

A Comparison of Nurse Practitioners, Physician Assistants, and Primary Care Physicians' Patterns of Practice and Quality of Care in Health Centers

Ellen T. Kurtzman, PhD, MPH, RN, FAAN* and Burt S. Barnow, PhD†

Background: Under the Affordable Care Act, the number and capacity of community health centers (HCs) is growing. Although the majority of HC care is provided by primary care physicians (PCMDs), a growing proportion is delivered by nurse practitioners (NPs) and physician assistants (PAs); yet, little is known about how these clinicians' care compares in this setting.

Objectives: To compare the quality of care and practice patterns of NPs, PAs, and PCMDs in HCs.

Research Design: Using 5 years of data (2006–2010) from the HC subsample of the National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey and multivariate regression analysis, we estimated the impact of receiving NP-delivered or PA-delivered care versus PCMD-delivered care. We used design-based and model-based inference and weighted all estimates.

Subjects: Primary analyses included 23,704 patient visits to 1139 practitioners—a sample representing approximately 30 million patient visits to HCs in the United States.

Measures: We examined 9 patient-level outcomes: 3 quality indicators, 4 service utilization measures, and 2 referral pattern measures.

Results: On 7 of the 9 outcomes studied, no statistically significant differences were detected in NP or PA care compared with PCMD care. On the remaining outcomes, visits to NPs were more likely to receive recommended smoking cessation counseling and more health education/counseling services than visits to PCMDs ($P \leq 0.05$). Visits to PAs also received more health education/counseling services than visits to PCMDs ($P \leq 0.01$; design-based model only).

Conclusions: Across the outcomes studied, results suggest that NP and PA care were largely comparable to PCMD care in HCs.

Key Words: community health center, nurse practitioner, primary care, quality of care, physician assistant

(*Med Care* 2017;00: 000–000)

Each year, millions of low-income Americans receive their health care at community health centers (HCs). HCs are independent, community-based nonprofit organizations located in medically underserved areas and are safety-net providers by virtue of their disproportionate share of uncompensated and publicly funded care.¹ Over the last 2 decades, these providers have grown in number and capacity.² This growth is expected to continue under the Affordable Care Act, which authorized \$11 billion in federal funds for HC capital improvements and operations.³

Although most HC care is provided by primary care physicians (PCMDs) who are certified in internal medicine, general and family practice medicine, pediatrics, or obstetrics/gynecology, HCs use a mix of clinicians to fulfill their missions and have traditionally relied more on nurse practitioners (NPs) and physician assistants (PAs) than private physician offices.⁴ In recent years, HCs' use of these clinicians has accelerated as their share of primary care visits has increased, whereas the share seen by PCMDs has declined.^{4–6}

The NP and PA roles were created in the 1960s in response to an increased demand for primary care—especially in rural and inner city settings—and an uneven geographic distribution of PCMDs across the United States. As was originally envisioned for these new roles, most NPs and many PAs currently practice primary care in settings such as physician offices, hospital-based outpatient departments, and health clinics.⁷ Although both clinicians have specialized education and extensive clinical instruction, their programs of study differ with NP curricula emphasizing health promotion, disease prevention, and health education and counseling and PA curricula resembling medical school training (eg, disease mechanisms, biomedical knowledge). Beyond differences in the organization and orientation of their education, states' approaches to their licensure and their level of autonomy also vary.⁸ Merely as an example, in some states, NPs can practice without physician oversight as permitted by law. Conversely, PAs must practice as members of physician-led teams and are required to be supervised by physicians in all states although the terms and conditions

From the *School of Nursing; and †Trachtenberg School of Public Policy and Public Administration, The George Washington University, Washington, DC.

Supported by the 2014 National Center for Health Statistics/AcademyHealth Health Policy Fellowship. The views presented here are solely those of the authors.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Reprints: Ellen T. Kurtzman, PhD, MPH, RN, FAAN, School of Nursing, The George Washington University, 1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20006. E-mail: etk@gwu.edu.

Copyright © 2017 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. All rights reserved.
ISSN: 0025-7079/17/000-000

vary. Over the next decade, the US Bureau of Labor Statistics considers both of these clinician groups to be among the fastest growing health care occupations—with employment increasing 35.3% and 30.4% for NPs and PAs, respectively—and significantly outpace the physician growth rate (14.0%).⁹

A growing body of evidence has compared the quality of primary care delivered by PCMDs to care delivered by NPs and PAs and generally demonstrated equivalence in these practitioners' outcomes; however, nearly all this evidence has been based on visits conducted in physician offices and hospital-based clinics.^{10–15} Extending these comparisons to HCs is important given their growth, the ongoing debate regarding the extent that NPs and PAs adequately substitute for PCMDs, and this setting's unique service delivery model, regulatory environment, and operating structure. For example, HCs receive an all-inclusive per visit Medicare payment regardless of the practitioner seen¹⁶ compared with physician offices and hospital-based clinics, which bill at higher rates for PCMD visits than for NP or PA visits—a payment policy that would likely increase the use and expand the roles of NPs and PAs. At the same time, NPs in HCs have reported greater role independence—that is, fewer restrictions, greater likelihood of managing their own patient panels—and better relationships with facility administration and leadership than in other primary care settings, which are factors that are known to optimize NP performance.^{17,18} Given predicted HC expansion, these providers' continued shift toward more NP-delivered and PA-delivered care, and HCs' distinguishing features, which could differentially influence practitioner performance, it is important to compare PCMD, NP, and PA outcomes in this setting. By comparing the quality of care and practice patterns among these clinicians in HCs, this study fills an important gap and seeks to inform stakeholders about the impact of shifting from predominantly PCMD-delivered to NP-delivered and PA-delivered care. The study protocol was reviewed and approved by The George Washington University Committee on Human Research (IRB #101446).

METHODS

We used 5 years (2006–2010) of repeated cross-sectional data from the National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey (NAMCS), a multistage probability sample survey conducted by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). The “traditional” NAMCS sample includes data from patient visits to office-based physicians in the United States; beginning in 2006, the annual sample was expanded to include visits to practitioners in approximately 104 HCs. Participating HCs were drawn from a roster compiled by the Health Resources and Services Administration, which provides federal oversight and funding for the Health Center Program, and up to 3 practitioners were randomly selected to participate in the survey from a list of all physicians, NPs, PAs, and nurse midwives working in these HCs. Subsequently, each practitioner provided encounter-level data for up to 30 patient visits during a randomly assigned 1-week period. Over the 5-year study period, unweighted annual

response rates ranged from 84% (2007 and 2009) to 88% (2006) (authors' analysis).

Each NAMCS visit file included 4-digit practitioner codes, associated 3-digit patient visit codes, and practitioner type identifiers, which were used to assign each patient visit to the specific practitioner who was seen, thus forming “practitioner-patient visit units.” To ensure appropriate attribution of outcomes, visits to >1 practitioner (eg, PCMD+NP, PCMD+PA)—which comprised <5% of HC visits (authors' analysis)—were excluded. In addition, because the sample included a relatively small number of nurse midwives and visits to them (ie, <2% of visits^{5,19}), they were also excluded from the study sample.

After making these exclusions, we pooled remaining visits across the study period and used bivariate analysis to describe the sample and the population from which the sample was drawn by practitioner type. NAMCS visit weights and adjustments for NAMCS' design were used to obtain national estimates.²⁰

To test the primary hypothesis—that the quality and practice patterns of NPs and PAs were comparable to those of PCMDs—multivariate logistic and negative binomial regression analyses were used to separately estimate the impact of practitioner type on each of the outcomes of interest: 3 quality indicators, 4 service utilization measures, and 2 referral pattern measures (Table 1). The quality indicators were chosen from among nearly 2 dozen that have been previously specified to reflect agreed-upon standards of practice derived from formal recommendations and consensus statements of authoritative bodies^{27–30} and subsequently tested in the scholarly literature.^{21–26} After examining the frequency of eligible visits for each indicator, the most prevalent indicator was selected in each of 3 categories reflecting the scope of primary care services³¹: smoking cessation counseling (prevention and early detection), depression treatment (treatment of common acute and chronic illnesses), and statin treatment for hyperlipidemia (medical management). In each case, the indicator was modeled as a dichotomous variable—that is, every visit was identified as being eligible or ineligible for each quality indicator (1 = eligible; 0 = ineligible), and each eligible visit was classified as receiving or not receiving “recommended care” (1 = received recommended care; 0 = otherwise). The service utilization and referral pattern measures were derived from survey items detailing the procedures, treatments, and postvisit follow-up plans documented during each visit and were modeled as binary (eg, 1 = service ordered/provided or referral made; 0 = otherwise) or count variables (eg, total number of medications).

