Article

Hospitalization risk in a type 2 diabetes cohort

by Edward Ng, Kimberlyn M. McGrail and Jeffrey A. Johnson



August 2010



Statistics Canada Statistique Canada



Hospitalization risk in a type 2 diabetes cohort

by Edward Ng, Kimberlyn M. McGrail and Jeffrey A. Johnson

Abstract

Background

Using a health outcome research framework, the hospitalization risk for a type 2 diabetes (T2DM) cohort is evaluated. Diabetes is "ambulatory care sensitive"— a condition largely manageable with appropriate care in the community. Thus, hospitalization may represent a negative care outcome.

Data and methods

Analyses were conducted by linking data from the Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS) cycle 1.1 to the Canadian Hospital Morbidity Database for respondents identified as having T2DM. Logistic regression was used to examine the association between the likelihood of all-cause hospitalization within two years of the survey date and patients' characteristics, care path, and health system characteristics.

Results

When the effects of demographic, socio-economic and health status characteristics were taken into account, physical inactivity and former or current smoking were significantly associated with an increased likelihood of hospitalization for those with type 2 diabetes. Specialist visits were positively related to hospitalization (OR=1.4), whereas the relationship with general practitioner visits was negative (OR=0.7). Regional hospital use patterns were significantly associated with hospitalization (OR=2.6).

Interpretation

Regional patterns of hospital use are important for hospitalization: T2DM residents of health regions with generally higher hospitalization rates were more likely to be hospitalized than were those living elsewhere. In terms of care path, GP consultations were associated with a lower risk of hospitalization. Specialist consultations, likely a marker of disease severity, had the reverse effect.

Keywords

databases, health services research, health surveys, hospital records, inpatient, outcome assessment, probabilistic linkage

Authors

Edward Ng (1-613-951-5308; edward.ng@statcan. gc.ca) and Kimberlyn M. McGrail are with the Health Analysis Division at Statistitics Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0T6. Kimberlyn M. McGrail is also with the School of Population and Public Health, University of British Columbia. Jeffrey A. Johnson is with the School of Public Health, University of Alberta.

In recent years, diabetes-related mortality has increased, an increase that has been linked to an upturn in the prevalence of obesity.^{1,2} Diabetes is currently the sixth leading cause of death in Canada.³ In 2005, approximately 1.3 million Canadians aged 12 or older (5% of the population in that age range) reported that they had been diagnosed with the disease.⁴ The complications of diabetes can attack every major organ. Because of its wide-ranging impact on the health of individuals and the economic burden it places on the health care system,^{5,6} diabetes is recognized as a major public health problem.

Yet, to some extent, diabetes is also "ambulatory care sensitive." That is, it can be managed with appropriate care in the community. But if not well controlled, diabetes can result in multiple co-morbidities that may require extensive care, 8 including hospitalization. 8-10

With the rise of health expenditures,¹¹ emphasis is being placed on the effectiveness of services. A conceptual framework, developed jointly by Statistics Canada and the Canadian Institute for Health Information,^{12,13} highlights the relationship between patient outcomes and three sets of possible determinants—health care system, care path and patient characteristics—in the context of place and environment. Through a linkage

of survey and hospitalization data, the current study applies this framework to diabetes.

Specifically, this analysis examines risk factors for acute care hospitalization in a cohort with type 2 diabetes (T2DM), the predominant form of the disease, accounting for 95% of cases. Acute care hospitalization (for any reason) is used as a proxy for negative outcome. Associations between hospitalization and patients' characteristics, care path factors, and health system characteristics are analysed.

With regard to care path, relatively little is known about the roles of general practitioners (GPs) and specialists in the risk of hospitalization of people with diabetes. Previous research suggests that the more aggressive care offered by specialists¹⁴⁻¹⁸ may simply reflect more advanced disease.

With regard to characteristics of the health care system, the use of services has been shown to vary by region.¹⁹⁻²² It is possible, then, that the likelihood of hospital admission may, in part, reflect where an individual lives; all else being equal, residents of "high-use" areas may be more likely to be hospitalized.

Of course, the role of risk factors like smoking, drinking, physical activity and diet must also be taken into account.^{23,24}

This article assesses a range of factors associated with hospitalization of individuals with type 2 diabetes, using linked survey and administrative data.

