

UNCLASSIFTED SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

• •

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE						
1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		16. RESTRICTIVE	MARKINGS		······································	
28. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY		3. DISTRIBUTION	AVAILABILITY	OF REPORT		
25. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDU	JLE	Approved for Public Release; distribution unlimited. 5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)				
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBE	ER(S)					
HR 89-003A						
6a NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION USA Health Care Studies & Clinical Investigation	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MO	NITORING OR	ANIZATION		
Activity,	INSHN-H	7b ADDRESS (City State and 7IP Code)				
ort Sam Houston, Texas 78234-6060		5109 Leesburg Pike Falls Church, VA 22041-3258				
	Tab OFFICE SYMBOL	9 PROCUREMENT	INSTRUMENT	IDENTIFICATION		
ORGANIZATION HQDA (DASG-RMB)	(if applicable)	J. PROCONCINENT	NUNCTION			
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)		10. SOURCE OF F	UNDING NUME	ERS		
5109 Leesburg Pike Falls Church, VA 22041-325	8	PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.	TASK NO.	WORK UNIT	
			L			
Reliability of the U.S. Ar Methodology and Findings.	my Ambulatory	Care Data	Base (A	CDB) Stud	у;	
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Jeffrey P.	Moon, MAJ, Ma DAC Sue Al	5, USA; Jam	es M. Ge Velda Au	orgoulaki stip DAC	s, MAJ, MS	
13a. TYPE OF REPORT	COVERED	14. DATE OF REPO	RT (Year, Mon 1989	th, Day) 15. PA		
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION		<b></b>		ئىسىسەلەسىسىس		
17. COSATI CODES	18. SUBJECT TERMS	<i>(Continue on revers</i> care; data	e <i>if necessary</i> reliabil	ity, medi	<i>lock number)</i> cal record	
	patient enco rates, 6 Abur	THERAPY, (	dom samp	le, study	error	
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessar	y and identify by block	number)	-hor 109	7	abora sala	
lected data on 3.1 million	od, January 1 1 patient ence	986 - Septe Sunters (vi	sits at	/, resear	chers col-	
Army hospitals. After the	data collec	•			cipating	
		tion phase	of the A	CDB study	cipating , study te	
members conducted a comple	hensive 6-mon	tion phase th review	of the A to deter	CDB study mine a da	cipating , study te ta relia- v The	
members conducted a compre- bility score for each part study team reviewed over /	hensive 6-mon cicipating ho 0.000 randoml	tion phase oth review spital and y selected	of the A to deter clinical visits w	CDB study mine a da specialt ith their	cipating , study te ta relia- y. The supportin	
members conducted a compre- bility score for each part study team reviewed over /9 medical records. They eve	hensive 6-mon cicipating ho 9,000 randoml aluated varia	tion phase oth review spital and y selected oles of int	of the A to deter clinical visits w erest wi	CDB study mine a da specialt ith their th a spec	cipating , study te ta relia- y. The supportin ially de-	
members conducted a compre- bility score for each part study team reviewed over /9 medical records. They even veloped scoring instrument selected variables.	hensive 6-mon cicipating ho 9,000 randoml aluated varia which they	tion phase oth review spital and y selected oles of int used to ass	of the A to deter clinical visits w erest wi ign nume	CDB study mine a da specialt ith their th a spec rical wei	cipating , study te ta relia- y. The supportin ially de- ghts for t	
members conducted a compre- bility score for each part study team reviewed over medical records. They eva veloped scoring instrument selected variables. Reliability mean score	ehensive 6-mon icipating ho 9,000 randoml aluated varia which they es were compu	tion phase oth review spital and y selected oles of int used to ass ted for eac	of the A to deter clinical visits w erest wi ign nume h hospit	CDB study mine a da specialt ith their th a spec rical wei	cipating , study te ta relia- y. The supportin ially de- ghts for t inic for t	
members conducted a complete bility score for each part study team reviewed over /9 medical records. They ever veloped scoring instrument selected variables. Reliability mean score two data collection phases period January 1986 through	ehensive 6-mon cicipating ho 0,000 randoml aluated varial which they es were compu s. Phase One ah April 1987	tion phase of review spital and y selected oles of int used to ass ted for eac (1) data w . Phase two	of the A to deter clinical visits w erest wi ign nume h hospit as colle II (cor	CDB study mine a da specialt ith their th a spec rical wei cal and cl cted duri	cipating , study te ta relia- y. The supportin ially de- ghts for t inic for t ng the reverse	
members conducted a compar- bility score for each part study team reviewed over 9 medical records. They ever veloped scoring instrument selected variables. Reliability mean score two data collection phases period January 1986 throug side)	ehensive 6-mon cicipating ho 9,000 randoml aluated varia which they es were compu s. Phase One gh April 1987	tion phase of review spital and y selected oles of int used to ass ted for eac (1) data w . Phase two	of the A to deter clinical visits w erest wi ign nume h hospit as colle II (cor	CDB study mine a da specialt ith their th a spec rical wei cal and cl cted duri tinued on	cipating , study te ta relia- y. The supportin ially de- ghts for t inic for t ng the reverse	
members conducted a compre- bility score for each part study team reviewed over 9 medical records. They ever veloped scoring instrument selected variables. Reliability mean score two data collection phases period January 1986 throug side) 20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRAC DUNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED SAME AS	ehensive 6-mon cicipating ho 9,000 randoml aluated varia which they es were compu s. Phase One gh April 1987	tion phase th review spital and y selected oles of int used to ass ted for eac (1) data w Phase two 21. ABSTRACT SI UNCLASS	of the A to deter clinical visits w erest wi ign nume h hospit as colle II (cor ECURITY CLASS SIFIED	CDB study mine a da specialt ith their th a spec rical wei cal and cl cted duri tinued on	cipating , study te ta relia- y. The supportin ially de- ghts for t inic for t ng the reverse	
members conducted a compare bility score for each part study team reviewed over 9 medical records. They ever veloped scoring instrument selected variables. Reliability mean score two data collection phases period January 1986 throug side) 20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRAC UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED SAME AS 222. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Jeffrey P. Moon, MAJ, USA	ehensive 6-mon cicipating ho 9,000 randoml aluated varial which they es were compu s. Phase One gh April 1987 T	tion phase th review spital and y selected oles of int used to ass ted for eac '(1) data w Phase two 21. ABSTRACT SI UNCLASS 225. TELEPHONE (512) 221	of the A to deter clinical visits w erest wi ign nume h hospit as colle II (cor CURITY CLASS SIFIED (Include Area C - 5880/05	CDB study mine a da specialt ith their th a spec rical wei cal and cl cted duri tinued on FFICATION	cipating , study te ta relia- y. The supportin ially de- ghts for t inic for t ng the reverse	