Separate regression models were constructed for each outcome and included the predictors of primary interest—that is, dichotomous variables reflecting each practitioner type (NP, PA) with PCMDs serving as the reference group—and, based on underlying theory and previous research, a multitude of covariates for statistical control. In those cases where potential correlates were not available in NAMCS or missing values limited a variable's use, suitable proxies were explored. For example, percent of the population with a high school diploma or higher based on the patient's zip code served as a proxy for patient's level of education, which was

TABLE 1. Outcomes Studied^{21–26}

Outcome	Type	Description
1. Smoking cessation counseling ^{27,28}	Binary	Numerator: Received smoking cessation intervention (i.e., nicotine replacement therapy or medications ordered, supplied, administered, or continued and/or smoking cessation counseling) Denominator: Visits by adults who were screened for tobacco use and identified as smokers
2. Depression treatment ²⁹	Binary	Numerator: Antidepressants ordered, supplied, administered, or continued and/or psychotherapy or mental health counseling Denominator: Visits by adults with depression
3. Statin for hyperlipidemia ³⁰	Binary	Numerator: Statin ordered, supplied, administered, or continued Denominator: Visits by adults with hyperlipidemia
4. Physical exam	Binary	Physical exam/general medical exam provided
5. Total number of health education/counseling services	Count	All of the following services ordered/provided during the visit: asthma, diet/nutrition, exercise, family planning/contraception, growth/development, injury prevention, stress management, tobacco use/exposure, and weight reduction
6. Imaging services	Binary	Any of the following services that were ordered/provided during the visit: x-ray, bone mineral density, CT scan, echocardiogram, and other ultrasound
7. Total number of medications	Count	All of the following that were ordered, supplied, administered or continued during the visit: prescription and over-the-counter drugs, immunizations, allergy shots, oxygen, anesthetics, chemotherapy, and dietary supplements
8. Return visit at a specified time	Binary	Visit disposition marked ‘return at a specified time’
9. Physician (MD) referral	Binary	Visit disposition marked ‘referred to other physician’

not available in NAMCS. Each variable’s values were closely examined, transformations were made, and summary statistics and bivariate associations were examined to determine the strength and direction of associations. Covariates were added—in some cases, as higher power terms to satisfy non-linearity assumptions—and their expected signs, statistical significance, contribution to overall fit, and effect on other covariates were used to diagnose specification error. Ultimately, estimates for each quality indicator controlled for age and age squared, sex, race, ethnicity, payer source, metropolitan status, region, number of chronic conditions and number of chronic conditions squared, HC type (Federally Qualified Health Center, other), percent of the population with a high school diploma or higher, and visit year. Estimates for each service utilization and referral pattern measure controlled for these same covariates with visit type (new problem, chronic problem, preventive care, presurgical/postsurgical care) substituting for the number of chronic conditions and number of chronic conditions squared variables.

Although we also considered the role of and the need for control variables that reflected state scope of practice policies, based on a separate, recent study, we found little evidence to support their inclusion.³² Even so, we reran each model including these variables, and their addition to each model had only a minor effect on the magnitude of our estimates and no effect on their direction or statistical significance. Because nonresponse rates for race and ethnicity exceeded 10%, each model was reestimated incorporating their imputed values, which were derived by NCHS using a model-based, single, sequential regression method.³³ Finding that differences were small, all reported results include imputed values.

Adjustments for NAMCS’ Complex Survey Design

As a multistage probability survey, each year’s NAMCS sample was comprised of a selection of observations from the population of interest rather than a complete count. Observations in the sample were nested—that is, patient visits were drawn from selected practitioners within HCs—which resulted in greater homogeneity than if observations had been independent. Without statistical adjustments, these survey features can introduce bias and increase variance.³⁴ There are 2, common approaches to estimation when faced with these challenges—design-based and model-based inference.^{35,36} Design-based models rely on the distribution of all possible samples that could have been chosen under the sample design. Using this approach to inference, the analyst relies on variables that describe the survey’s characteristics (eg, strata and cluster identifiers, finite population correction), specifies the method of variance estimation, and uses sampling weights to “map” the sample back to an unbiased representation of the survey population. In contrast, model-based inference relies on the distribution of the random variable of interest. In these cases, the analyst fits a model, which is assumed to be true—that is, accurately and reliably accounts for the dependencies and variances—and ignores the sampling design. Model-based approaches allow the analyst to estimate individual and group effects and decompose the variance into its within-group and between-group components.

Given their relative strengths and different uses, we used both approaches, choosing a 3-level [patient (level 1), practitioner (level 2), HC (level 3)], random intercept model. Because of the constrained nature of the outcomes and their non-normal distribution, we used logistic and negative binomial models and maximum pseudolikelihood estimation techniques. Also, we relied on intraclass correlation coefficients to divide the variance components into the: (a) proportion among patients within practitioners ($\hat{\rho}_i$), (b) proportion among practitioners within HCs ($\hat{\rho}_p$), and (c) proportion among HCs ($\hat{\rho}_h$). Stata/SE 12.1 was used for design-based analyses,³⁷ but because of its limitations for multilevel modeling, Hierarchical Linear and Nonlinear Modeling version 7.01 was used for model-based analyses.³⁸

In addition to our choice of model type, we also contemplated how to handle the sampling weights. Researchers agree on their use to produce population descriptive statistics

and when conducting inferential analyses to correct for heteroskedasticity and endogenous sampling, identify misspecification and average partial effects, and proxy for ≥ 1 feature of the sample design that has a bearing on the outcome of interest (referred to as “informative sample design”).³⁹ We assumed NAMCS to be an informative design given its oversampling of respondents from highly populous geographic sampling units and corresponding patterns of regional variation in quality—that is, higher quality in less populous states and those in the Northeast—which have been well documented.^{40–44} Even so, because our weighted and unweighted estimates differed—which was suggestive of misspecification—we double checked our assumptions with appropriate diagnostics and explored alternative covariate structures. Finding no evidence of bias, we opted to weight all estimates. (Note: unweighted estimates are available from the authors upon request.)

RESULTS

During the 5-year study period, data from 1139 practitioners were collected in the NAMCS database, a sample representing nearly 15,000 practitioners nationwide—69% PCMDs, 21% NPs, and approximately 10% PAs. In most ways, the distribution of these clinicians’ characteristics was similar by practitioner type (Table 2) although a greater proportion of NPs was female compared with PCMDs or PAs (92% vs. 44% and 62%, respectively). At the same time, a larger percentage of NPs and PAs were white and worked in rural HCs than their PCMD counterparts, although sample size limitations made these results imprecise [ie, coefficients of variation (relative SEs) were >0.30]. These descriptive statistics are consistent with those most recently reported by Morgan et al^{5,19} for the NAMCS HC sample over the same period.

After excluding visits to nurse midwives and those to >1 practitioner, there were 23,704 patient visits, representing nearly 30 million visits to US HCs from 2006 to 2010 (Table 2). For the most part, visits to NPs and PAs were similar to those seen by PCMDs; however, there was a 10-percentage point difference by sex—70% of visits to NPs were by female patients versus 59% and 57% to PCMDs and PAs, respectively—and by ethnicity—25% of visits to NPs, 26% of visits to PAs, and 36% of visits to PCMDs were made by Hispanic/Latino patients. Also, NPs tended to see patients who had been seen fewer times over the past 12 months than PCMDs or PAs.

Regarding the primary research question about the comparability of NP, PA, and PCMD care, in large part, there was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis regardless of which approach to analysis was taken (Table 3). On 7 of the 9 outcomes studied, no statistically significant differences were detected in NP or PA care compared with PCMD care. On the remaining 2 outcomes, patients seen by NPs were more likely to receive recommended smoking cessation counseling [adjusted odds ratio (AOR)=1.62; 95% confidence interval (CI), 1.17–2.26; $P \leq 0.01$ (design based) and AOR = 1.80; 95% CI, 1.15–2.80; $P \leq 0.05$ (model based)] and patients seen by either NPs

[adjusted incidence rate ratio (aIRR)=1.40; 95% CI, 1.19–1.64; $P \leq 0.01$ (design based) and aIRR = 1.20; 95% CI, 1.02–1.40; $P \leq 0.05$ (model based)] or PAs [aIRR = 1.28; 95% CI, 1.08–1.52; $P \leq 0.01$ (design based) and aIRR = 0.91; 95% CI, 0.61–1.46; $P = 0.50$ (model based)] received significantly more health education/counseling services than patients seen by PCMDs. Although patients seen by NPs were less likely to receive recommended depression treatment [AOR=0.69; 95% CI, 0.46–1.03 (design based) and AOR = 0.72; 95% CI, 0.50–1.04 (model based)], these differences were not statistically significant at any conventional level.

