U.S. Department of Health & Human Services • National Institutes of Health



National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health

New Strategies and Methodologies for Whole Person Research

Emrin Horgusluoglu, Ph.D. Thursday, April 11, 2024



Division of Extramural Research, NCCIH, NIH



Speakers

Moderator – Dr. Emrin Horgusluoglu; Program Director, NCCIH

Netional Center for Complementary and Integrative Health

– Dr. Helene M. Langevin, Director, NCCIH – Dr. Patricia M. Herman, RAND Corporation – Dr. Jeffery A. Dusek, University of California, Irvine – Dr. Aaron Y. Lee, University of Washington









U.S. Department of Health & Human Services • National Institutes of Health

National Center for Complementary and **Integrative Health**

New Strategies and Methodologies for Whole Person Research

Helene M. Langevin, M.D. Director, The National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health (NCCIH)

THE PROBLEM



https://ourworldindata.org/financing-healthcare/

National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health



THE HEALTH CONTINUUM

Healthy





National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health

Less Healthy



Disease



 \bigotimes

WHERE WE NEED TO GO







Netional Center for Complementary and Integrative Health

Mrs. M. at age 40







Netional Center for Complementary and Integrative Health

Mrs. M. at age 40







Mrs. M. at age 80





 \bigotimes



Netional Center for Complementary and Integrative Health

Mrs. M. at age 45



 $\langle X \rangle \langle X \rangle$





Y





National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health

TREATMENT

Multiple long-term medications

Frequent interventions

Minimal skills training

OUTCOME

Accelerated aging and frailty

Intensive support required









The Economics of Whole Person Health

A Hypothetical Case Study



Research Across Complementary and Integrative Health Institutions (REACH) Center



Patricia M. Herman, ND, PhD Senior Behavioral Scientist, Codirector RAND REACH Center

Overview

- Methods
- Detailed assumptions regarding treatments and cost
- How these assumptions play out over the years
- Estimated total healthcare costs under each scenario
- Summary

Methods

- healthcare utilization for each approach
- the 2020 Medical Expenditures Panel Survey (MEPS)
- residents of a county in Minnesota*
- All costs are presented in 2023 USD
- using a 3% discount rate

*Long KH, et al. Medical and nursing home costs. Alzheimer's & Dementia. 2022;18(3):393-407.

You just heard Mrs. M's clinical case scenarios under each approach A PCP with experience in both laid out typical unit costs and detailed

Healthcare utilization for conventional care was vetted against data from

Unit costs (prices) were also vetted against MEPS and Medicare pricing Annual nursing home costs come from an actual cost survey of n=2438

Future costs discounted back to Mrs. M's 40th birthday (her decision point)

Detailed Assumptions on Healthcare Utilization by Year



	\$900		
22010	\$900	Tomazon	
razole	\$900	Temazepa	
heprazole	3900	теппаzерані	
meprazole	\$900	Temazepam	Split DD View Side by S
)meprazole	\$900	lemazepam	Synchronous S
Omeprazole	\$900	Temazepam	\$45 ge Freeze Panes Y Unbide Do Reset Window
)meprazole	\$900	Temazepam	\$450
)meprazole	\$900	Temazepam	\$450 Window
)meprazole	\$900	Temazepam	\$450
)meprazole	\$900	Temazepam	\$450
Omeprazole	\$900	Temazepam	\$450 PT Hapitalian Derakte and indicate and indicate Advecting and Advecting
)meprazole	\$900	Temazepam	\$450
)meprazole	\$900	Temazepam	\$450 and a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a
Omeprazole	\$900	Temazepam	\$45 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31
)meprazole	\$900	Temazepam	S 10000 Lowerla, slrips 25 1 200 150 10000 Lowerla, slrips 25 200 150 150 10000 Lowerla, slrips 25 200 150
)meprazole	\$900	Temazepam	1888 B Lanoria, alripa 25 288 B 158 1888 B Lanoria, alripa 68 288 B 2 158 1888 B Lanoria, alripa 25 288 B 2 158 1888 B Lanoria, alripa 25 288 B 158
peprazole	\$900	Temazepam	Total Constraint Constraint </td
ozole	\$900	Temazep	1000 0 Laurela, aleipa 25 200 0 150 1000 0 Laurela, aleipa 25 200 0 150 1000 0 Laurela, aleipa 25 200 0 150 1000 0 Laurela, aleipa 25 200 0 150
	\$900	Ter	1000 U.S. 1000 U
231			Lanorla, alripa 25 288 8 158 Lanorla, alripa 25 288 8 158 Lanorla, alripa 25 288 8 158 Lanorla, alripa 68 288 8 158
1511		151 151 151 151 151	1 1 11. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
2511 251 1 1		1 151 151 1 151 151 1 151 151 1 151 151	68 8 1158 58 1 1159 58 8 1 1159 58 8 1 1159 58 8 1 1159
	<u>_</u>	1 150 151 8 8 158 8 9 158 8	1 1151 150 0 0 1150 1 1150 150 2 0 150 2 0 150
:	2 8.848788488	202 0002	

BIG Thank Yous to Drs. Mark Pitcher and Sekai Chedeya for this!





