



Findings from Recent CMS Research on Medicare

Chair: Niall Brennan





Patent Expirations and Part D Spending on Atypical Antipsychotic Medications

Eric Rollins Director, Policy & Data Analytics Group Office of Information Products and Data Analytics

Use of Generic Drugs in Part D, 2007-2012

 The share of total prescriptions filled with generics rose from 63% in January 2007 to 84% in December 2012







Source: IMS, CVS Caremark, Barclays Research



Part D Spending for Atypical Antipsychotics

| ANTIPSYCHOTICS/AN | TIMANIC AGENTS | | | | Share of |
|-------------------|---|------|------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 2013 Spend (%) | Total Spending Trend | Vear | Spending (in \$ billions) | Percent | all Part D |
| 2013 Fills (%) | 300 | 2006 | ¢4.2 | IIICIEdae | 0.1% |
| | 250 | 2000 | \$4.2 \$4.0 | 10.2% | 8.1% |
| \$5 8 B (6%) | 200 | 2007 | \$4.9 ¢r. 7 | 19.3% | 7.9% |
| 93.00(0/0) | 150 | 2008 | \$5.7 ¢5.0 | 15.5% | 8.3% |
| 29.8 IVI (2%) | 100 | 2009 | \$5.9 | 3.0% | 8.0% |
| | 50 | 2010 | \$6.5 | 10.4% | 8.3% |
| | 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 | 2011 | Ş7.6 | 17.3% | 9.0% |
| | | 2012 | \$6.4 | -16.8% | 7.1% |
| | | 2013 | \$5.8 | -9.1% | 5.6% |



Major Atypical Antipsychotics: Patent Expiration Dates and Part D Market Shares

| Drug | Generic Name | Patent Expiration * | Forms Affected | Percentage of 2011 Fills | Percentage of 2011 Spend |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Clozaril | Clozapine | 30-Aug-96 | Tablet | 5.2 | 1.7 |
| Risperdal | Risperdone | 30-Jun-08 | Tablet | 25.6 | 6.5 |
| Zyprexa | Olanzapine | 24-Oct-11 | Tablet | 14.3 | 26.2 |
| Geodon | Ziprasidone | 02-Mar-12 | Capsule | 5.5 | 7.1 |
| Seroquel | Quetiapine Fumarate | 26-Mar-12 | Tablet | 34 | 32.3 |
| Abilify | Aripiprazole | Apr-15 | Tablet | 12.1 | 19.7 |
| Total | N/A | N/A | N/A | 96.7 | 93.5 |

* This is the expiration date for the patent on the leading dosage form, as reported by the FDA Orange Book; the date for Abilify comes from Express Scripts/Medco's file of anticipated patent expiration dates, accessed on April 1, 2013.



Generics as a Share of Total Prescriptions, by Drug, by Months after Patent Expiration

(Here month 1 is the month when the patent expired.)





Part D Market Shares, by Prescriptions, 2006-2013



Fills for Top 5 (as of 2013) Atypical Antipsychotics (All)



Part D Market Shares, by Spending, 2006-2013



Spend for Top 5 (as of 2013) Atypical Antipsychotics (All)



Year-over-Year Monthly Growth Rates in Average Spending per Prescription

(Here month 0 is the month when the patent expired)









Zyprexa (Olanzapine) 30-Day Prescription Average Cost 2013 Total Spending: \$545 M

(Generic equivalent available on 10/24/2011)





Seroquel (Quetiapine Fumarate) 30-Day Prescription Average Cost

2013 Total Spending: \$556 M

(Generic equivalent available on 03/26/2012)





Abilify (Aripiprazole) 30-Day Prescription Average Cost

2013 Total Spending: \$2.1 B

(Generic equivalent available on 04/01/2015)



Key Findings

- Rapid generic substitution (80-90% within 2 months of patent expiration and ~95% within 9 months), but limited therapeutic substitution within the drug class
- Savings in first 180 days after patent expiration were relatively limited for two drugs
 - The average cost of the brand-name drug increased rapidly leading up to patent expiration
 - When a single generic manufacturer held the market exclusivity rights for the first 180 days after patent expiration, the average cost of the generic was similar to the brand-name cost 12-24 months prior
- The average cost of generic prescriptions declined sharply after the 180-day period, but full extent of savings may take years to