The hierarchical linear models described the distribution of the variation within practitioner, across practitioners, and within HCs. Although the intraclass correlation coefficients were outcome dependent (Table 3), there was a large range in how the total variance was distributed. For example, the proportion of variance in the number of medications was greater within practitioners—that is, more of the variation was explained by differences among patients—than either across practitioners or HCs (ie, 0.90 vs. 0.04 and 0.06). At the same time, the proportion of variance was much more evenly distributed for recommended return visits (ie, 0.38 vs. 0.27 and 0.35). For nearly every outcome, the proportion of within-practitioner variance (ie, among patients) tended to be larger than either the across-practitioner or across-HC variation. These results suggest that more of the variation in care was attributable to differences among patients than to differences either among practitioners or among HCs.

In addition to the AORs, predictive margins—which estimate the average probability of each outcome by practitioner type while leaving all other predictors at their observed values—were estimated (Table 4). Merely as an example, in terms of smoking cessation counseling—where the adjusted odds of receiving recommended counseling was found to be higher among patients seen by NPs than among patients seen by PCMDs—the predicted probability of receiving such care from an NP was 33% compared with 26% from a PA and 24% from a PCMD (differences which were statistically different from zero at the 1% level of significance). The predicted probability of receiving a physical exam was 13% regardless of whether the patient visited an NP, PA, or PCMD (a difference that was not statistically different from zero). Across all 9 outcomes, statistically significant differences between NP or PA and PCMD care were detected on only 2 outcomes—that is, the probability of receiving smoking cessation counseling was higher when seen by an NP and patients seen by either an NP or PA received more health education/counseling services than those seen by a PCMD. In each of the other 7 cases, differences between these practitioner groups were evident but did not reach statistical significance at any conventional level.

DISCUSSION

HCs are assuming a greater role in the provision of primary care. Although these providers have historically depended on PCMDs to deliver primary care, they are shifting toward the use of NPs and PAs. Our findings, which suggest that NP, PA, and PCMD care are comparable in HCs,

TABLE 2. Sample Characteristics by Practitioner Type in Health Centers (2006–2010)*†

Practitioner Characteristic	PCMD (n = 742)	NP (n = 291)	PA (n = 106)	P
Age (mean) (y)	48	48	47	0.75
Sex (%)				
Female	44	92	62	<0.01
Race (%)				
White	70	88	89	
Black	12	8‡	8‡	<0.01
Other	18	4‡	3‡	
Ethnicity (%)				
Hispanic/Latino	8	6‡	10‡	0.72
Health center type (%)				
Federally Qualified Health Center	89	96	91	0.28
Metro status (%)				
Rural	11‡	28‡	32‡	<0.01
Region (%)				
Northeast	28	24	27‡	
Midwest	17	20	15‡	0.96
South	25	29	24‡	
West	31	27	34	
Patient Visit Characteristic	PCMD (n = 15,743)	NP (n = 5250)	PA (n = 2711)	P
Age (mean) (y)	35	32	36	0.42
Sex (%)				
Female	59	70	57	<0.01
Race (%)				
Black	32	30	26	0.45
Ethnicity (%)				
Hispanic/Latino	36	25	26	0.02
Payer source (%)				
Private insurance	16	17	21	
Medicare	14	8	11	0.14
Medicaid	42	40	32	
Self-pay	13	16	21	
Other	16	19	15	
Visit type (%)				
New problem	40	40	46	
Chronic problem	34	27	32	0.15
Preventive care	26	32	20	
Presurgical/post-surgical	1	1‡	1‡	
No. chronic conditions (%)				
None	45	52	46	
1	24	23	23	0.27
2–3	24	18	23	
≥ 4	6	7	8	
No. past visits over the last 12 mo (%)				
None	3	6	3	0.03
1–3	47	49	52	
4–10	42	35	38	
> 10	8	10	7	
No. medications (%)				
None	19	19	18	
1	22	28	22	0.50
2–4	35	34	37	
≥ 5	23	20	23	
Primary care shortage area designation (%)				
None of county	1‡	3‡	<1‡	0.70
Whole county	44	46	45	
Part of county	55	52	55	
Year (%)				
2006	12	9	12	
2007	23	25	11	0.33
2008	20	16	24	
2009	28	32	22	
2010	18	28	32	

*Adjusted for complex survey design and weighted for sampling probabilities.

†Population of 14,679 practitioners and 29,848,995 visits.

‡Coefficient of variation/relative SE >0.3.

NP indicates nurse practitioner; PA, physician assistant; PCMD, primary care physician.

TABLE 3. Effect of Practitioner Type on Quality of Care and Practice Patterns in Health Centers (2006–2010)[†]

Design-Based Approach/Adjusted Odds Ratio (CI) [‡]			Model-Based Approach/Adjusted Odds Ratio (CI) [‡]		
Outcome	NP Visit	PA Visit	Outcome	NP Visit	PA Visit
Quality Indicator[§]			Quality Indicator[§]		
Smoking cessation (n=3882)	1.62** (1.17-2.26)	1.16 (0.68-1.97)	Smoking cessation (n _i =3862; n _p =735; n _h =363)	1.80* (1.15-2.80) $\hat{\rho}_i=0.54$ $\hat{\rho}_p=0.12$ $\hat{\rho}_h=0.34$	0.95 (0.55-2.64)
Depression treatment (n=2734)	0.69 (0.46-1.03)	1.17 (0.70-1.94)	Depression treatment (n _i =2712; n _p =678; n _h =350)	0.72 (0.50-1.04) $\hat{\rho}_i=0.56$ $\hat{\rho}_p=0.22$ $\hat{\rho}_h=0.22$	1.06 (0.70-1.60)
Statin for hyperlipidemia (n=2737)	0.88 (0.65-1.20)	1.03 (0.65-1.62)	Statin for hyperlipidemia (n _i =2732; n _p =654; n _h =346)	0.94 (0.66-1.34) $\hat{\rho}_i=0.50$ $\hat{\rho}_p=0.31$ $\hat{\rho}_h=0.19$	0.98 (0.61-1.59)
Service Utilization and Referral Pattern Measure[¶]			Service Utilization and Referral Pattern Measure[¶]		
Physical exam (n=21296)	0.97 (0.72-1.31)	1.01 (0.71-1.43)	Physical exam (n _i =21233; n _p =1011; n _h =399)	0.94 (0.70-1.27) $\hat{\rho}_i=0.59$ $\hat{\rho}_p=0.39$ $\hat{\rho}_h=0.05$	0.94 (0.61-1.46)
Health education services [#] (n=21153)	1.40** (1.19-1.64)	1.28** (1.08-1.52)	Health education services [#] (n _i =20920; n _p =1009; n _h =399)	1.20* (1.02-1.40) $\hat{\rho}_i=0.54$ $\hat{\rho}_p=0.19$ $\hat{\rho}_h=0.27$	0.91 (0.71-1.19)
Medications [#] (n=21466)	0.97 (0.88-1.07)	1.00 (0.91-1.10)	Medications [#] (n _i =21233; n _p =1011; n _h =399)	0.94 (0.86-1.03) $\hat{\rho}_i=0.90$ $\hat{\rho}_p=0.04$ $\hat{\rho}_h=0.06$	1.03 (0.92-1.15)
Imaging (n=21466)	0.94 (0.77-1.15)	1.14 (0.84-1.54)	Imaging (n _i =21233; n _p =1011; n _h =399)	0.90 (0.70-1.15) $\hat{\rho}_i=0.70$ $\hat{\rho}_p=0.17$ $\hat{\rho}_h=0.13$	1.16 (0.90-1.49)
Return visit (n=21466)	1.05 (0.76-1.44)	0.77 (0.52-1.13)	Return visit (n _i =21233; n _p =1011; n _h =399)	0.96 (0.74-1.25) $\hat{\rho}_i=0.38$ $\hat{\rho}_p=0.27$ $\hat{\rho}_h=0.35$	0.78 (0.58-1.07)
Physician referral (n=21466)	1.08 (0.87-1.35)	1.17 (0.87-1.56)	Physician referral (n _i =21233; n _p =1011; n _h =399)	1.05 (0.87-1.28) $\hat{\rho}_i=0.39$ $\hat{\rho}_p=0.54$ $\hat{\rho}_h=0.06$	0.97 (0.75-1.25)

$\hat{\rho}$ = intraclass correlation coefficient (ρ_i = patient visit; ρ_p = practitioner; ρ_h = health center).
^{*} $P \leq 0.05$ (vs. PCMD).
^{**} $P \leq 0.01$ (vs. PCMD).
[‡] Adjusted for complex survey design and weighted for sampling probabilities.
[§] CIs based on Taylor linearized SEs.
[¶] Controlled for age, age², sex, race, ethnicity, payer, metro status (rural), region, # chronic conditions, # chronic conditions², health center type, % with high school diploma or higher, and year.
^{||} Sample size differences due to missing data within hierarchy (n_i = patient/visit; n_p = practitioner; n_h = health center).
[#] Controlled for age, age², sex, race, ethnicity, payer, metro status (rural), region, reason for visit, health center type, % with high school diploma or higher, and year.
[†] Negative binomial distribution and adjusted incidence rate ratio reported.
 CI indicates confidence interval; NP, nurse practitioner; PA, physician assistant.

suggest that greater use of NPs and PAs is unlikely to have a dramatic effect on patient care as specified by the 9 outcomes we examined (and may improve care in some areas). From a practice perspective, this should offer reassurance to patients who are served by HCs that NPs and PAs provide care that is largely equivalent to PCMDs. These findings should also encourage HC administrators, who depend on NPs and PAs to meet growing demands for primary care in their communities, that the quality of care will be maintained. This is especially important given the relative difficulty HCs have recruiting and retaining PCMDs compared with NPs and PAs.⁴⁵

The study also has important policy relevance especially given federal investments in the Health Center Program and commitments to achieving the triple aim—better care, better health, and lower costs.⁴⁶ On one hand, our findings should heighten policymakers’ confidence in the contributions of NPs and PAs to high-quality care and inform their decisions regarding occupational licensing and regulation, payment reform, and health professions’ education. Especially because the cost of using an NP or PA is typically less than a PCMD,⁴⁷ their comparable outcomes could produce cost-savings for HCs. On the other hand, small differences in our estimates could have significant economic repercussions. For example, we found that NPs and PAs provide as much as 30%–40% more health education/counseling services than PCMDs. Although these services

may benefit patients, if they are excessively costly or unnecessary, they could represent system inefficiencies and waste.

