic center and affiliated community hospitals), detail the implementation strategies used, and monitor outcomes for longer durations of time. By leveraging our field's passion for QI in these ways, we can realize true gains in providing the highest quality care for children within and beyond our hospital walls.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge Naomi Bardach, Michael Cabana, and Amy Markowitz for their thoughtful comments on earlier drafts of this commentary.

REFERENCES

1. Goodman DC. Unwarranted variation in pediatric medical care. *Pediatr Clin North Am*. 2009;56(4):745–755
2. Glover JA. The incidence of tonsillectomy in school children: (section of epidemiology and state medicine). *Proc R Soc Med*. 1938;31(10):1219–1236
3. National Asthma Education and Prevention Program. Expert panel report 3 (EPR-3): guidelines for the diagnosis and management of asthma-summary report 2007 [published correction appears in *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2008; 121(6):1330]. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2007;120(suppl 5):S94–S138
4. Biagini Myers JM, Simmons JM, Kerckmar CM, et al. Heterogeneity in asthma care in a statewide collaborative: the Ohio Pediatric Asthma Repository. *Pediatrics*. 2015;135(2): 271–279
5. Chamberlain JM, Teach SJ, Hayes KL, Badolato G, Goyal MK. Practice pattern variation in the care of children with acute asthma. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2016; 23(2):166–170
6. Kenyon CC, Melvin PR, Chiang VW, Elliott MN, Schuster MA, Berry JG. Rehospitalization for childhood asthma: timing, variation, and opportunities for intervention. *J Pediatr*. 2014;164(2): 300–305
7. Silber JH, Rosenbaum PR, Wang W, et al. Auditing practice style variation in pediatric inpatient asthma care. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2016;170(9):878–886
8. Balas EA, Boren SA. Managing clinical knowledge for health care improvement. *Yearb Med Inform*. 2000; (1):65–70
9. Khurana Hershey GSJ, Biagini Myers J, Martin L, et al. Ohio Pediatric Asthma Repository: opportunities to revise care practices to decrease time to physiologic readiness for discharge. *Hosp Pediatr*. 2018;8(6)
10. Ketelaar NA, Faber MJ, Flottorp S, Rygh LH, Deane KH, Eccles MP. Public release of performance data in changing the behaviour of healthcare consumers, professionals or organisations. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2011;(11): CD004538
11. Goitein L. Virtual quality: the failure of public reporting and pay-for-performance programs. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2014;174(12):1912–1913
12. Mendelson A, Kondo K, Damberg C, et al. The effects of pay-for-performance programs on health, health care use, and processes of care: a systematic review. *Ann Intern Med*. 2017;166(5): 341–353
13. Frakt AB, Jha AK. Face the facts: we need to change the way we do pay for performance. *Ann Intern Med*. 2018; 168(4):291–292
14. Hogan AH, Rastogi D, Rinke ML. A quality improvement intervention to improve inpatient pediatric asthma controller accuracy. *Hosp Pediatr*. 2018;8(3): 127–134
15. Nkoy F, Fassl B, Stone B, et al. Improving pediatric asthma care and outcomes across multiple hospitals. *Pediatrics*. 2015;136(6). Available at: www.pediatrics.org/cgi/content/full/136/6/e1602
16. Ralston SL, Atwood EC, Garber MD, Holmes AV. What works to reduce unnecessary care for bronchiolitis? A qualitative analysis of a national collaborative. *Acad Pediatr*. 2017;17(2): 198–204
17. Parikh K, Biondi E, Nazif J, et al; Value in Inpatient Pediatrics Network Quality Collaborative for Improving Care in Community Acquired Pneumonia. A multicenter collaborative to improve care of community acquired pneumonia in hospitalized children. *Pediatrics*. 2017; 139(3):e20161411
18. Ralston SL, Garber MD, Rice-Conboy E, et al; Value in Inpatient Pediatrics Network Quality Collaborative for Improving Hospital Compliance with AAP Bronchiolitis Guideline (BQIP). A multicenter collaborative to reduce unnecessary care in inpatient bronchiolitis. *Pediatrics*. 2016;137(1): e20150851
19. Auerbach AD, Landefeld CS, Shojania KG. The tension between needing to improve care and knowing how to do it. *N Engl J Med*. 2007;357(6):608–613
20. Bardach NS, Cabana MD. The unintended consequences of quality improvement. *Curr Opin Pediatr*. 2009;21(6):777–782
21. Handley MA, Gorukanti A, Cattamanchi A. Strategies for implementing implementation science: a methodological overview. *Emerg Med J*. 2016;33(9):660–664
22. Shadman KA, Ralston SL, Garber MD, et al. Sustainability in the AAP bronchiolitis quality improvement project. *J Hosp Med*. 2017;12(11): 905–910
23. Scoville R, Little K, Rakover J, Luther K, Mate K. *Sustaining Improvement*. Cambridge, MA: Institute for Healthcare Improvement; 2016