.

was accomplished from May through September 1987 using modified versions of the original data collection forms. The reliability mean score for the Phase I data was 8.57 (9 was the maximum score) with a standard deviation of 1.27 (n=7,589). The reliability mean score for the Phase II data was 8.50 with a standard deviation of 1.31 (n=1,426). These results indicate a high degree of reliability between the key variables on the ACDB visit forms and the corresponding official patient medical record.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# SECTION

\*

# PAGE

Disclaimer	i
Report Documentation Page (DD 1473)	ii
Table of Contents	iv
Summary	1
Introduction	1
History & Purpose	1
Background	2
Results	3
References	5
Distribution List	6

## RELIABILITY OF THE U.S. ARMY AMBULATORY CARE DATA BASE (ACDB) STUDY: METHODOLOGY AND CLINICAL FINDINGS

#### SUMMARY

During the study period, January 1986 - September 1987, researchers collected data on 3.1 million patient encounters (visits) at six Army hospitals. After the data collection phase of the ACDB study, members of the study team conducted a comprehensive 5-month review to determine a data reliability score for each participating hospital and clinical specialty. The study team reviewed over 9,000 randomly selected visits with their supporting medical records. They evaluated variables of interest with a specially developed scoring instrument which they used to assign numerical weights for the selected variables.