The study has several limitations. For example, the statistical analysis requires strong assumptions for the parameter estimates to be unbiased, and these assumptions may not have been met. To address potential bias and as an additional sensitivity analysis, we reestimated the effect of NP and PA care on each outcome using propensity score matching, which paired treatment units (NP visits, NP+PA visits) to comparison units (PCMD visits) that were as similar as possible on their observable characteristics. On 8 of the 9 outcomes, the direction and the statistical significance of the postmatch estimates were largely unchanged. For only 1 outcome—that is, smoking cessation counseling—were NPs more likely to provide recommended care than PCMDs, but the difference in the postmatch estimate was not statistically significant as it had been in the full sample. Despite this difference, these results suggest that our initial models adequately accounted for observable differences associated with practitioner assignment. (Note: estimates from these propensity score matched samples are available from the authors upon request.)

Patients, practitioners, policymakers, and other health care decision makers should be particularly mindful of the results presented in Table 4, which provide an overall “report card” of HC quality. On the basis of these results, patients

TABLE 4. Predicted Probability of Outcomes Studied by Practitioner Type (2006–2010)[†]

Outcome	Design-based Approach		
	Predicted Probability (CI) [‡]		
	NP Visit	PA Visit	PCMD Visit
Quality indicator [§]			
Smoking cessation (n = 3882)	0.33 (0.25–0.40)**	0.26 (0.16–0.36)	0.24 (0.19–0.29)
Depression treatment (n = 2734)	0.49 (0.41–0.56)	0.61 (0.50–0.72)	0.57 (0.52–0.62)
Statin for hyperlipidemia (n = 2737)	0.45 (0.37–0.54)	0.49 (0.38–0.60)	0.48 (0.41–0.56)
Service utilization and referral pattern measure [¶]			
Physical exam (n = 21,296)	0.13 (0.10–0.15)	0.13 (0.10–0.15)	0.13 (0.11–0.15)
Health education services (n = 21,153) [#]	0.96 (0.78–1.15)**	0.88 (0.73–1.03)**	0.69 (0.57–0.81)
Medications (n = 21,466) [#]	2.62 (2.25–2.99)	2.69 (2.36–3.03)	2.70 (2.44–2.95)
Imaging (n = 21,466)	0.08 (0.07–0.10)	0.10 (0.07–0.12)	0.09 (0.08–0.10)
Return visit (n = 21,466)	0.69 (0.63–0.76)	0.63 (0.55–0.71)	0.68 (0.64–0.72)
Physician referral (n = 21,466)	0.14 (0.11–0.16)	0.14 (0.11–0.18)	0.13 (0.11–0.15)

*P ≤ 0.05 (vs. PCMD).

**P ≤ 0.01 (vs. PCMD).

[†]Adjusted for complex survey design and weighted for sampling probabilities.

[‡]Confidence intervals adjusted for repeated sampling.

[§]Controlled for age, age², sex, race, ethnicity, payer, metro status (rural), region, # chronic conditions, # chronic conditions², health center type, % with high school diploma or higher, and year.

[¶]Controlled for age, age², sex, race, ethnicity, payer, metro status (rural), region, reason for visit, health center type, % with high school diploma or higher, and year.

[#]Negative binomial distribution and adjusted incidence rate ratio reported.

CI indicates confidence interval; NP, nurse practitioner; PA, physician assistant; PCMD, primary care physician.

routinely received less than one half of recommended care, with considerable outcome-to-outcome variation. These estimates are generally consistent with studies that have examined the quality of care in the United States across a range of settings and measures,⁴⁸ including studies that have relied on the NAMCS-derived quality indicators.^{21–26} Taken together, findings suggest substantial gaps in the quality of HC care.

Finally, although caution should be exercised when interpreting the variance decomposition results, they suggest the presence of considerable variation in care that was better explained by differences among patients than differences across practitioners or HCs. This could signal the presence of unobservable or inadequately controlled patient characteristics. A study by Tyo et al⁴⁹ raised this same issue and argued for improved risk-adjustment methods to adequately control patient heterogeneity especially when outcomes are used for performance-based payments. At the same time, results from a study by Selby et al⁵⁰ suggest that quality improvement remains possible even when the relative proportion of variance at the practitioner level and/or facility level is small. So although statistical tools can certainly be improved, practitioners and providers should not let low proportional variance discourage them from achieving higher value nor should policymakers be deterred from incentivizing it.

CONCLUSIONS

Under the Affordable Care Act, the role of HCs will continue to expand and these providers' dependence on NPs and PAs will grow. Although evidence of the equivalence of NPs, PAs, and PCMDs has been substantiated in physician offices and hospital-based clinics, until this point, findings could not be generalized to HCs. By isolating visits made to NPs, PAs, and PCMDs and estimating the differential impact of being seen by each practitioner type on a variety of out-

comes, our findings extend what is known about the equivalence of these clinicians to HCs and inform decision makers about the real-world consequences of increasing the share of NP-delivered and PA-delivered care in this setting.

REFERENCES

- Doty MM, Abrams MK, Hernandez SE, et al. *Enhancing the Capacity of Community Health Centers to Achieve High Performance: Findings From the 2009 Commonwealth Fund National Survey of Federally Qualified Health Centers*. New York, NY: Commonwealth Fund; 2010.
- Katz A, Felland LE, Hill I, et al. *A Long and Winding Road: Federally Qualified Health Centers, Community Variation and Prospects Under Reform*. Washington, DC: Center for Studying Health System Change; 2011.
- Ku LC, Richard P, Dor A, et al. *Strengthening Primary Care to Bend the Cost Curve: The Expansion of Community Health Centers Through Health Reform Policy Research Brief No 19*. Washington, DC: Geiger Gibson/RCHN Community Health Foundation Research Collaborative; 2010.
- Hing E, Hooker RS, Ashman JJ. Primary health care in community health centers and comparison with office-based practice. *J Community Health*. 2011;36:406–413.
- Morgan P, Everett C, Hing E. Nurse practitioners, physician assistants, and physicians in community health centers, 2006–2010. *Healthcare*. 2014;3:102–107.
- Proser M, Bysshe T, Weaver D, et al. Community health centers at the crossroads: growth and staffing needs. *JAAPA*. 2015;28:49–53.
- Kaiser Family Foundation (KFF). *Improving Access to Adult Primary Care in Medicaid: Exploring the Potential Role of Nurse Practitioners and Physician Assistants*. Washington, DC: KFF; 2011.
- Atwater A, Bednar S, Hassman D, et al. Nurse practitioners and physician assistants in primary care. *Dis Mon*. 2008;54:728–744.
- Hogan A, Roberts B. Occupational employment projections to 2024. *Mon Labor Rev*. 2015;138:1. Available at: <http://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2015/article/occupational-employment-projections-to-2024.htm>.
- Day LW, Siao D, Inadomi JM, et al. Non-physician performance of lower and upper endoscopy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Endoscopy*. 2014;46:401–410.
- Mafi JN, Wee CC, Davis RB, et al. Comparing use of low-value health care services among US advanced practice clinicians and physicians. *Ann Intern Med*. 2016;165:237–244.