Methods

The dataset used in this analysis links the 2000/2001 Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS) to the Hospital Morbidity Data Base (HMDB). The CCHS collects information about the health and well-

being of the household population. For cycle 1.1 (2000/2001), about 130,000 Canadians aged 12 or older were interviewed.²⁵ In addition to questions about socio-demographic characteristics, risk factors, and health care services use, they were asked about diabetes and related treatment. The HMDB is a national administrative database of acute inpatient hospital stays from 1992/1993 to 2003/2004. It can be used to analyse trends in causes of hospitalization, 26-28 but it lacks detailed patient information such as socio-economic background and risk factors. However, linkage of the CCHS and the HMDB yields a dataset with information about hospital patients' socio-economic status and risk factors.29

The linked dataset used in this analysis consisted of a preliminary cohort of 6,361 CCHS 1.1 respondents who self-reported diabetes. Of these, 1,003 Quebec residents were excluded because Statistics Canada did not have health insurance numbers with which to link them to the HMDB. An additional 467 non-Quebec respondents who

refused permission to link their survey results to health services administrative data were excluded, along with 37 who reported only gestational diabetes. An algorithm³⁰ was used to exclude another 243 respondents identified as having type 1 diabetes.³¹ The final T2DM cohort consisted of 4,611 CCHS respondents. Statistics Canada's Policy Committee approved the data linkage.

A hospital episode is defined as any record of acute hospital discharge obtained from the HMDB. Hospital episodes that occurred within one year before and two years after the survey date were included in the analyses. The primary outcome of interest was hospitalization during the two years after the CCHS interview, excluding hospital stays related to pregnancy/birth. All other acute hospitalizations, defined as all-cause hospitalization, were included in the study,

Univariate and bivariate statistics were calculated to describe the data. With bootstrap methods^{32,33} and special linked weights, the descriptive statistics were

Table 1 Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS) and Hospital Morbidity Database (HMDB) variables used in analyses of hospitalization of CCHS respondents with type 2 diabetes

Variable	Source	Explanation
Socio-demographic		
Age group	CCHS	12 to 44, 45 to 64, 65 or older
Sex	CCHS	Male/Female
Household income adjusted for household size	CCHS	Quintiles; missing kept as category
Residence	CCHS	Urban/Rural
Health status		
Health utility index (HUI3)	CCHS	Continuous measure
Other chronic conditions	CCHS	Binary variable; "yes" to at least one of : emphysema/chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, heart disease, asthma, arthritis/rheumatism (excluding fibromyalgia), high blood pressure, cancer, stroke
Prior hospitalization	HMDB	Hospitalization for any reason (except pregnancy/delivery) in year before CCHS interview
Impact of health problems	CCHS	Impact of long-term physical and mental conditions on home, work/school, other activities: often, sometimes, never
Risk factors		
Body mass index (BMI)	CCHS	Underweight, normal, overweight, obese
Physical activity index	CCHS	Active, moderate, inactive
Smoking	CCHS	Current smoker, former smoker, never smoked
Alcohol consumption	CCHS	Regular, occasional, former/never drinker
Daily fruit/vegetable consumption	CCHS	Fewer than than 5 times/5 or more times
Care path		
Current insulin use	CCHS	Yes/No
GP consultation (past 12 months)	CCHS	Yes/No
Specialist consultation (past 12 months)	CCHS	Yes/No
Unmet health care needs	CCHS	Yes/No
System response Regional hospitalization patterns	HMDB/CCHS	Likelihood of hospital admission in each health region

Table 2
Selected characteristics of type 2 diabetes cohort compared with other Canadians, household

adjusted for the complex survey design and to account for non-response when permission to link survey data to hospital records had been denied. Predictors of hospitalization were identified through multivariate logistic regression. Normalized weights were used to ensure proportional representation of the provincial, age and gender distributions in the sample with diabetes, and to report the 95% confidence intervals and significance levels (0.01 and 0.05).

Most variables were derived directly from the CCHS or the HMDB (Table 1). For example, among the CCHS derived variables, "impact of health problem" is a measure of the effect of long-term physical and mental conditions on home, work or school, and other activities: often, sometimes or never. GP and specialist consultations were based on separate questions about the number of contacts with doctors in the past 12 months.

Two additional variables were derived from the linked CCHS/HMDB file. The first attempts to capture regional hospital utilization patterns as an indicator of regional variations in the use of health care services. This variable, based on the full CCHS sample linked to all acute hospitalizations (excluding pregnancy/ delivery) in the two years after the survey is the ratio of the observed number of hospitalizations to the expected number in each health region, controlling for characteristics of the region's population that represent need: age, sex, functional health status as measured by the Health Utility Index Mark 3 (HUI3), self-reported health compared with a year earlier, prior hospitalization, co-morbidities, smoking status, alcohol use and physical activity. The second derived variable—prior hospitalization—is a marker for disease severity indicating if the respondent had been admitted to hospital in the year before the CCHS interview.