Reliability mean scores were computed for each hospital and clinic for the two data collection phases. Phase One (I) data were collected during the period January 1986 through April 1987. Phase Two (II) was accomplished from May through September 1987 using modified versions of the original data collection forms. The reliability mean score for the Phase I data was 8.57 (9 was the maximum score) with a standard deviation of 1.27 (n=7,589). The reliability mean score for the Phase II data was 8.50 with a standard deviation of 1.31 (n = 1,426). These results indicate a high degree of reliability between the key variables on the ACDB visit forms and the corresponding, official patient medical record.

# INTRODUCTION

## <u>History</u> and <u>Purpose</u>

Recognizing the requirement for an ambulatory care data base, the Army Medical Department began planning in 1984 for a multi-year study to establish an outpatient data base. Based on the results of a 6-month pilot study completed at Fox Army Community Hospital, Redstone Arsenal, Alabama (Misener & Gilbert, 1984), the ACDB Study was formulated to collect clinical data from patient encounters (visits). During a 21-month period from January 1986 to September 1987, over 3.1 million patient encounters were recorded.

This report examines the reliability of the clinical data obtained from the six participating Army hospitals and their respective clinical specialties. A quantitative measure of the reliability of the data was determined to be a prerequisite to the subsequent analysis by clinical specialty.

## <u>Background</u>

The development of medical classification systems is not a recent innovation (e.g., International Classification of Diseases, 1979). However, the application of such systems to hospital management and reimbursement mechanisms is fairly recent. Specifically, Diagnostic Related Groups (DRGs) were developed for this purpose (Fetter, Averill, Lichtenstein & Freeman, 1984). The quest for more efficient management and more equitable reimbursement systems led to the development of other similar methodologies. These include Ambulatory Visit Groups (AVGs), Resource Utilization Groups (RUGs), Products of Ambulatory Care (PACs), and others (Kelly, Fillmore, & Tenan, 1988). Central to the development of these and other classification systems is the accurate measurement of care provided. This accuracy of measurement, more commonly referred to as reliability of data, is not identified with glamorous research. It is, however, essential for confidence in results obtained from any subsequent work (Richards, Lurie, Rodgers, & Brook, 1988).

In order to determine the reliability of the Army's ACDB, a

2

comprehensive reliability study was conducted at all six test hospitals and included the outpatient specialties which were part of the study. Hospitals participating in the study were Brooke Army Medical Center (BAMC), Fort Sam Houston (San Antonio), Texas; Bayne-Jones Army Community Hospital, Fort Polk (Leesville), Louisiana; Womack Army Community Hospital, Fort Bragg (Fayetteville), North Carolina; Fox Army Community Hospital, Redstone Arsenal (Huntsville), Alabama; Blanchfield Army Community Hospital, Fort Campbell (Clarksville, Tennessee), Kentucky; and Moncrief Army Community Hospital, Fort Jackson (Columbia), South Carolina.

#### RESULTS

The four variables selected in the reliability study are part of each patient's record. Unfortunately, the reliability study was not able to specifically review on a one-to-one basis the other fifty-seven variables (e.g., time spent with patient, number of prescriptions, pathology tests and radiography) used in the study. Study researchers contend that the reliability of the variables selected has the potential to imply a similar trend in other variables.

Quantifiable reliability measures for each participating hospital and clinical specialty were derived from an exhaustive review of supporting patient medical records. Since data were collected during two consecutive but separate periods, the reliability measures were computed for each phase.