12. Ohman-Strickland PA, Orzano AJ, Hudson SV, et al. Quality of diabetes care in family medicine practices: influence of nurse-practitioners and physician's assistants. *Ann Fam Med*. 2008;6:14–22.
13. Roblin DW, Becker ER, Adams EK, et al. Patient satisfaction with primary care: does type of practitioner matter? *Med Care*. 2004;42:579–590.
14. Subramanian U, Kerr EA, Klamerus M, et al. Treatment decisions for complex patients: differences between primary care physicians and mid-level providers. *Am J Manag Care*. 2009;15:373.
15. Wilson IB, Landon BE, Hirschhorn LR, et al. Quality of HIV care provided by nurse practitioners, physician assistants, and physicians. *Ann Intern Med*. 2005;143:729–736.
16. US Department of Health & Human Services, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). Federally Qualified Health Center. 2016. Available at: <http://www.cms.gov/Outreach-and-Education/Medicare-Learning-Network-MLN/MLNProducts/downloads/fqhcfactsheet.pdf>. Accessed December 9, 2016.
17. Poghosyan L, Aiken LH. Maximizing nurse practitioners' contributions to primary care through organizational changes. *J Ambul Care Manag*. 2015;38:109–117.
18. Poghosyan L, Nannini A, Stone PW, et al. Nurse practitioner organizational climate in primary care settings: implications for professional practice. *J Prof Nurs*. 2013;29:338–349.
19. Morgan P, Everett C, Hing E. Time spent with patients by physicians, nurse practitioners, and physician assistants in community health centers, 2006–2010. *Healthcare*. 2014;2:232–237.
20. US Department of Health & Human Services, National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). NAMCS Micro-data File Documentation. 2006–2010. Available at: ftp://ftp.cdc.gov/pub/Health_Statistics/NCHS/Dataset_Documentation/NAMCS/. Accessed December 9, 2016.
21. Bishop TF, Federman AD, Ross JS. Association between physician quality improvement incentives and ambulatory quality measures. *Am J Manag Care*. 2012;18:e126–e134.
22. Chen LM, Farwell WR, Jha AK. Primary care visit duration and quality: does good care take longer? *Arch Intern Med*. 2009;169:1866–1872.
23. Goldman LE, Chu PW, Tran H, et al. Federally Qualified Health Centers and private practice performance on ambulatory care measures. *Am J Prev Med*. 2012;43:142–149.
24. Ma J, Stafford RS. Quality of US outpatient care: temporal changes and racial/ethnic disparities. *Arch Intern Med*. 2005;165:1354–1361.
25. Ma J, Xiao L, Stafford RS. Adult obesity and office-based quality of care in the United States. *Obesity*. 2009;17:1077–1085.
26. Romano MJ, Stafford RS. Electronic health records and clinical decision support systems: impact on national ambulatory care quality. *Arch Intern Med*. 2011;171:897–903.
27. Frieden TR, Berwick DM. The “Million Hearts” initiative—preventing heart attacks and strokes. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;365:e27.
28. US Preventive Services Task Force. *Guide to Clinical Preventive Services*, 2nd ed. Baltimore, MD: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 1996.
29. Snow V, Lascher S, Mottur-Pilson C. Pharmacologic treatment of acute major depression and dysthymia: clinical guideline, part 1. *Ann Intern Med*. 2000;132:738–742.
30. Expert Panel on Detection. Executive summary of the Third Report of the National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) expert panel on detection, evaluation, and treatment of high blood cholesterol in adults (Adult Treatment Panel III). *JAMA*. 2001;285:2486.
31. Institute of Medicine (IOM). *Primary Care: America's Health in a New Era*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 1996.
32. Kurtzman ET, Barnow BS, Johnson JE, et al. Does the regulatory environment affect nurse practitioners' patterns of practice or quality of care in health centers? *Health Serv Res*. 2017;52(1pt2):437–458.
33. Lewis T, Goldberg E, Schenker N, et al. The relative impacts of design effects and multiple imputation on variance estimates: a case study with the 2008 National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey. *J Off Stat*. 2014;30:147–161.
34. Korn EL, Graubard BI. Examples of differing weighted and unweighted estimates from a sample survey. *Am Stat*. 1995;49:291–295.
35. Heeringa SG, West BT, Berglund PA. *Applied Survey Data Analysis*. Boca Raton, FL: Chapman & Hall; 2010.
36. Bertolet M, Seltman H, Greenhouse JB, et al. *National Survey of Adolescent Well-Being (NSAW): A Comparison of Model and Design Based Analyses of Cognitive Stimulation Scores*. Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Mellon University; 2003.
37. StataCorp LLP. *Stata/SE Version 121 [Computer Software]*. College Station, TX: Stata Corp LLP; 2011.
38. Scientific Software International (SSI). *Hierarchical Linear and Non-Linear Modeling (HLM) Version 701 [Computer Software]*. Lincolnwood, IL: SSI; 2011.
39. Solon G, Haider SJ, Wooldridge J. *What Are We Weighting For? (No w18859)*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research; 2013.
40. Bradley EH, Herrin J, Mattera JA, et al. Quality improvement efforts and hospital performance: rates of beta-blocker prescription after acute myocardial infarction. *Med Care*. 2005;43:282–292.
41. Jencks SF, Cuerdon T, Burwen DR, et al. Quality of medical care delivered to Medicare beneficiaries: a profile at state and national levels. *JAMA*. 2003;284:1670–1676.
42. Kachan D, Tannenbaum SL, Olano HA, et al. Geographical variation in health-related quality of life among older US adults, 1997–2010. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2014;11:E110.
43. Lund BC, Charlton ME, Steinman MA, et al. Regional differences in prescribing quality among elder veterans and the impact of rural residence. *J Rural Health*. 2013;29:172–179.
44. Zarkowsky DS, Hicks CW, Arhuidese I, et al. Quality improvement targets for regional variation in surgical end-stage renal disease care. *JAMA Surg*. 2015;150:764–770.
45. Rosenblatt RA, Andrilla CH, Curtin T, et al. Shortages of medical personnel at community health centers: implications for planned expansion. *JAMA*. 2006;295:1042–1049.
46. Berwick DM, Nolan TW, Whittington J. The triple aim: care, health, and cost. *Health Aff*. 2008;27:759–769.
47. Roblin DW, Howard DH, Becker ER, et al. Use of midlevel practitioners to achieve labor cost savings in the primary care practice of an MCO. *Health Serv Res*. 2004;39:607–626.
48. McGlynn EA, Asch SM, Adams J, et al. The quality of health care delivered to adults in the United States. *N Engl J Med*. 2003;348:2635–2645.
49. Tyo KR, Gurewich D, Shepard DS. Methodological challenges of measuring primary care delivery to pediatric Medicaid beneficiaries who use community health centers. *Am J Public Health*. 2013;103:273–275.
50. Selby JV, Schmittiel JA, Lee J, et al. Meaningful variation in performance: what does variation in quality tell us about improving quality? *Med Care*. 2010;48:133–139.

Health Affairs

At the Intersection of Health, Health Care and Policy

Cite this article as:

Christine Everett, Carolyn Thorpe, Mari Palta, Pascale Carayon, Christie Bartels and
Maureen A. Smith

Physician Assistants And Nurse Practitioners Perform Effective Roles On Teams
Caring For Medicare Patients With Diabetes

Health Affairs, 32, no.11 (2013):1942-1948

doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.2013.0506

The online version of this article, along with updated information and services, is
available at:

<http://content.healthaffairs.org/content/32/11/1942.full.html>

For Reprints, Links & Permissions:

http://healthaffairs.org/1340_reprints.php

E-mail Alerts : <http://content.healthaffairs.org/subscriptions/etoc.dtl>

To Subscribe: <http://content.healthaffairs.org/subscriptions/online.shtml>

Health Affairs is published monthly by Project HOPE at 7500 Old Georgetown Road, Suite 600, Bethesda, MD 20814-6133. Copyright © 2013 by Project HOPE - The People-to-People Health Foundation. As provided by United States copyright law (Title 17, U.S. Code), no part of *Health Affairs* may be reproduced, displayed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying or by information storage or retrieval systems, without prior written permission from the Publisher. All rights reserved.

Not for commercial use or unauthorized distribution

By Christine Everett, Carolyn Thorpe, Mari Palta, Pascale Carayon, Christie Bartels, and Maureen A. Smith

DOI: 10.1377/hlthaff.2013.0506
HEALTH AFFAIRS 32,
NO. 11 (2013): 1942–1948
©2013 Project HOPE—
The People-to-People Health
Foundation, Inc.

Physician Assistants And Nurse Practitioners Perform Effective Roles On Teams Caring For Medicare Patients With Diabetes

Christine Everett (christine.everett@duke.edu) is an assistant professor in the Physician Assistant Program, Department of Community and Family Medicine, Duke University School of Medicine, in Durham, North Carolina.

Carolyn Thorpe is a core investigator at the Center for Health Equity Research and Promotion, Veterans Affairs Pittsburgh Healthcare System, and an assistant professor of pharmacy and therapeutics at the School of Pharmacy, University of Pittsburgh, in Pennsylvania.

Mari Palta is a professor of population health sciences at the University of Wisconsin–Madison.

Pascale Carayon is a professor of industrial and systems engineering at the University of Wisconsin–Madison.