The role of risk factors, care path and health system characteristics on all-cause hospitalization of the T2DM cohort was examined while controlling for age, sex and household income.^{34,35}

Total Socio-demographic	Percen	t (weighte	ed)		Percer	t (weighted	1)
Socio-demographic		050/	_			(4)
Socio-demographic		95% confidence interval		Number		95% confidence interval	Number
Socio-demographic	%	from	to	(un- weighted)	%	from to	(un- to weighted)
	100.0			4,611	100.0		103,566
Age group 12 to 44	10.8	9.5 12	26	433	57.5	57.3 57	.7 53,783
45 to 64	43.9	41.8 46		1,789	27.0	26.8 27	
65 or older	45.3	43.3 4	7.2	2,389	15.6	15.3 15	.8 21,550
Sex Male	52.8	50.7 54	./ Q	2,285	49.0	48.8 49	.2 47,583
Female	47.2	45.1 49		2,326	51.0	50.8 51	,
Household income quintile							
Lower	4.1		4.9	261	3.3		.6 4,442
Lower-middle Middle	10.4 28.4	9.2 1 ⁻ 26.4 30		702 1,390	6.5 19.0	6.3 6 18.5 19	.8 9,967 .4 23,036
Upper-middle	27.4	25.4 29		1,193	30.8	30.3 31	
Highest	17.2	15.4 19		613	29.0	28.4 29	
Missing Residence	12.6	11.0 14	4.3	452	11.4	11.1 11	.8 9,993
Urban	79.9	78.3 8 ⁻	1.4	3,292	81.4	80.7 82	.0 75,055
Rural	20.1	18.6 2	1.7	1,319	18.6	18.0 19	.3 28,511
lealth status							
Other chronic conditions No	25.9	23.9 28	8.0	1,043	65.7	65.2 66	.2 62,931
Yes	74.1	72.0 76		3,568	34.3	33.8 34	
Prior hospitalization	00.0	05.0.0	7.0	0.070	047	04.4.04	0.000
No Yes	86.6 13.4	85.2 87 12.1 14		3,873 738	94.7 5.3	94.4 94 5.1 5	.9 96,627 .6 6,939
Impact of health problems	10.4	12.1	4.0	700	0.0	0.1 0	0,303
Often	29.0	27.0 3		1,374	12.1	11.7 12	
Sometimes	21.3 49.6	19.5 20		1,029	13.9	13.6 14	
Never Missing	49.0 F	47.3 5		2,196 F	73.9 0.1	73.4 74 0.1 0	
Risk factors	•			•			
Body mass index (BMI)			0 7	101	40.0	44 7 40	44.405
Underweight Normal	2.8 23.8		3.7 25.9	124 1,011	12.0 42.0	11.7 12 41.5 42	
Overweight	36.3	34.2 38		1,709	29.7	29.2 30	
Obese	35.0	33.0 3	7.0	1,637	13.5	13.1 13	.8 15,416
Missing	2.1	1.7	2.6	130	2.8	2.7 3	.0 3,187
Physical activity index Active	13.3	12.0 14	4.8	638	22.1	21.6 22	.5 23,701
Moderate	19.7	18.0 2		879	21.3	20.9 21	
Inactive	58.4	56.1 60		2,826	47.8	47.2 48	
Missing	8.7	7.3 10	0.2	268	8.9	8.5 9	.3 6,618
Smoking Never	30.9	28.7 33	3.1	1,243	37.8	37.3 38	.3 35,230
Former	50.6	48.4 52		2,504	36.8	36.3 37	
Current	18.4	16.8 20	0.1	858	25.2	24.7 25	
Missing	F	•••		F	0.2	0.2 0	.3 215
Alcohol consumption Regular	35.3	33.2 3	7.4	1,543	54.8	54.2 55	.4 54,569
Occasional	23.3	21.4 2		1,099	20.2	19.8 20	
Former/Never drank Missing	41.3 F	39.1 43		1,961 F	24.7 0.3	24.2 25 0.2 0	
	Г		•••	Г	0.3	0.2 0	.5 510
Daily fruit/vegetable consumption Fewer than 5 times	60.5	58.3 62		2,767	63.3	62.8 63	
5 or more times	37.8	35.7 40		1,757	35.6	35.1 36	
Missing Care path	1.7	1.2	2.4	87	1.1	1.0 1	.2 1,621
Current insulin use							
Yes	21.5	19.5 2		964	0		0
No Missing	78.5 F	76.4 80		3,643 F	99.9 0.1	99.9 100 0.0 0	
GP consultation (past 12 months)					0.1		
Yes	93.2	91.9 94		4,320	80.8	80.4 81	
No Missing	6.5 F		7.8	269 22	18.9 0.3	18.5 19 0.2 0	
Specialist consultation (past 12 months)	Г	•••	•••	22	0.5	0.2 0	. 334
Yes	42.4	40.4 4		1,828	28.3	27.8 28	
No Missing	57.4	55.3 59		2,773	71.5	71.1 72	
Missing Unmet health care needs	F			F	0.2	0.1 0	.2 143
Yes	86.7	85.3 88	8.0	3,946	87.4	87.0 87	.7 89,621
No Missing	13.1 F	11.8 14	4.6	657 F	12.6 0.1	12.2 12 0.0 0	.9 13,874