Healthcare Utilization and Costs Across Years

		Cumulative healthcare costs	No. of medi- cations	PCP Office visits	Specialist visits	Labs and Imaging	Urgent care & ED visits	Hospital days	Other visits*
Age 40	Conventional care	\$4,121	3	6	3	7	1	0	0
	WPH care MEPS check	\$4,762 \$3,046	1	3	0	1	1	0	26
Age 45	Conventional care	\$28,153	7	6	2	6	1	0	0
	WPH care MEPS check	\$23,524 \$24,491	1	1	0	1	0	0	5
Age 80	Conventional care	\$353,155	7	6	4	6	0	1	0
0	WPH care	\$52,425	1	2	0	2	1	0	4
	MEPS check	\$181,892	← Note co	onvention	al care costs	s = \$186,670) without sk	killed nursing	g costs.
Healthca	re utilization totals a	cross years							
	Conventional care		275	246	138	256	47	8	8
	WPH care		41	56	1	73	18	0	199
*Othor vi	sits include visits to a	nhysical ther	anist nutri	itionict n	sychologist	health coar	h and soci	alworker	

Other visits include visits to a physical therapist, nutritionist, psychologist, health coach, and social worker.

Discounted Cumulative Total Health Care Costs for Mrs. M Starting at Age 40

\$400.000							
9400,000							
\$350,000							
¢200.000							
\$300,000							
\$250,000							
4000.000							
Ş200,000							
\$150,000							
Ş100,000							
\$50,000							
\$0							
	40	42	44	46	48	50	52





DIAGNOSIS

Version A

Organ-/systemspecific



Version B

Biopsychosocial case history

TREATMENT

Multiple long-term medications

Frequent interventions

Minimal skills training





OUTCOME



\$353,155

\$52,425



- reduced healthcare costs

Early investments in patient support and skill building can generate substantial benefits in terms of improved health and quality of life and

This case study illustrates the major challenge for implementing a whole person approach to care: the long time frame required to see cost benefits

Effectiveness of Complementary and Integrative Health Interventions

Jeffery A Dusek, PhD

Director of Outcomes Research, Susan Samueli Integrative Health Institute, University of California, Irvine

Co-Chair, BraveNet Practice Based Research Network Executive Committee









Objectives

- 1. Rationale for outcomes research in complementary and integrative health clinical settings
- 2. Describe BraveNet's Practice Based Research Network (PRBN)
- 3. Review primary findings from BraveNet's 17 site practice-based research registry study called PRIMIER
- 4. Recommendations for future CIH effectiveness research



Objective 1: Rationale for Outcomes Research

- paradigm

 RCTs assess the efficacy of specific interventions for specific patient populations in "controlled settings"

 But do not accurately inform the real-world practice of CIH because of the controlled nature of the RCT

 Outcomes research evaluates the effectiveness of treatments in the real-world of clinical practice.



Objective 2: What is the BraveNet PBRN?

Mission

To conduct and disseminate high quality practice-based research that evaluates the effectiveness, safety, cost and impact on patient experience of integrative medicine approaches.



BraveNet Focus

- 24 site **Practice Based Research** Network
- Focus on patient reported outcomes in real world integrative health settings
- Multi-site collaboration for
 - Observational ambulatory CIH care
 - Randomized controlled trials

BraveNet Members



Objective 3: Patients Receiving Integrative Medicine Effectiveness Registry (PRIMIER) Overview

- Design: Prospective, non-randomized, observational study conducted at 17 BraveNet clinical sites (2013)
- Data Collection: Patient Reported data and Demographics: Primarily REDCap, paper forms, electronic assessment center; *Health Service Utilization*: Electronic Health Records
- **Primary Outcome**: Health related quality of life
- Patient-reported outcome measures collected at 5 time points: index, 2, 4, 6, 12 months.
 - > PROMIS-29 (physical function, anxiety, depression, sleep disturbance, fatigue, pain interference, social roles)
 - Perceived Stress Scale-4 (PSS4)
 - > Patient Activation Measure (PAM)
- **Secondary Outcome**: Integrative Health service utilization (from electronic health records): **ICD diagnostic** codes, CPT codes, Clinician type, Visit date
- Inclusion/Exclusion criteria: 18⁺ years, seen by a provider in CIH clinics, consented to study
- **Recruitment:** Fliers, QR Code in clinic, email blast to clinic patients, **Integration into clinical care**





Participant Flow

Demographics: Participants were white (88.4%), female (79.7%), **college-educated** or beyond (78.5%) with a mean age of **51.4 years** (SD 14.5)

T scores of 55 on Anxiety, Fatigue, Pain Interference

PSS 5.5 and **PAM** 67

Clinical Trials.gov (NCT01754038).