Christie Bartels is an assistant professor in the Department of Medicine at the University of Wisconsin–Madison.

Maureen A. Smith is a professor of population health sciences, family medicine, and surgery at the University of Wisconsin–Madison.

ABSTRACT One approach to the patient-centered medical home, particularly for patients with chronic illnesses, is to include physician assistants (PAs) and nurse practitioners (NPs) on primary care teams. Using Medicare claims and electronic health record data from a large physician group, we compared outcomes for two groups of adult Medicare patients with diabetes whose conditions were at various levels of complexity: those whose care teams included PAs or NPs in various roles, and those who received care from physicians only. Outcomes were generally equivalent in thirteen comparisons. In four comparisons, outcomes were superior for the patients receiving care from PAs or NPs, but in three other comparisons the outcomes were superior for patients receiving care from physicians only. Specific roles performed by PAs and NPs were associated with different patterns in the measure of the quality of diabetes care and use of health care services. No role was best for all outcomes. Our findings suggest that patient characteristics, as well as patients' and organizations' goals, should be considered when determining when and how to deploy PAs and NPs on primary care teams. Accordingly, training and policy should continue to support role flexibility for these health professionals.

The implementation of team-based care is considered essential to the redesign of the fragmented and inefficient US health care system.¹ Patients with chronic illnesses are especially likely to experience costly care with suboptimal access and quality.² Patient-centered medical homes aim to improve care delivery through coordinated clinician teams with common goals and defined roles.^{3,4} Team-based care involving physician assistants (PAs) and nurse practitioners (NPs) is one recommended strategy for improving chronic illness care in the patient-centered medical home.⁵

Evidence is limited regarding the effectiveness of primary care PAs and NPs in managing chronic disease. Studies in this area typically examine

patients with diabetes because it is a prevalent condition, the patient population has a range of clinical complexity, and PAs and NPs commonly participate in care delivery for these patients.^{5–7}

Three studies have reported that diabetes control is similar for patients treated by PAs or NPs and for those treated by physicians.^{8–10} However, other studies have demonstrated improvements in diabetes control when NPs are involved in patient care.^{11,12} Hence, the evidence generally supports the involvement of PAs and NPs in diabetes care but provides limited understanding of appropriate team-based roles.

The variation in study findings may be partly explained by the range of roles these professionals perform. It is estimated that they can perform 85–90 percent of the primary care services that

are traditionally provided by physicians.¹³ Although PAs and NPs are trained to provide a similar range of primary care services, their individual roles are negotiated with collaborating physicians and, therefore, vary considerably across and within settings.^{14,15}

The team roles of primary care PAs and NPs can be defined according to the following three dimensions: level of involvement (usual provider, supplemental provider, or no participation), type of patient care provided (chronic care or other care), and patient complexity (in other words, the number and type of medical conditions for a given patient). How primary care roles for PAs and NPs are implemented may reflect the priorities that each practice gives to different goals.¹⁶

For example, patient-centered medical homes may employ primary care PAs and NPs to perform a supplemental role, such as chronic disease management,¹² if the practice's highest priority is to improve its quality measures. Although the role of a PA or NP may meet a practice's primary goals, the role may also have unintended consequences for other aspects of care. Thus, it is necessary to understand the impact of team members' roles on a variety of outcomes.

To date, no study has compared the effectiveness of a range of PA and NP roles to the effectiveness of physician-only care for patients with chronic illness. Using data for Medicare patients with diabetes treated in a single multispecialty physician group, we evaluated the impact of primary care roles for PAs and NPs on the quality of diabetes care and the use of health services.

Our findings failed to identify an optimal role for PAs and NPs in the team-based care of diabetes patients. However, the results tend to confirm that there are a variety of potentially effective roles. Determining when and how to place PAs and NPs on teams may require the consideration of situation-specific goals and local factors such as patients' characteristics.

Study Data And Methods

DATA The providers and patients in the study were associated with a large midwestern multispecialty physician group. Organizational policies regarding payment and practice differed across clinicians in 2008, the time of the study. Physicians received salaries with bonuses for increased productivity, but PAs and NPs received only salaries. PAs and NPs shared a single job description and were prohibited from being the named, usual provider of primary care.

Our results are based on visits delivered by 210 attending physicians, 24 physician assistants, 28

nurse practitioners, and 51 resident physicians in thirty-two internal medicine, family practice, and geriatric clinics. Some of the clinics were in urban locations, and others were in rural locations, but they were all in the same county. The Minimal Risk Institutional Review Board approved this study with a waiver of the authorization required by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) of 1996. (See the online Appendix for full details on all aspects of our data and methods.)¹⁷

METHODS Medicare data were linked to the provider group's electronic health records. We identified 2,576 Medicare patients ages 23–102 with diabetes managed by the provider group in 2008. We identified patient panels by determining which provider each patient saw most frequently, and we grouped patients according to this “usual” provider (physician, physician assistant, or nurse practitioner).

We measured the quality of diabetes care by the receipt of two or more hemoglobin A1c tests in the year and the mean HbA1c (an indicator of glycemic control). Mean HbA1c was categorized according to clinical guidelines in the following way: good, or less than 7.0 percent (reference group); fair, or 7.0–9.0 percent; and poor, or more than 9.0 percent.

Two outcomes of the use of health services were examined.¹⁸ First, we used a high number of emergency department (ED) visits as an indicator of limited access to primary care and of costly use of services.¹⁹ Second, we used the number of hospitalizations as an indicator of the quality and cost of primary care.²⁰

The role of the physician assistant or nurse practitioner was defined according to the following three factors: level of involvement, patient complexity, and whether or not the physician assistant or nurse practitioner delivered chronic care (Exhibit 1). *Highly complex patients* were defined according to the Johns Hopkins Ambulatory Care Group System Predictive Model.²¹ This model produces a patient risk score based on previous use and diagnoses to predict the use of health care resources in the future. Panels with PAs or NPs as supplemental providers that provided care to at least one patient with a risk score of 2.0 or greater (that is, twice the average predicted use of services for older patients) were categorized as providing care to highly complex patients.

The roles of PAs and NPs were combined in this study for several reasons. First, the primary care job descriptions were the same for both professions in the physician group under study. Second, in most states the members of both professions were required to work in a team with physicians as collaborators or supervisors.

EXHIBIT 1

The Influence Of Primary Care Physician Assistant (PA) And Nurse Practitioner (NP) Roles On Outcomes Of 2,576 Adult Medicare Patients With Diabetes, 2008

PA or NP role		Patients		Patient outcomes			
Treat highly complex patients?	Deliver chronic care?	Number	Percent	2 or more HbA1c tests	Glycemic control	Number of ED visits	Number of hospitalizations
SUPPLEMENTAL ROLE^a							
No	Yes	412	16	+	=	=	=
No	No	154	6	=	+	+	=
Yes	Yes	736	29	=	+	=	-
Yes	No	138	5	=	-	=	=
USUAL PROVIDER^b							
Yes and no ^c	Yes	127	5	=	=	-	=

SOURCE Authors' analysis of physician group electronic health data linked with Medicare claims. **NOTES** The reference category was no role for PAs and NPs, with care provided by physicians only. This category included 1,009 patients (39 percent). The patients were ages 23–102. Results were adjusted for patients' sociodemographic variables (age, race, Medicaid dual eligible status, and disability entitlement), clinical characteristics (Ambulatory Care Group risk score [see Note 21 in text], sixteen medical conditions, and three diabetes complications), use of health care services (number of primary care visits; having one or more endocrinology visits; and, when appropriate, number of emergency department [ED] visits and hospitalizations), and characteristics of patient panel (specialty of the usual provider, number of patients on the panel, and percentage of women on the panel). All results were significant ($p \leq 0.05$). The plus symbol denotes better outcome than physician-only care. The equals symbol denotes equivalent outcome to physician-only care. The minus symbol denotes worse outcome than physician-only care. ^aPAs and NPs provided a minority of primary care. ^bPAs and NPs provided the majority of primary care. ^cWhen PAs or NPs performed usual provider roles, the majority of the panels (86 percent) did not involve highly complex patients.

Third, PAs and NPs provide similar primary care services.^{14,22} Despite differences in their philosophy and training, the scope—although not the distribution—of the services they deliver is similar.^{23,24} Observed differences in the distribution of service delivery in national studies may result from differences in geographic location, organizational characteristics, or roles within care teams, instead of differences in professional capacities.^{25–27}

To evaluate the relationship between patient outcomes and the roles of PAs and NPs, multivariable regression models were fit with all of the variables described in the notes to Exhibit 1. The type of regression model that we used reflected the outcome variable. Logistic regression was used to examine the receipt of two or more HbA1c tests, multinomial logistic regression was used to examine glycemic control, and negative binomial models were used to examine the number of ED visits and hospitalizations. Ninety-five percent confidence intervals were obtained using a robust estimate of the variance, taking into account clustering within clinics.