F estimate not provided because of small sample size

Source: 2000/2001 Canadian Community Health Survey

Table 3
Percentage hospitalized within two years of 2000/2001 Canadian Community Health Survey interview, by selected characteristics, household population aged 12 or older with type 2 diabetes, Canada excluding Quebec and territories

		95% confidence interval		
	%	from	to	
Total	24.0	22.2	25.9	
Socio-demographic				
Age group 12 to 44	11.7	8.4	16.0	
45 to 64	17.1	14.8	19.6	
65 or older	33.6	30.6	36.8	
Sex				
Male Female	24.0 24.0	21.5 21.4	26.8 26.8	
Household income quintile	24.0	21.4	20.0	
Lower	31.1	23.2	40.4	
Lower-middle	33.3	28.0	39.1	
Middle Upper-middle	28.3 20.4	24.7 17.7	32.2 23.5	
Highest	16.3	13.1	20.3	
Missing	22.5	17.5	28.4	
Residence				
Urban	23.7	21.6	26.0	
Rural	25.1	21.8	28.6	
Health status Other chronic conditions				
No	12.5	9.9	15.5	
Yes	28.0	25.9	30.2	
Prior hospitalization No	19.4	17.6	21.3	
Yes	53.5	48.2	58.7	
Impact of health problems	00.0	10.2	00.1	
Often	37.4	33.5	41.5	
Sometimes Never	28.0 14.5	24.2 12.5	32.1 16.8	
Risk factors Body mass index (BMI) Underweight Normal	28.6 ^E 23.7 24.5	18.8 20.4 21.3	40.8 27.4 28.0	
Overweight Obese	23.1	20.3	26.1	
Physical activity index	20.1	20.5	20.1	
Active	16.2	12.5	20.6	
Moderate	17.1	14.2	20.6	
Inactive	26.9	24.6	29.4	
Smoking Never	19.3	16.2	22.8	
Former	26.5	24.0	29.0	
Current	25.3	21.0	30.1	
Alcohol consumption	18.1	15.7	20.7	
Regular Occasional	26.0	15.7 22.1	30.4	
Former/Never drank	27.9	25.0	31.1	
Daily fruit/vegetable consumption Fewer than 5 times				
	24.7	22.3 20.2	27.2	
5 or more times	22.9	20.2	25.8	
Care path Current insulin use				
Yes	34.9	30.1	39.9	
No	21.0	19.3	22.9	
GP consultation (past 12 months) Yes	24.0	22.2	25.8	
No	24.0	16.6	33.9	
Specialist consultation (past 12 months)				
Yes	30.4	27.5	33.6	
No	19.2	17.2	21.4	
Unmet health care needs Yes	28.1	23.1	33.7	
No	23.3	21.4	25.3	

^E coefficient of variation between 16.6% and 33.3% (interpret with caution) **Source:** 2000/2001 Canadian Community Health Survey.

Results

The characteristics of the T2DM cohort differed substantially from those of other Canadians (Table 2). The T2DM cohort was much older, more likely to be male, and tended to have a lower household For instance, almost half (45%) the cohort were aged 65 or older, compared with 16% of the rest of the population. The cohort was more likely to have chronic conditions other than diabetes and to have been hospitalized in the past year. They were more likely than other Canadians to be overweight or obese and physically inactive, but less likely to be current smokers or regular drinkers. Higher percentages of T2DM had consulted a GP or specialist in the year before their CCHS interview.

Given their generally less favourable health status, it is not surprising that in the two years after their CCHS interview, almost a quarter (24%) of the T2DM cohort were admitted to hospital (Table 3). But not all members of the cohort were equally likely to have been hospitalized.

As might be expected, hospitalization rates were higher among those who were older, lived in lower-income households, had co-morbidities, or reported having been hospitalized in the year before the CCHS interview. Around a third (34%) of cohort members aged 65 or older were hospitalized, compared with 12% of those aged 14 to 44. Similarly, about third of the T2DM cohort who lived in lower-income households were hospitalized versus 16% of those in the highest household income quintile. And fully 54% of the T2DM cohort who had been hospitalized in the year before the CCHS interview were admitted to hospital in the two years after the interview, compared with 19% who had no prior hospitalization. T2DM cohort members who never smoked were less likely than former or current smokers (19%, 27% and 25%, respectively) to be hospitalized. Regular drinkers had lower hospitalization rates than did occasional or non-drinkers. In terms of care path, equal percentages of those who did and did not have a recent consultation with GP were hospitalized (24%). However, 30% who had consulted a specialist were hospitalized, compared with 19% who had not done so.

