Study Focus and Characteristics						Analytic Controls			Comparisons	
Metric/Study	Geography	MA Plan Types (mainly HMOs pre 2006) <sup>8</sup>	Beneficiary Age	Data Time Period	Geographic Variation	Socio- demographic Characteristics	Health Status/Risk	MA vs. TM†	MA Plan Type	
HEDIS Measu	res on Effectiv	eness of Care (n	= 3)							
Ayanian et al. 2013a	National	НМО	65+	2003-2009	√ 	√	√ (CAHPS variables only)	√	√ (Not-for- profit, larger, older vs. For- profit, smaller, newer)	
Ayanian et al. 2013b	National	HMO and PPO	65–69 (women)	2009	√	√		$\checkmark$	√	
Brennan and Shephard 2010	National	HMO, POS, PPO	All	2006-2007	√ (state)			$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{\text{(All MA vs.}}$ PPO only)	
Beneficiary R	eports on Qua	lity and Access (	n = 10)							
Farley et al. 2011	California vs. Nation	MA	All	2008	√	√	<b>√</b>	$\checkmark$		
Elliott et al. 2011	National	MA	All	2007	$\checkmark$	$\sqrt{}$	<b>√</b>	$\checkmark$		
Keenan et al. 2009	National	MA	65+	2003-2004	$\checkmark$	$\sqrt{}$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		
Mittler et al. 2010	National	MA	65+, non- duals	2003	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\checkmark$		
Kennan et al. 2010	National	MA	All	2001-2004	$\checkmark$	$\sqrt{}$	<b>√</b>	$\checkmark$		
Landon et al. 2004	National	MA	65+	2000-2001	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	$\checkmark$		
Balsa et al. 2007	National	MA	65+, non- duals, non- ESRD	1996-2001	√ (MA counties only for TM)	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{\text{(descriptive statistics only)}}$	$\sqrt{}$		
Safran et al. 2002	13 mature state markets	НМО	65+, continuously enrolled 1+ year, enrolled in Parts A+B	1998	√ 	√	√	V	√ (HMO IPA/ Network vs. Staff/Group, For-profit vs. nonprofit)	

<sup>†</sup> Abbreviations refer to Medicare Advantage (MA) and traditional Medicare (TM).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Until 2004, MA was known as Medicare+Choice.

Study Focus and Characteristics					Analytic Controls			Comparisons	
Metric/Study	Geography	MA Plan Types (mainly HMOs pre 2006)	Beneficiary Age	Data Time Period	Geographic Variation	Socio- demographic Characteristics	Health Status/Risk	MA vs. TM	MA Plan Type
Pourat et al. 2006	National	НМО	65+	1996	√ (region)	√	$\checkmark$	√	√
Beatty and Dhont 2001	National	НМО	Under 65 disabled or aged with 1 IADL	1994		√	$\sqrt{}$	$\sqrt{}$	
Potentially Av	oidable Hosp	oitalizations (n =	6)						
Friedman et al. 2009	13 states	MA	65+	2006				<b>√</b>	
Anderson 2009	13 ACHP plans	HMOs	All	2007	*			√ (Not-for- Profit ACHP HMO Plans vs. TM)	
Nicholas 2013	4 states	MA	All	1999-2005	<b>√</b>	√	$\sqrt{}$	√	
Basu 2011	3 states	MA	65+	2004	√ (state)	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	√	
Basu and Mobley 2007	4 states	M+C	65+	2001	<b>√</b>	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\sqrt{}$	
Zeng et al. 2006	California	HMOs	65+	1996	<b>√</b>	$\checkmark$	√ (pre–65 disabled)	<b>√</b>	
Quality of Ad	mitting Hosp	ital/Physician (n	= 5)						
Friedman and Jiang 2010	13 states	MA	65+	2006		<b>√</b>	$\sqrt{}$	√	
Huesch 2010	Florida	M+C	65+	2003-2006	√	$\sqrt{}$		√	√
Basu and Friedman 2013	Florida	НМО	65+	2002	√	$\sqrt{}$	$\checkmark$	√ 	
Luft 2003	California	НМО	65+	1994-1995	√		$\checkmark$		
Erickson et al. 2000	New York	MA	65+	1993-1996	√	√ 	$\checkmark$	√	√ (also include comparison to private HMO, TM)
Readmission R	ate (n = 3)								
Friedman et al. 2012	5 states	MA	All	2006		<b>√</b>	$\sqrt{}$	√	