LIMITATIONS Our findings were based on a small subset of patients, which affects the interpretation and generalizability of our results. Adult Medicare patients with diabetes do not represent the entire primary care population, or even the entire population of patients with diabetes, and findings for this group may not be generalizable to patients in other groups. Similarly, the patients and providers in our study

were from a single organization with unique policies and characteristics, within a small geographic area, and with limited variation in patients' demographic characteristics.

Several methodological issues could affect the validity of the study. The assignment of roles to PAs and NPs was not random. The number of patients receiving care from a PA or NP in some roles was small, and the numbers of patients receiving care from those clinicians in different roles might differ. As a consequence, the results might be biased. Additional characteristics at the provider, team, and clinic levels also likely affected the results but were not considered in the study.

The study included only a sample of the physician group's primary care clinics. However, there are reasons to believe that the sampled clinics served a large and representative majority of the group's patients who would have met study inclusion criteria. The number of ED visits was used as a measure of access to primary care. However, that figure included all visits, not just those for reasons that could have been addressed in a primary care clinic during normal business hours. (See the Limitations section of the Appendix for a fuller discussion of limitations.)¹⁷

Study Results

Data were available on 2,576 patients with a mean age of seventy-two. Ninety-one percent

were white, and 55 percent were female (Exhibit 2). The mean risk score was 1.5, indicating a 50 percent higher predicted use of health care services than that of the average older patient (Appendix Exhibit 1).¹⁷

There were 261 primary care panels. Fifty-five percent of them had PAs or NPs providing care, and in these panels an average of 24 percent of visits were to these clinicians. For 39 percent of patients, only physicians provided care (Exhibit 1). For only 5 percent of patients was the usual provider a PA or NP. Sixty-two percent of patients received two or more HbA1c tests, and 50 percent had good glycemic control. The mean number of ED visits and hospitalizations was less than one (Appendix Exhibit 2).¹⁷

Patients received different quality of diabetes care depending on whether they received care from a physician only or also from a PA or NP (Exhibit 1). Compared to patients who received care from a physician only, patients with supplemental PAs or NPs who did not treat highly complex patients but who did provide chronic care were more likely to receive two or more outpatient HbA1c tests (odds ratio: 1.4; 95% confidence interval: 1.05, 1.82) (Appendix Exhibit 3).¹⁷

The associations between PA or NP role and glycemic control demonstrated a different pattern. Compared to patients who received care from physicians only, patients with supplemental PAs or NPs who did not treat highly complex patients and did not deliver chronic care had only 0.46 times the odds (95% CI: 0.22, 0.97) of having poor versus good glycemic control. Patients with supplemental PAs or NPs who did treat highly complex patients but did not deliver chronic care had 1.8 times the odds (95% CI: 1.21, 2.67) of having poor versus good glycemic control. Patients with supplemental PAs or NPs who both treated highly complex patients and delivered chronic care had 0.70 times the odds (95% CI: 0.59, 0.84) of having fair compared to good glycemic control (Appendix Exhibit 4).¹⁷

The association between the role of PAs and NPs and use of health care services demonstrated yet another pattern (Exhibit 1). Compared to patients receiving physician-only care, patients with supplemental PAs or NPs who did not treat highly complex patients and did not deliver chronic care experienced a 0.7 times lower rate of ED visits (95% CI: 0.56, 0.93). In contrast, patients with PAs or NPs in usual provider roles experienced a 1.5 times higher rate (95% CI: 1.06, 2.03) (Appendix Exhibit 5).¹⁷ Patients with supplemental PAs or NPs who both treated highly complex patients and delivered chronic care experienced higher hospitalization rates (inci-

dence rate ratio: 1.2; 95% CI: 1.05, 1.47) (Appendix Exhibit 6).¹⁷

Overall, the comparisons of outcomes for patients whose care teams included PAs or NPs in any role and outcomes for patients receiving care only from physicians revealed equivalent results in thirteen out of twenty cases (Exhibit 1). PA or NP roles were associated with better outcomes than physician-only care in four cases and with worse outcomes in three cases.

Discussion

Findings from this and previous studies offer evidence that PAs and NPs can fill a range of

EXHIBIT 2

Characteristics Of 2,576 Adult Medicare Patients With Diabetes, 2008

Characteristic	Percent
Medicaid	16.1
Entitlement due to disability	19.3
AGE (YEARS)^a	
Less than 50	5.0
50-59	7.2
60-69	20.7
70-79	41.4
80 or older	25.8
RACE OR ETHNICITY	
White	91.3
Black	5.1
Other	3.7
SEX	
Female	54.9
COMORBID CONDITIONS	
Ambulatory Care Group risk score, mean ^b	1.5
Ambulatory Care Group chronic condition count, mean ^c	5.2
Cardiovascular disease	
None	47.2
Ischemic heart disease only	23.5
Congestive heart failure	29.3
Hypertension	82.5
Chronic kidney disease or end-stage renal disease	22.7
Stroke or transient ischemic attack	8.3
Obesity	21.6
Depression	22.3
Dementia	8.7
DIABETES COMPLICATIONS	
Ulcers	11.9
Amputation	1.5
Eye disease	21.6
Peripheral vascular disease	36.6

SOURCE Authors' analysis of physician group electronic health data linked with Medicare claims.

NOTES The patients were ages 23-102. Percentages may not sum to 100 because of rounding. Ambulatory Care Group is the Johns Hopkins Adjusted Clinical Groups case-mix system (see Note 21 in text). ^aMean age: 72. Standard deviation: 11. ^bStandard deviation: 1.0. The risk score is relative to the average predicted use of older adult populations. Values can range from numbers approaching zero (healthy people without diagnosed diseases) to 20 or higher (patients with many diagnosed diseases). A risk score of 1.5 represents a 50 percent increase in predicted use compared to that of the average older adult population. ^cStandard deviation: 3.2.

roles on primary care teams, even for older patients with clinically challenging conditions such as diabetes.^{8-12,28} However, selecting an appropriate role for these clinicians may require consideration of context-specific factors. In particular, organizations may need to prioritize patient and organization goals, as well as consider the characteristics of the population served. Therefore, implementing primary care teams and evaluating their impact on outcomes may require a nuanced understanding and balancing of a range of local factors.

Including PAs and NPs in a variety of roles on primary care teams within a single organization resulted in encouraging outcomes more often than not. Adult patients with diabetes on panels with PAs or NPs in any role did the same or better on most outcome measurements than patients receiving physician-only care (Exhibit 1). They did worse on only a few measurements. Given the anticipated increase in demand for services and the expected shortage of primary care physicians, findings from this and past studies suggest that primary care teams including PAs or NPs could be designed to meet at least some goals for improving the quality and cost of care or access to it.

Overall, the findings suggest that local factors, including the characteristics of patients served and which goals are a high priority, may be important considerations when selecting roles for PAs and NPs. No single role was consistently associated with the best outcomes on all measures (Exhibit 1). The complexity of the patients served appeared to influence the patterns of patients' outcomes.

This may explain some of the variation in findings across previous studies of the effectiveness of PAs and NPs in diabetes care. Patients with supplemental PAs or NPs who did not treat highly complex patients consistently experienced similar or better outcomes, compared to patients receiving physician-only care. In contrast, patients with supplemental PAs or NPs who did treat highly complex patients experienced several worse outcomes, again compared to patients receiving physician-only care.

This raises the question of whether a team approach that divides primary care delivery between clinicians would work for all patient populations, particularly the most clinically complex patients. Such patients may be best served through a continuous relationship with a single primary care clinician.²⁹

The selection of a role for PAs and NPs on a primary care team may also require the prioritization of goals, as noted above.¹⁶ Improving quality and access while reducing costs is important, but it may not be feasible for a single feature of a

practice redesign to accomplish all three goals. For example, if the primary goal is more frequent testing of glycemic control, then the addition of supplemental PAs or NPs who do not treat highly complex patients but who do deliver care for chronic conditions might be appropriate. However, such a design might not reduce ED visits, at least in the short term.

Alternatively, an organization might have rural clinics that are faced with a shortage of physicians. In such cases, including a PA or NP on the primary care team as a usual provider could alleviate that shortage, but it also has the potential to indirectly increase costs through greater use of the ED. To be able to weigh the costs and benefits of each potential approach, organizations need population-based evaluations of multiple outcomes.

Perhaps the most important contribution of this study is to suggest that determining the best roles and primary care team designs will require an even more nuanced approach than that taken in the current analysis. The present study, which examined a single organization, could not evaluate a variety of potentially important factors that tend to vary among organizations and populations.³⁰

One organizational policy example is the influence of clinician payment practices.³¹ The organization in the study paid physicians based on the volume of services they delivered, and it paid PAs and NPs a salary. Such differences and others may influence how patients and services are divided across provider types, and ultimately they may also influence access to and the quality and cost of care. In the absence of multi-organization studies, each organization must make its own evidence-based decisions about the implementation of primary care teams. This also suggests that it will be challenging to determine on the national level what is the optimal workforce to deliver care within a team setting.