Of course, many characteristics associated with high hospitalization rates are related to each other. For instance, older people with diabetes are more likely than their younger counterparts to have other chronic conditions and to have had a prior hospitalization. Smoking tends to be more prevalent among low- than high-income groups. When the potentially confounding effects of other variables were taken into account, the factors significantly associated with hosptialization among the T2DM cohort were: older age, male, lower reported health utility, presence of other chronic condition(s), impact of health problems, physical inactivity, smoking, alcohol consumption, insulin use, doctor consultations, and system response (high- or low-hospitalization region) (Table 4).

The of strongest predictor hospitalization in the two-year followup period was prior hospitalization (OR=3.0, 95% CI: 2.5 to 3.7). T2DM cohort members who had contacted a specialist in the year before their CCHS interview were more likely to be admitted, compared with those who had not (OR=1.4, 95% CI: 1.2 to 1.6). By contrast, those who had contacted a GP were less likely to be admitted to hospital in the next two years (OR=0.7, 95% CI 0.5-0.9). Cohort members who lived in health regions with generally higher hospitalization rates had significantly higher odds of hospitalization in the next two years (OR=2.6, 95% CI: 1.8 to 3.7).

Discussion

Linkage of the CCHS and the HMDB made it possible to identify a number of factors significantly related to all-cause hospitalization of people with type 2 diabetes. Because diabetes is, to a considerable extent, an ambulatory care

Table 4 Adjusted odds ratios relating selected characteristics to hospitalization within two years of 2000/2001 Canadian Community Health Survey, household population aged 12 or older with type 2 diabetes, Canada excluding Quebec and territories

Socio-demographic Age group 12 to 441	2.1 0.7 0.9 1.0 0.8 0.7 0.7 0.4 1.2 2.5	1.8 4.1 1.0 2.0 1.8 1.4 1.2 1.1 0.7
Age group 12 to 44¹ 1.0 45 to 64 1.3 65 or older 2.9** Sex Male¹ Male¹ 1.0 Female 0.8* Household income quintile 1.3 Lower-middle 1.3 Middle 1.1 Upper-middle 1.0 Highest¹ 1.0 Residence Urban¹ Urban¹ 1.0 Rural 0.9 Health status Health Utility Index (continuous) Other chronic conditions No¹ No¹ 1.0 Yes 1.5** Prior hospitalization No² No¹ 1.0 Yes 3.0** Impact of health problems Often Often 5.6**	2.1 0.7 0.9 1.0 0.8 0.7 0.7 0.4 1.2 2.5	4.1 1.0 2.0 1.8 1.4 1.2
12 to 44" 1.0	2.1 0.7 0.9 1.0 0.8 0.7 0.7 0.4 1.2 2.5	4.1 1.0 2.0 1.8 1.4 1.2
45 to 64 1.3 65 or older 2.9** Sex Male! 1.0 Remale 0.8* Household income quintile Lower 1.3 Lower-middle 1.1 Upper-middle 1.1 Upper-middle 1.0 Residence Urban! 1.0 Residence Urban! 1.0 Rural 0.9 Health status Health Utility Index (continuous) 0.5** Other chronic conditions No! Yes 1.5** Prior hospitalization No! Yes 3.0** Impact of health problems Offen 5.6** Inc.**	2.1 0.7 0.9 1.0 0.8 0.7 0.7 0.4 1.2 2.5	4.1 1.0 2.0 1.8 1.4 1.2
Sex Male 1.0	0.7 0.9 1.0 0.8 0.7 0.7 0.4 1.2	1.0 2.0 1.8 1.4 1.2
Male 1.0 1.0 Female 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.4 1.5	0.9 1.0 0.8 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.4	2.0 1.8 1.4 1.2
Household income quintile 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.4 1.5	0.9 1.0 0.8 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.4	2.0 1.8 1.4 1.2 1.1
Lower-middle	1.0 0.8 0.7 0.7 0.4 1.2 2.5	1.8 1.4 1.2 1.1
Middle	0.8 0.7 0.7 0.4 1.2	1.4 1.2 1.1 0.7
Highest* 1.0	0.7	1.1
Residence 1.0 1.0 Rural 0.9 Health status Health Utility Index (continuous) 0.5** Other chronic conditions No¹ 1.0 Yes 1.5** Prior hospitalization No¹ 1.0 Yes 3.0** Impact of health problems Offen 1.6** Sometimes 1.6** 1.6** 1.6** 1.6** 1.6** 1.6** 1.0 1.0 1.6**	0.7	1.1 0.7
Urban 1.0 0.9	0.4	0.7
Health status 0.5** Health Utility Index (continuous) 0.5** Other chronic conditions 1.0 No¹ 1.5** Prior hospitalization 1.0 Yes 3.0** Impact of health problems 0.ften Offen 1.6** Sometimes 1.6**	0.4	0.7
Health Utility Index (continuous)	1.2	
No [†] 1.0 Yes 1.5** Prior hospitalization 1.0 No [†] 1.0 Yes 3.0** Impact of health problems 0ften Often 1.6** Sometimes 1.6**	2.5	1.9
Prior hospitalization 1.0 No¹ 1.0 Yes 3.0** Impact of health problems Offen Sometimes 1.6**	2.5	1.9
Not 1.0 Yes 3.0** Impact of health problems 0ften Sometimes 1.6**		
Impact of health problems Often 1.6** Sometimes 1.6**		3.7
Offen 1.6** Sometimes 1.6**	1.3	3.7
		2.0
Never 1.0		2.0
Risk factors		•••
Body mass index (BMI)		
Undérweight 0.9 Normal [†] 1.0	0.6	1.4
Overweight 1.0	0.8	1.2
	0.7	1.1
Physical activity index Active [↑] 1.0		
Moderate 1.0		1.4
	1.0	1.8
Smoking Never [†] 1.0		
		1.7
Current 1.7** Alcohol consumption	1.4	2.2
Regular 0.7**	0.6	0.9
Occasional† 1.0 Former/Never drank 1.0	0.8	1.2
Daily fruit/vegetable consumption	0.0	1.2
Fewer than 5 times 1.1	0.9	1.2
5 or more times [†] 1.0		
Care path Current insulin use		
Yes 1.7**	1.4	2.0
No [†] 1.0 GP consultation (past 12 months)		
Yes 0.7** No [†] 1.0	0.5	0.9
Specialist consultation (past 12 months) Yes 1.4**		
Yes " 1.4** No [†] 1.0	1.2	1.6
Unmet health care needs		
Yes 0.9 No [†] 1.0	0.7	1.1
	1.8	3.7