1â		<i>ued)</i> . Overview of		imig Medicare	- Auvantage				
Study Focus and Characteristics						Analytic Contro	Comparisons		
Metric/Study	Geography	MA Plan Types (mainly HMOs pre 2006)	Beneficiary Age	Data Time Period	Geographic Variation	Socio- demographic Characteristics	Health Status/Risk	MA vs. TM	MA Plan Type
Lemieux et al. 2012	MORE registry plans	MA	65+	2006-2008			$\sqrt{}$	√ 	
Smith et al. 2005	Firm	НМО	65+	1998-2000	$\sqrt{}$	√	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	
		ing HEDIS Use ar			Metrics (n =	6)			
MedPAC 2014b	National	MA	All	2012				<b>√</b>	
Stevenson et al. 2013	National	НМО	65+, in year of death		<b>√</b>	$\sqrt{}$		<b>√</b>	
Matlock et al. 2013	12 states	MA patients served by CVRN	65+	2003-2007	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	(only MA)	$\checkmark$	
Landon et al. 2012	National	HMOs	65+	2003-2009	√ 	√ 	$\checkmark$	√ 	√ (Plans present before 2003 vs. new entrants)
Mello et al. 2002	National	HMOs	65+	1993-1996		$\sqrt{}$	$\checkmark$	√	
Dhanani et al. 2004	California	HMOs (including subgroups of those switching to/from HMO and TM)	65+	1991-1995	√ (state)	√		√ 	√ (IPA or group staff model)
Health Care (	Outcomes								
Mortality (n =	= 1)								
Dowd et al. 2011	National	HMOs	65+	1996-2000	<b>√</b>	√	$\checkmark$	<b>√</b>	
Stage of Cand	cer Diagnosis	and Outcomes (n	= 5)						
Ward et al. 2010	NCDP registry hospitals		55-74	2005-2007	√ 	√ 		√ (including TM subgroups and private insurance subgroups)	

Ta	able 2 <i>(continu</i>	<i>ued)</i> . Overview o	f Studies Compa	ring Medicare	Advantage	to Traditional M	edicare by Ca	tegory of Meti	ric
Study Focus and Characteristics					Analytic Controls			Comparisons	
Metric/Study	Geography	MA Plan Types (mainly HMOs pre 2006)	Beneficiary Age	Data Time Period	Geographic Variation	Socio- demographic Characteristics	Health Status/Risk	MA vs. TM	MA Plan Type
Sadetsky et al. 2008	CapSURE database practices	Medicare HMO, PPO	Men 65+	1995-2005		√ 	$\checkmark$	√ (TM comparison included subgroups of duals and Medicare alone (vs. supplement) as well as private MC, VA)	√ (HMO, PPO)
Riley et al. 2008	SEER registry locales	M+C	65-79	1998-2002	√ (TM limited to counties with 3+ cases)	√	√ (cancer diagnosis stage, type, grade)	√	
Kirscher et al. 2005	SEER registry locales	НМО	65+	1985-1994	√	√	√ (cancer stage)	<b>√</b>	
Lee-Feldstein et al. 2002	Cancer Surveillance Program Region 3 (Sacramento + urban and rural areas throughout N. California)	НМО	65+	1987-1993		√ 	-	√ (TM comparison included subgroups of duals, Medicare alone, Medicare with supplement	√ (group vs. nongroup MA model)
Functional Sta									
Porell and Miltiades 2001	National	НМО	65+	1991-1996		√ 	$\checkmark$	√(TM comparison included subgroups by supplemental insurance	

<sup>\*</sup>This study (Anderson 2009) does not provide sufficient detail to assess whether geographical adjustments are made, noting that the MA comparison is made using claims from beneficiaries in the same counties, but not how this was done, weighted, or analyzed.

SOURCE: Authors' analysis based on review of published papers.