- **580** with no visits between index and 12M

Final PRIMIER Participants Recruited by Site

- —Alliance
- -Allina
- Boston
- -Colorado
- ----Continuum
- -Duke
- -Irvine
- —Jefferson
- ----Maryland
- —Northwestern
- —Osher UCSF
- —OSU
- -Pittsburgh
- -Scripps
- -UCSD
- ----Vanderbilt
- —Venice

Cohort Self-Reported Symptoms at Index: Top 10

Condit

Chronic Pain Acute Pain Wellness Visit Anxiety/Stress Cancer Fatigue/Chronic Fatig Heart Disease Fibromyalgia/Myofas Headache/Migraine Inflammatory Bowel Syndrome/Irritable Bowel

*10 patients did not complete this question on the survey at the Index visit.

ion*	%
	18.9%
	9.3%
	9.2%
	4.9%
	4.6%
gue	4.5%
	4.1%
scial Pain	3.8%
	3.1%
	2.5%

	Me	nt
aex	2	
	1.5	
e IIO	1	
gueu	0.5	
כ	0	
		In

dex	0	
m Inc	-0.5	
e fro	-1	
Jang	-1.5	
Ċ	-2	
		- Ir

Primary Outcomes

Adjusted Mean Changes Across PROs: Summary

Significant Improvements at 12 months (p<0.001)

Significant improvements at all 4 timepoints

- All PROMIS-29 subscales
- PROMIS Mental Health + Physical Health Summary Scores
- PROMIS Composite Score
- **PSS-4**
- PAM

- PROMIS Mental Health Summary Score
- PROMIS Composite score
- **PSS-4**

PROMIS-29: Minimal Clinically Important Difference MCID defined as <u>>3 points better than index scores</u> at a given time point for PROMIS-

- 29 scores
- Mental Health Summary score:

Timepoint	2 months	4 months	6 months	12 months
% at MCID	30.2%	34.5%	34.9%	38.5%

• Physical Health score:

Timepoint	2 months	4 months	6 months	12 month
% at MCID	21.8%	21.3%	24.3%	28.3%

month follow-up assessment

Common pattern of the percentage of responders increasing from 2-month to 12-

CIH Service Utilization

					Index - 12
IM Service	Index - 2 months	2 - 4 months	4 - 6 months	6 - 12 months	months
Consult MD/NP	45.9%	31.2%	26.2%	38%	67.8%
Acupuncture	23.5%	16.6%	13.6%	17.9%	32.9%
Manual therapy	10.7%	8.5%	8.2%	11.3%	19.1%
Chiropractic	6.4%	4.9%	4.4%	6.8%	11%
Mind and body	6.8%	4.6%	3.4%	3.8%	10%
Consult coaching	5.7%	3.2%	2.9%	3.7%	9.5%
Energy therapy	0.8%	1%	1%	2.7%	3.4%
Other	0.8%	0.5%	0.4%	1.6%	2.1%
Any CIH	1768 (74.5%)	1233 (51.9%)	1025 (43.2%)	1394 (58.7%)	2374 (100%)

Summary of Findings

- 2,374 (65%) completed at least 1 follow-up assessment, had evaluable EHR data and >1 CIH visit through 12 months
- At index visit, most common conditions were chronic pain, acute pain, and wellness
- Significant improvements observed at 12-months on all PROMIS-29 measures, PSS and PAM
- At 12 months, clinically meaningful improvements found on **PROMIS**-**29 Mental Health (38%) and Physical Health (28%) Summary scores**
- CIH service utilization was possible (albeit painful) with EHR extracts

Limitations

- **CIH effectiveness studies**
- Limited demographic diversity of sample
- No control group
- study
- treatment course

65% retention rate; however, within high-normal range of multisite

• Though typical of those seeking CIH care, future research should strive to include more diverse samples for improved generalizability

• Absence of multiple testing adjustments, due to exploratory nature of

• Any patient receiving care at participating site was eligible to join PRIMIER – thus, index visit may **not** have been the **actual start** of

Effectiveness Future Directions

- sites using Epic EHR

 - occurred
- dose, for the most effective duration

Standardize CIH documentation and data collection practices across

✓ PROMs: Use of Common Data Elements with customization for each clinical site's needs to incorporate recruitment and data collection into routine clinical care

✓ CIH Utilization: Use of common visit types to be able to identify when CIH has

Use of Propensity Score Matching to create comparison groups

• GOAL: deliver CIH to the right patient, at the right time, at the right

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ctim

Patients Receiving Integrative Medicine Effectiveness Registry (PRIMIER) of the BraveNet practice-based research network: Outcomes of the PRIMIER cohort[☆]