Policy Implications

This attempt to meet the challenge of identifying appropriate roles for primary care team members such as PAs and NPs highlights several points relevant to policy makers. The capacity of these clinicians to fill a variety of roles argues for increased support for new and existing state and federal policies that encourage flexible approaches to provider roles and team design.

Additional funding for programs that encourage generalist training in education programs for PAs and NPs would produce additional clinicians capable of filling a variety of roles. Policies that encouraged novel approaches to reimbursing team-based care and approaches that were

In an era of health system redesign, team-based care is frequently offered as a solution.

applicable to a range of possible professional roles would encourage innovative team designs. Finally, policies encouraging the collection of additional population, organizational, team, and provider information in accountable care and patient-centered medical home demonstrations or evaluations could help identify additional factors that could influence the implementation of roles for primary care team members such as PAs and NPs and, ultimately, could influence patient outcomes.

Conclusion

In an era of health system redesign where the goals are improved access, better quality of care, and reduced costs, team-based care is frequently offered as a solution. Although the results presented here generally support the contention that physician assistants and nurse practitioners can perform a range of effective roles on primary care teams, the findings also indicate that there may be notable exceptions. This suggests that the implementation of roles for primary care team members such as PAs and NPs may require thoughtful consideration of local factors such as the population served and identified goals.

Our findings suggest that policies related to system redesign and to workforce development and deployment should preserve the capacity for flexibility in team implementation and role definition. This would allow for innovative approaches to addressing workforce constraints and provide the opportunity to identify additional factors that might influence team design, role implementation, and the full complement of relevant outcomes. ■

This material was presented at IMPACT, the American Academy of Physician Assistants' 2013 Physician Assistant Conference, in Washington, D.C., May 2013. Funding for this project was provided by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (Grant Nos. R21 HS017646 and R01 HS018368). Additional support was provided by the Health Innovation Program by providing assistance with Institutional Review Board application, Medicare data management, creation of variables, and manuscript formatting; the Community-Academic Partnerships core of the University of Wisconsin Institute for

Clinical and Translational Research (Grant No. UL1TR000427 from the Clinical and Translational Science Award program of the National Institutes of Health's National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences); and the University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health from the Wisconsin Partnership Program, which provided funding to the Health Innovation Program. Christine Everett was supported by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality/National Research Service Award T32 Institutional Training Program (Grant No. 5-T32-HS00083) and the American

Academy of Physician Assistants Breitman-Dorn Fellowship. Christie Bartels was supported by the National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases (Grant No. K23 AR062381-01). No other funding source had a role in the design or conduct; data collection, management, analysis or interpretation; or preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript. The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institutes of Health, Department of Veterans Affairs, or the US government.

NOTES

- 1 Institute of Medicine. Crossing the quality chasm: a new health system for the 21st century. Washington (DC): National Academies Press; 2001.
- 2 McGlynn EA, Asch SM, Adams J, Keesey J, Hicks J, Decristofaro A, et al. The quality of health care delivered to adults in the United States. *N Engl J Med.* 2003;348(26):2635-45.
- 3 Rittenhouse DR, Shortell SM, Fisher ES. Primary care and accountable care—two essential elements of delivery-system reform. *N Engl J Med.* 2009;361(24):2301-3.
- 4 Salas E, Cooke NJ, Rosen M. On teams, teamwork, and team performance: discoveries and developments. *Hum Factors.* 2008;50(3):540-7.
- 5 Yarnall KS, Østbye T, Krause KM, Pollak KI, Gradison M, Michener JL. Family physicians as team leaders: "time" to share the care. *Prev Chronic Dis.* 2009;6(2):A59.
- 6 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National diabetes fact sheet, 2011 [Internet]. Atlanta (GA): CDC; 2011 [cited 2013 Oct 7]. Available from: http://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/pubs/pdf/ndfs_2011.pdf
- 7 Østbye T, Yarnall KS, Krause KM, Pollak KI, Gradison M, Michener JL. Is there time for management of patients with chronic diseases in primary care? *Ann Fam Med.* 2005;3(3):209-14.
- 8 Federman DG, Krishnamurthy R, Cancir S, Goulet J, Justice A. Relationship between provider type and the attainment of treatment goals in primary care. *Am J Manag Care.* 2005;11(9):561-6.
- 9 Mundinger MO, Kane RL, Lenz ER, Totten AM, Tsai WY, Cleary PD, et al. Primary care outcomes in patients treated by nurse practitioners or physicians: a randomized trial. *JAMA.* 2000;283(1):59-68.
- 10 Ohman-Strickland PA, Orzano AJ, Hudson SV, Solberg LI, DiCiccio-Bloom B, O'Malley D, et al. Quality of diabetes care in family medicine practices: influence of nurse-practitioners and physician's assistants. *Ann Fam Med.* 2008;6(1):14-22.
- 11 Jackson GL, Lee S-YD, Edelman D, Weinberger M, Yano EM. Employment of mid-level providers

- in primary care and control of diabetes. *Prim Care Diabetes*. 2011; 5(1):25–31.
- 12 Litaker D, Mion L, Planavsky L, Kippes C, Mehta N, Frolkis J. Physician-nurse practitioner teams in chronic disease management: the impact on costs, clinical effectiveness, and patients' perception of care. *J Interprof Care*. 2003;17(3): 223–37.
 - 13 Hooker RS, Cawley JF, Leinweber W. Career flexibility of physician assistants and the potential for more primary care. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2010;29(5):880–6.
 - 14 Hooker RS, McCaig LF. Use of physician assistants and nurse practitioners in primary care, 1995–1999. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2001;20(4): 231–8.
 - 15 Hooker RS, Everett CM. The contributions of physician assistants in primary care systems. *Health Soc Care Community*. 2012;20(1):20–31.
 - 16 Bosch M, Faber MJ, Cruijsberg J, Voerman GE, Leatherman S, Grol RP, et al. Review article: effectiveness of patient care teams and the role of clinical expertise and coordination: a literature review. *Med Care Res Rev*. 2009;66(6 Suppl): 5S–35S.
 - 17 To access the Appendix, click on the Appendix link in the box to the right of the article online.
 - 18 Starfield B, Shi L, Macinko J. Contribution of primary care to health systems and health. *Milbank Q*. 2005;83(3):457–502.
 - 19 Oster A, Bindman AB. Emergency department visits for ambulatory care sensitive conditions: insights into preventable hospitalizations. *Med Care*. 2003;41(2):198–207.
 - 20 Fleming ST. Primary care, avoidable hospitalization, and outcomes of care: a literature review and methodological approach. *Med Care Res Rev*. 1995;52(1):88–108.
 - 21 Starfield B, Mumford L, Steinwachs D. Ambulatory care groups: a categorization of diagnoses for research and management. *Health Serv Res*. 1991;26(1):53–74.
 - 22 Hooker RS. Physician assistants and nurse practitioners: the United States experience. *Med J Aust*. 2006;185(1):4–7.
 - 23 Hing E, Hooker RS, Ashman JJ. Primary health care in community health centers and comparisons with office-based practice. *J Community Health*. 2011;36(3):406–13.
 - 24 Morgan PA, Shah ND, Kaufman JS, Albanese MA. Impact of physician assistant care on office visit resource use in the United States. *Health Serv Res*. 2008;43(5 Pt 2):1906–22.
 - 25 Aparasu RR, Hegge M. Autonomous ambulatory care by nurse practitioners and physician assistants in office-based settings. *J Allied Health*. 2001;30(3):153–9.
 - 26 Mills AC, McSweeney M. Nurse practitioners and physician assistants revisited: do their practice patterns differ in ambulatory care? *J Prof Nurs*. 2002;18(1):36–46.
 - 27 Everett CM, Thorpe CT, Palta M, Carayon P, Gilchrist VJ, Smith MA. Division of primary care services between physicians, physician assistants, and nurse practitioners for older patients with diabetes. *Med Care Res Rev*. 2013;70(5):531–41.
 - 28 Lenz ER, Mundinger MO, Hopkins SC, Lin SX, Smolowitz JL. Diabetes care processes and outcomes in patients treated by nurse practitioners or physicians. *Diabetes Educ*. 2002;28(4):590–8.
 - 29 Grumbach K. Chronic illness, comorbidities, and the need for medical generalism. *Ann Fam Med*. 2003;1(1):4–7.
 - 30 Campion MA, Medsker GJ, Higgs AC. Relations between work group characteristics and effectiveness: implications for designing effective work groups. *Pers Psychol*. 1993; 46(4):823–47.
 - 31 Chaix-Couturier C, Durand-Zaleski I, Jolly D, Durieux P. Effects of financial incentives on medical practice: results from a systematic review of the literature and methodological issues. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2000;12(2):133–42.