Use of Post-Acute Care Following a Hip or Knee Replacement (DRG 470)

Allison Oelschlaeger Office of Information Products and Data Analytics

Episode Construction

- Episodes started with an index hospitalization that occurred in CY 2010
 - Initial episodes had to be preceded by a 30-day clean period, during which the beneficiary received no acute or post-acute care services
- Episodes ended "naturally" with either a clean period (20 days) or admission for certain surgical MS-DRGs
- PAC defined as use of home health, SNF, IRF, LTCH, or Part B outpatient therapy (hospital outpatient therapy services and therapy claims delivered by independent therapists)



MS-DRG 470: Profile

| | \$25,000 | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Total Episodes = 285,520 | | | | | | | |
| (Total discharges for DRG 470 = 437,981) | ¢20.000 | | | | | | |
| Total Spending = \$6.1 B | | | | | | | |
| Average episode cost = \$21,317 | \$15,000 - | | | | | | |
| Average episode length = 56 days | | | | | | | |
| Beneficiaries: | \$10,000 | | | | | | |
| Survived the index admit in 99.9% of episodes (285,242) | \$5 000 | | | | | | |
| Survived the index and used PAC as the first service after the index in 92.3% of | φ0,000 Φ0 | | | | | | |
| episodes (263,507) | \$0 | | | | | | |
| Readmissions per episode = 0.09 | IndexReadm | niss | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |



Distribution of Spending

PAC is a much larger share of episode spending for MS-DRG 470



Distribution of Episodes by First/Second Service Used after Discharge

| 1st Service Af | ter Index | 2nd Service After Index | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------|-------|------|------|------|----------------|--|
| Service | % of Total | None | Therapy | HHA | SNF | IRF | LTCH | Acute Admit | |
| None | 7.1% | 7.1% | | | | | | | |
| Therapy | 11.4% | 10.8% | | 0.1% | * | * | | 0.4% | |
| HHA | 35.2% | 15.1% | 18.7% | | 0.1% | * | * | 1.2% | |
| SNF | 36.3% | 5.0% | 9.1% | 18.9% | 0.9% | 0.1% | * | 2.4% | |
| IRF | 9.5% | 0.8% | 2.4% | 5.2% | 0.7% | * | * | 0.4% | |
| LTCH | * | * | * | * | * | * | | * | |
| Acute Admit | 0.5% | 0.2% | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.1% | * | * | * | |
| | 100.0% | 39.0% | 30.3% | 24.3% | 1.8% | 0.1% | * | 4.4% | |

Episodes that accounted for less than 0.1% of the total are marked with an asterisk



Average Episode Cost by First/Second Service Used after Discharge

| 1st Service After Index | | 2nd Service After Index | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------|----------------|--|
| Service | Avg. Episode Cost | None | Therapy | ННА | SNF | IRF | LTCH | Acute Admit | |
| None | \$9,301 | \$9,301 | | | | | | | |
| Therapy | \$14,000 | \$13,551 | | \$18,196 | * | * | | \$24,281 | |
| HHA | \$16,920 | \$15,689 | \$17,088 | | \$27,202 | * | * | \$28,548 | |
| SNF | \$27,154 | \$24,860 | \$23,388 | \$26,729 | \$36,345 | \$40,065 | * | \$45,865 | |
| IRF | \$32,746 | \$25,466 | \$26,887 | \$32,595 | \$50,015 | * | * | \$52,724 | |
| LTCH | * | * | * | * | * | * | | * | |
| Acute Admit | \$24,319 | \$15,732 | \$20,609 | \$24,463 | \$36,599 | * | * | * | |
| | \$21,325 | \$15,311 | \$19,764 | \$27,944 | \$41,405 | \$39,711 | * | \$39,881 | |

Episodes that accounted for less than 0.1% of the total are marked with an asterisk



Average Episode Cost by HRR



Outlier HRRs

| | Average Episode | % of "No PAC" | Share of PAC Episode Dollars Going to | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | Length | Episodes | SNF | HHA | IRF | Therapy | LTCH | | |
| High Outlier | 69 | 3.4% | 46.40% | 22.60% | 24.00% | 6.60% | 0.40% | | |
| HKKS [^] | | | (\$5,217) | (\$2,505) | (\$2,825) | (\$724) | (\$42) | | |
| All HRRs | 56 | 7.1% | 47.90% (\$3,986) | 28.20% (\$2,345) | 16.20% (\$1,344) | 7.20% (\$595) | 0.50% (\$46) | | |
| Low Outlier HRRs* | 46 | 15.6% | 54.00% (\$3,112) | 24.00% (\$1,332) | 11.10% (\$648) | 10.80% (\$601) | 0.10% (\$6) | | |

*Outlier HRRs had spending that was 15% above / below the national average.