Analysis of variance tests revealed statistically significant differences between hospital sites, phases of data collection, and individual participating clinical specialties do exist. However, no practical significance or practical implications were found as a result of these statistical differences. Moreover, some of the statistical

3

differences found can be a function of large sample sizes (Welch & Comer, 1988).

As a result of this extensive study, the question of the accuracy of the studied variables can be answered without hesistation. These data are unquestionably of a very high quality and on a par with the best of any medical data collected and scrutinized within or outside the Army Medical Department.

#### REFERENCES

- Fetter, R.B., Averill, R.F., Lichtenstein, J.L., & Freeman, J.L. (1984). Ambulatory Visit Groups: A Framework for Measuring Productivity in Ambulatory Care. <u>Health Services Research</u>, 19(4), 415-437.
- Georgoulakis, J.M., Moon, J.P., Akins, S.E., Begg, I., Misener, T.R., & Bolling, D.R. (1988). <u>The Army Ambulatory Care Data Base Study:</u> <u>Implementation and Preliminary Data</u> (Report No HR 88-002), Fort Sam Houston, TX: U.S. Army Health Care Studies & Clinical Investigation Activity.
- <u>International Classification of Disease, Ninth Revision, Clinical</u> <u>Modification, Adapted for Use in the United States</u> (1979). Washington D.C.: National Center for Health Statistics, U.S. Department of Health, Education, & Welfare (1979).
- Kelley, W., Fillmore, H., & Tenan, P. (1988). Case Mix Classification and Ambulatory Care. <u>Business</u> and <u>Health.</u> 5, 41-44.
- Misener, T.R., & Gilbert, P.M. (1984). Ambulatory Care Data Base (Report No. 83-009). Fort Sam Houston, TX: U.S. Army Health Care Studies and Clinical Investigation Activity. (NTIS: ADA144838).
- Richards, T., Lurie, N., Rodgers, W., & Brook, R. (1988). Measuring differences between teaching and nonteaching hospitals. <u>Medical Care</u>. <u>26</u>(5), S1-S141.
- Welch, S., & Comer, J. (1988). <u>Quantitative Methods for Public</u> <u>Administration</u> (2nd ed.). Chicago: The Dorsey Press.

#### **DISTRIBUTION:**

Deputy Under Secretary (Operations Research), Department of the Army, ATTN: Mr. Walter Hollis, The Pentagon, Rm 2E660, Wash DC 20310-0200 (1)

Army Study Program Management Office, ATTN: DACS-DMO/Mrs. Joann Langston, The Pentagon, Rm 3C567, WASH DC 20310-0200 (1)

Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Medical Resources Management), Rm 3E336, The Pentagon, WASH DC 20310-2300 (1)

Resource Analysis & Management System, ATTN: OASD-HA/LTC S. Baker, 3 Skyline Place, Suite 1507, 5201 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041-3203 (2) HQ HSC (HSCL-A), Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234-6000 (2)

Dir, The Army Library, ATTN: ANR-AL-RS (Army Studies), Rm 1A518, The Pentagon, WASH DC 20310-2300 (1)

Administrator, Defense Logistics Agency, DTIC, ATTN: DTIC-DDAB, Cameron Station, Alexandria, VA 22304-6145 (2)

Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange, ALMC, ATTN: Mrs. Alter, Ft Lee, VA 23801-6043 (1)

Dir, Joint Medical Library, DASG-AAFJML, Offices of The Surgeons General, Army/Air Force, Rm 670, 5109 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041-3258 (1)

HQDA (DASG-HCD-D), 5109 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041-3258 (2)

HQDA (DASG-RMP), 5109 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041-3258 (2) HQDA (DASG-RMB), 5109 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041-3258 (2) HQDA (DASG-PSA), 5109 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041-3258 (2)

Medical Library, BAMC, Reid Hall, Bldg 1001, Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234-6200 (1)

Stimson Library, AHS, Bldg. 2840, Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234-6100 (1)