Jeffery A. Dusek^{a,b,*}, Qi Gao^c, Ryung S. Kim^c, Donald I. Abrams^d, Benjamin Kligler^e, Natalie L. Dyer^a, Kathryn Hansen^f, M. Diane McKee^{c, g}, the PRIMIER Research Group

Complementary Therapies in Medicine 71 (2022) 102904

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Complementary Therapies in Medicine

Thank you

Treatment Patterns of complete cases in EMR matched (n=2374)

OTHER DBM OTHER DBM OTHER 10M OTHER 12M	
OTHER DBM	
OTHER 04M	
OTHER 02M	
OTHER BS	
PHYSICAL THERAPY 12M	
PHYSICAL THERAPY 10M	
PHYSICAL THERAPY 08M	
PHYSICAL THERAPY 06M	
PHYSICAL THERAPY 04M	

Boston University School of Medicine Integrative Medicine

UC San Diego **CENTERS FOR INTEGRATIVE HEALTH**

Osher Center for Integrative Health

School of Medicine GW & Health Sciences

Research Institute

Bridge2AI **Propelling Biomedical Research** with Artificial Intelligence

Salutogenesis Grand Challenge Al Ready and Equitable Atlas for Diabetes Insights (AI-READI)

Aaron Y Lee, MD, MSCI University of Washington

Introduction

studying salutogenesis in Type 2 Diabetes

The DGP is also referred to as the AI Ready and Equitable Atlas for Diabetes Insights (AI-READI) project

The goal of the Salutogenesis Data Generation **Project** (DGP) is to create a multidimensional, ethically-sourced dataset in diverse people for

Pathogenesis Health Disease Salutogenesis

Pre-visit (~1hr, at home)

Self-reporting surveys

- Initial Screening
- Demographic
- Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) - 10
- Problem Areas In Diabetes Questionnaire (PAID-5)
- Diabetes score
- Diet
- Smoking History
- Alcohol Use, Vaping, and Marijuana Use
- General Health,
- Social Determinants of Health (SDoH)
- Visual Impairment and Eye Care Access

Current medical list

Driving record (accident report)

Monofilament test

FLIO = Fluorescence Lifetime Imaging, OCT = Optical Coherence Tomography, OCTA = Optical Coherence Tomography Angiography, ECG = Electrocardiogram, MoCA = Montreal Cognitive Assessment, PM1.0, 4.0, and 10.0 = Particulate matter less than 1, 4, and 10 microns, respectively

Data collection

On-site visit (~3 to 4 hrs)

Vision testing (lensometer, autorefraction, best corrected visual acuity (BCVA), letter contrast sensitivity)

Retinal imaging (undilated/dilated fundus photography, pupillary dilation, FLIO, OCT, OCTA)

Post-visit (10 days, at home)

Continuous glucose monitoring

Physical Activity Monitoring (heart rate, steps, sleep phases)

Environmental sensor measurements (temperature, humidity, spectrogram, PM1.0, PM4.0, PM10.0, Nitric Oxides, volatile organic compounds)

Preparing Al-Ready Data

OMOP

- Demographics
- Survey data
- Physical assessment data
- Medications
- Blood and urine lab values
- MOCA
- Vision testing

mHealth

- Physical activity monitor
- Continuous glucose monitor

DICOM

- Fundus photography
- OCT
- OCTA
- FLIO

Waveform Database (WFDB) • ECG

Earth Science Data Specification

• Environmental sensor

Dimension Reduction

Where:

- Ideally a lower dimensional latent space
 - Two points close to each other means that the input are similar
 - Two points far away means that the input are very dissimilar.

Reduced Space •

Opportunities for Engagement

Our AI-READI team is excited to be sharing the pilot dataset with you soon!

We will have several team members present at the jamboree to interact with the participants and to answer questions about the data collection protocol, the ethical considerations, the data formats and organization.

Beyond the jamboree, we will be soliciting feedback from the community.

Acknowledgement

Joseph Yracheta Native BioData

Bhavesh Patel CALMI

Linda Zangwill UCSD

Sally Baxter UCSD

Sara Singer Stanford

Michael Snyder Stanford

Samm Hurst UCSD

Camille Nebeker UCSD

Cecilia Lee UW

Aaron Lee UW

Cynthia Owsley UAB

Gerald McGwin UAB

T. Y. Alvin Liu JHU

Christopher Chute JHU

Megan Collins JHU

Kadija Ferryman JHU

Program and Project Managers

Clinical Research Coordinators

Michelle Hribar OHSU/NIH

Shannon McWeeney OHSU

Hiroshi Ishikawa OHSU

Developers