Reducing 30-Day Readmissions after Coronary Artery Bypass Grafting for High-Risk Populations: A Focus on Medicaid Insurance

Alison Davidson, MSN, FNP-BC; Faculty Advisor: Phyllis Sharps, PhD, RN, FAAN; Organizational Mentor: Julie Swain, MD

Organizational Contributors: Joel Estabillo, MSN, ACNP-BC; Roberto Galao-Malo, MSN, ACNP-BC; Farzan Filsoufi, MD; Percy Boateng, MD

Introduction

- 30-day readmissions after CABG are costly from a fiscal and quality standpoint with annual rates ranging 12.6-23.6% nationally.^{1,2,3}
- Medicaid insurance and related socioeconomic risk factors increase likelihood of readmission after CABG.^{1,2}
- Most readmissions occur within 10 days from discharge and are considered preventable through the Hospital Readmissions Reduction Program (HRRP).^{1,2,3}
- Multidisciplinary care coordination to ensure timely follow-up after discharge may reduce readmissions for this population.^{2,4}

Purpose

To reduce 30-day readmissions after CABG for patients with Medicaid insurance by implementing an evidence-based, comprehensive, early postoperative follow-up protocol at discharge.

Project Aims

- To reduce the number of Medicaid-insured patients readmitted within 30 days of discharge after CABG.
- To schedule postoperative follow-up appointments after CABG prior to discharge for 85% of patients with Medicaid insurance.
- To see Medicaid-insured patients after CABG for postoperative followup in the surgical clinic within 10 days of discharge.

Methods

- **Design**: pre/post test intervention design; data from STS database
- **Setting**: inpatient step-down unit and outpatient surgical clinics
- Inclusion criteria: Medicaid-insured and uninsured adult patients who underwent CABG and CABG+valve surgeries
- **Exclusion criteria**: other insurance types and other operations

Intervention: Postop Scheduling Algorithm

- Discharge providers triage patients for early or usual care post-discharge follow-up visit based on insurance- and clinical-related risk factors.
- Appointments scheduled accordingly for patients prior to discharge.
- Patients seen for post-discharge visit within recommended timeframe in outpatient surgical clinic.



Comparison group (n=49)	p-Value (Chi-square testing)
Yes, n=7 (14.3%) No, n=41 (83.7%)	0.71
Yes, n=36 (73.5%) No, n=13 (26.5%)	0.65
Yes, n=16 (32.7%) No, n=33 (67.3%)	0.17
on after Discharge	
	 Intervention Group Comparison Group
Day 21-30 scharge	



Results

Conclusions

References

Connolly, T. M., White, R. S
artery bypass grafting surge
42(10), 3240-3249. doi:10.2
Shah, R. M., Zhang, Q., Cha
factors for readmission afte
doi:S0003-4975(18)31820-4
Hospital Readmission Redu
initiatives-patient-assessme
Hall, M. H., Esposito, R. A.,
practitioner home visits pre



COVID-19 pandemic presented challenges in the intervention group. Limitations: small sample size, 20-week time frame, single institution

• Improved care coordination and continuity after discharge to ensure timely follow-up after CABG benefits patients with Medicaid clinically.

Readmissions remain a multifactorial issue.

Sustainability: adopted as standard practice in Department, strong potential for wider application/adaptation to other HRRP diagnoses. **Future work**: all insurance types, patient satisfaction, financial implications.

S., Sastow, D. L., Gaber-Baylis, L. K., Turnbull, Z. A., & Rong, L. Q. (2018). The disparities of coronary ery outcomes by insurance status: A retrospective cohort study, 2007-2014. World Journal of Surgery, 1007/s00268-018-4631-9 [doi]

atterjee, S., Cheema, F., Loor, G., Lemaire, S. A., . . . Ghanta, R. K. (2019). Incidence, cost, and risk er coronary artery bypass grafting. The Annals of Thoracic Surgery, 107(6), 1782-1789. 4 [pii]

uction Program [HRRP]. (2020). Retrieved June 1, 2019, from https://www.cms.gov/medicare/qualityent-instruments/value-based-programs/hrrp/hospital-readmission-reduction-program.html. , Pekmezaris, R., Lesser, M., Moravick, D., Jahn, L., . . . Hartman, A. R. (2014). Cardiac surgery nurse revent coronary artery bypass graft readmissions. The Annals of Thoracic Surgery, 97(5), 1488-93; discussion 1493-5. doi:10.1016/j.athoracsur.2013.12.049 [doi].