Source: 2000/2001 Canadian Community Health Survey; Hospital Morbidity Database.

sensitive condition, it was assumed that hospitalization is an indirect indicator of poor outcome.

Age was obviously important. As well, females with diabetes had a lower risk of hospitalization than did males. Smoking, whether former and current, was a strong predictor of hospitalization; regular alcohol consumption had a protective effect.36 As expected, having other chronic disease(s), prior hospitalization, and the impact of long-term physical and mental conditions on daily life were strong predictors of hospitalization.

T2DM cohort members who had consulted a specialist in the 12 months before their CCHS interview had a significantly higher risk of hospitalization over the next two years. Of course, the specialist consultation did not "cause" the hospitalization; rather, consulting a specialist was likely a reflection of disease severity.

At the health care system level, T2DM cohort members in high-hospital-use health regions had signficantly high odds of hospital admission.

Limitations

This analysis has several limitations, foremost among them, in the case of the CCHS, reliance on self-reports. An earlier study found that only about 75% of people with physician-diagnosed diabetes self-reported the condition to the CCHS, and their characteristics differ from those of people who do report diabetes.37

The analyses are limited to acute care hospitalizations. Information is not provided about the use of emergency rooms, where diabetes-related events such as hyperglycemia are often treated. As a result, the full extent of diabetes patients' use of hospitals is not represented.

Because the CCHS does not include residents of institutions, the linkage with hospital data is necessarily confined to the household population. An evaluation study of the linked data showed a high undercoverage rate among people aged 75 or older, many of whom live in institutions.³⁸ Consequently, the data

What is already known on this subject?

- Diabetes is "ambulatory care sensitive"—a condition largely manageable with appropriate community care.
- Well-known risk factors like smoking, drinking, and physical activity are important in managing the disease.
- Much less is known about the roles of GPs and specialists in the risk of hospitalization of people with diabetes.
- Regional variations in the use of health care services suggest that an individual's likelihood of hospitalization may, in part, reflect where he or she lives.

What does this study add?

- Data from the 2000/2001 Canadian Community Health Survey were linked with data from the Hospital Morbidity Database to determine care path and health system factors related to the likelihood that people with type 2 diabetes would be hospitalized over the subsequent two years.
- Among people with type 2 diabetes, consultation with a specialist was associated with a higher risk of hospitalization; this was likely a marker of disease severity.
- Regional hospital utilization patterns were highly significant for all-cause hospitalization.

presented here likely underestimate the strength of the relationship between diabetes and hospitalization. As well, Ouebec residents were excluded from the analyses.