Average Episode Length



Percent of Episodes without PAC services





Average PAC Cost (for Episodes with PAC spending)







Real-Time Reporting of Medicare Readmissions Data

Niall Brennan Acting Director, Offices of Enterprise Management

Why CMS is Focused on Readmissions

- Nearly one in five fee-for-service Medicare patients returns to the hospital within 30 days of being discharged
 - 2 million readmissions each year
 - 139,000 beneficiaries had 3 or more readmissions in 2012
- High readmission rate can be indicator of poor quality care
- Readmissions estimated to cost Medicare \$26 billion per-year, \$17 billion of which is potentially avoidable
- Examples of CMS initiatives to reduce readmissions:
 - Hospital Readmissions Reduction Program
 - Partnership for Patients
 - Shared savings programs
 - Quality Improvement Organizations



OIPDA Readmission Rate Methodology

- Source: 100% Medicare claims from Chronic Conditions Warehouse
- Medicare fee-for-service beneficiaries enrolled in Part A
- All acute care hospitals (IPPS and CAH)
- Index stay = impatient admission where patient did not die in hospital
- Readmission stay = inpatient admission within 30 days of discharge from index stay
- Stays can count as both index admission and readmission
- Readmission is attributed to the month of index stay and location of facility where index admission occurred
- Not risk adjusted



Real-Time Reporting of Readmissions Data

- Takes up to 13 months for all Medicare claims to reach final action status
- OIPDA adjusts preliminary readmissions data to compensate for claims that have not reached final action
- Can report reliable monthly readmissions data after just 2 months of claims run-out
 - Far faster than other types of reporting
 - Difficult to perform risk adjustment on real-time basis
- Timely reporting improves feedback to CMS programs and helps enable faster quality improvement



Claims Maturity for Index and Readmission Stays For a Typical Month





Improvement in Readmission Rate Among Medicare FFS Beneficiaries

- After holding steady at 19% over 2007-2011 period, national readmission rate started falling in 2012
 - 18.5% in 2012 and 17.9% in 2013
- Improvement has been broad-based across geography, demographics, and clinical conditions
- Estimate 150,000 fewer readmissions occurred during 2012-2013 than if readmission rate had remained at 19%
- Reduction in inpatient readmissions does not seem to be driven by substitution by outpatient ED visits or observation stays



Medicare 30-Day, All-Condition Readmission Rate January 2007 – February 2014





Medicare 30-Day, All-Condition Readmission Rate January 2007 – February 2014



Annual Change in Hospital Services 30 Days Post Inpatient Discharge

 Hospital outpatient services growing more slowly than readmissions have been declining





Change in Medicare All-Condition Readmission Rate 2007-2011 Mean to 2013, by Hospital Referral Region





Medicare All-Condition Readmission Rate by Age



Medicare All-Condition Readmission Rate by Race



Medicare All-Condition Readmission Rate by Hospital Size

Smaller hospitals started with lower rates, but have also seen the largest reductions





Annual Percentage Point Change in Readmission Rate by DRG Type

• Rates have decreased across different types of services





Medicare Readmission Rate for Selected Conditions

• These conditions represent about half of total readmission stays



Hospital Readmissions Reduction Program (HRRP)

- Section 3025 of the Affordable Care Act
- Reduces Medicare payments to IPPS hospitals with excess readmissions
- Started by measuring heart failure, acute myocardial infarction, and pneumonia
 - Payment adjustments began in FY 2012
- CMS proposing to expand measures to include COPD and elective hip and knee replacement
 - 5 conditions represent 20% of all readmissions
 - Payment adjustments based on all 5 measures would start in FY 2015
- Readmission rates for these conditions have gone down, but improvement is not limited to these conditions



Medicare Unplanned Readmission Rate for Conditions Measured by HRRP