The analysis would have been stronger had it been possible to include the nature of the care respondents were receiving as a potential factor in their odds of

reference category significantly different from reference category (p < 0.05) significantly different from reference category (p < 0.01) not applicable

hospitalization.³⁹ However, these data were not collected by the 2000/2001 CCHS. Such information (for example, use of haemoglobin A1C testing, foot care, eye exam) was collected in 2005 by the CCHS 3.1, but the data needed to examine subsequent hospital use are not yet available.

Sample size is an issue. Although the CCHS sample was constructed to allow the reporting of various conditions at the health region level, the study pertains to a relatively small group—people with type 2 diabetes—and a low-probability outcome—hospitalization. This combination makes it impossible to conduct analyses even at the provincial level, let alone the health region level.

To overcome the problem of small sample size, combining surveys may be an option in the future.

Clinical variables related to hospitalization, such as physiologic characteristics, diagnoses and treatments, could not be considered in this study.

Conclusion

When the effects of demographic, socio-economic and health status characteristics were taken into account, physical inactivity and former or current smoking were significantly associated with an increased likelihood of all-cause hospitalization of people with type 2 diabetes. Specialist visits were positively related to hospitalization, but

the relationship with general practitioner visits was negative. However, the fact of having seen a specialist is unlikely to be a risk factor for hospitalization, but rather, a marker for disease severity. Regional hospital use patterns were also significantly associated with all-cause hospitalization. Whether these factors would remain important if the focus was limited to diabetes-specific hospitalization can be a topic for future analyses.

References

- Conference Board of Canada. Mortality Due to Diabetes. Available at: http://sso. conferenceboard.ca/HCP/Details/Health. aspx. Accessed December 29, 2009.
- Public Health Agency of Canada. Diabetes in Canada: National Statistics and Opportunities for Improved Surveillance and Control. Available at: http://www.phac.aspc.gc.ca/ publicat/dic-dac99/d07-eng.php.
- Statistics Canada. Leading causes of death in Canada, 2000 to 2004 (Catalogue 84-215-X) Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 2008.
- Sanmartin C, Gilmore J. Diabetes care in Canada: Results from selected provinces and territories, 2005. Your community, your health: Findings from the Canadian Community Health Survey (Statistics Canada, Catalogue 82-621-XWE) Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 2006
- Health Canada. Economic Burden of Illness in Canada. Ottawa: Minster of Public Works and Government Services Canada, 2002.
- O'Brien JA, Patrick AR, Caro JJ. Cost of managing complications resulting from type 2 diabetes mellitus in Canada. BMC Health Services Research 2003; 3(7): 1-11.
- Ahern M, Hendryx M. Avoidable hospitalizations for diabetes: comorbidity risks. Disease Management 2007; 10(6): 347.
- Tomlin AM, Tilyard MW, Dovey SM, Dawson AG. Hospital admissions in diabetic and non-diabetic patients: A case-control study. *Diabetes Research & Clinical Practice* 2006; 73(3): 260-7.

- Bo S, Ciccone G, Grassi G, et al. Patients with type 2 diabetes had higher rates of hospitalization than the general population. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 2004, 57(11): 1196-201.
- Olveira-Fuster G, Olvera-Márquez P, Carral-Sanlaureano F, et al. Excess hospitalization, hospital days, and inpatient costs among people with diabetes in Andalusia, Spain. *Diabetes Care* 2004; 27(8): 1904-9.
- Canadian Institute for Health Information. National Health Expenditures Trends: 1975-2007. Ottawa: Canadian Institute for Health Information. 2007
- Canadian Institute for Health Information. A Framework for Health Outcomes Analysis: Diabetes and Depression Case Studies. Ottawa: Canadian Institute for Health Information, 2008.
- Sanmartin C, Zelmer J, McGrail K, et al. A framework for assessing health outcomes of health services. *Health Reports* (Statistics Canada, Catalogue 82-003) forthcoming.
- De Berardis G, Pellegrini F, Franciosi M, et al. Quality of care and outcomes in Type 2 diabetic patients: a comparison between general practice and diabetes clinic. *Diabetes Care* 2004; 27(2): 398-406.
- Chin MH, Zhang JX, Merrell K. Speciality differences in the care of older patients with diabetes. *Medical Care* 2000; 38(2): 131-40.
- Shah BR, Hux JE, Laupacis A, et al. Clinical inertia in response to inadequate glycemic control: do specialists differ from primary care physicians? *Diabetes Care* 2005; 28(3): 600-6.

- Shah BR, Hux JE, Laupacis A, et al. Diabetic patients with prior specialist care have better glycemic control than those with prior primary care. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice* 2005; 11(6): 568-75.
- McAlister FA, Majumdar SR, Eurich DT, Johnston JA. The effect of spcialist care within the first year on subsequent outcomes in 24,232 adults with new- onset diabetes mellitus: population-based cohoert study. *Quality & Safety in Health Care* 2007; 16(1): 6-11
- Fisher ES, Wennberg DE, Stukel TA, et al. The implications of regional variations in medicare spending. Part 1: The content, quality, and accessibility of care. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2003; 138(4): 273-87.
- Fisher ES, Wennberg DE, Stukel TA, et al.
 The implications of regional variations in medicare spending. Part 2: Health outcomes and satisfaction with care. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2003; 138(4): 288-98.
- Roos NP, Flowerdew G, Wajda A, Tate RB. Variations in physicians hospitalization practices - A population-based Study in Manitoba, Canada. *American Journal of Public Health* 1986; 76(1): 45-51.
- Wennberg, J, Gittelsohn A. Small area variations in health-care delivery. *Science* 1973; 182(4117): 1102-7.
- 23. Hays RD, Smith AW, Reeve BB, et al. Cigarette smoking and health-realted quality of life in Medicare beneficiaries. *Health Care Financing Review* 2008; 29: 57-67.

Hospitalization risk in a type 2 diabetes cohort • Research article

- De Jong FA, Sparreboom A, Verweij J, Mathijssen RH. Lifestyle habits as a contributor to anti-cancer treatment failure. *Journal of General Internal Medicine 2008*; 23: 48-53.
- Statistics Canada. Canadian Community Health Survey Cycle 1.1. Available at: http://www.statcan.gc.ca/cgi-bin/imdb/p2SV. pl?Function=getSurvey&SurvId=3226&Surv Ver=0&InstaId=15282&InstaVer=1&SDDS= 3226&lang=en&db=imdb&adm=8&dis=2#1.
- Heart and Stroke Foundation of Canada. The Changing Face of Heart Disease and Stroke in Canada (Statistics Canada, Catalogue 82F0076XIE) Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1999.
- Johansen H, Nair C, Mao L, Wolfson M. Revascularization and heart attack outcomes. *Health Reports* (Statistics Canada, Catalogue 82-003) 2002; 13(2): 35-46.
- Johansen H, Strauss B, Arnold JMO, et al. On the rise: The current and projected future burden of congestive heart failure hospitalization in Canada. *Canadian Journal* of Cardiology. 2003.19(4).

- Lawder R, Elders A, Clark D. Using the Linked Scottish Health Survey to Predict Hospitalisation and Death. Main Report. 2007. NHS Health Scotland and Information Services. Available at: www.scotpho.org.uk/ linkedshesreport. Accessed January, 2009
- Ng E, Johnson J, Dasgupta K. An algorithm to differentiate diabetic respondents in the Canadian Community Health Survey. *Health Reports* (Statistics Canada, Catalogue 82-003) 2008; 19(1): 71-9.
- Johnson JA, Pohar SL, Majumdar SR. Health care use and costs in the decade after identification of type 1 and type 2 diabetes: a population-based study. *Diabetes Care* 2006; 29: 2403-8.
- Rao JNK, Wu CFJ, Yue K. Some recent work on resampling methods for complex surveys. Survey Methodology (Statistics Canada, Catalogue 12-001) 1992; 18(2): 209-17.
- Rust KF, Rao JNK. Variance estimation for complex surveys using replication techniques. Statistical Methods in Medical Research 1996; 5: 281-310.
- Evans G, Barer M, Marmor T. Why Are Some People Healthy and Others Not?: The Determinants of Health of Populations. 1994.

- Canadian Institute for Health Information. *Improving the Health of Canadians* 2007-2008. Ottawa: Canadian Institute for Health Information, 2008.
- Criqui M, Golomb B. Should patients with diabetes drink to their health? *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1999; 282(3): 279-80
- Shah BR, Manuel DG. Self-reported diabetes is associated with self-management behaviour: a cohort study. BMC Health Services Research 2008: 8: 142.
- Rotermann M. Evaluation of the coverage of linked Canadian Community Health Survey and hosptial inpatient records. *Health Reports* (Statistics Canada, Catalogue 82-003) 2009; 20(1): 45-51.
- Giorda C, Petrelli A, Gnavi R, Regional Board for Diabetes Care of Piemonte. The impact of second-level specialized care on hospitalization in persons with diabetes: a multilevel population-based study. *Diabetes Medicine* 23(4): 337.