

# Community Pharmacist Collaboration with a Patient Centered Medical Home: Establishment of a Patient-**Centered Medical Neighborhood and Payment Model**

### Background

- A patient-centered medical home (PCMH) is a patientcentered, comprehensive, team-based, and coordinated model of care with a focus on accessibility.
- Several studies demonstrate the positive impact on appropriate medication use and disease management when pharmacists are incorporated into a PCMH practice.
- However, funding the pharmacist's salary remains a challenge and PCMH's often rely on residents and shared faculty positions.
- One opportunity for pharmacist integration into PCMH practices is through the development of a patientcentered medical neighborhood with a community pharmacy.
- In a medical neighborhood, the PCMH coordinates care with other local specialty practices, known as patientcentered medical home neighbors (PCMH-N).
- A patient-centered medical neighborhood including a pharmacy may increase access to care as patients could receive services at both the PCMH office and the pharmacy.
- A community pharmacy practice serving as a PCMH-N is a novel approach.
- This project integrated a community pharmacist into an existing PCMH and developed a referral process to the community pharmacy for initial and/or follow-up medication therapy management (MTM) services.
- Additionally, we investigated the feasibility of a capitated payment model for reimbursement.

#### **Purpose and Objectives**

The objectives of this study were to determine the feasibility of a partnership between a community pharmacy and a PCMH and determine the impact on clinical outcomes.

## Acknowledgement

This project was funded in part by the Community Pharmacy Foundation.

- A collaboration was established between Kroger Pharmacy and one large, health-system PCMH in the Cincinnati area. • From January 2013-2014, a Kroger clinical pharmacist spent 4 hours, twice weekly in the PCMH.
- Physicians referred patients or the pharmacist reviewed charts to identify patients with uncontrolled conditions,  $\geq 3$  chronic medical conditions, or  $\geq 8$  medications.
- Pharmacists reviewed medications, discussed lifestyle modifications, provided handouts, and set SMART goals and documented interventions in the EMR.
- Follow-up appointments occurred either at the PCMH or the pharmacy based on patient preference.
- Practice Innovation:

  - measures.
- Evaluation:



Heidi R Luder, PharmD, MS, BCACP, Pam Shannon, RN, MEd, Stacey M Frede, PharmD, BCACP, CDE

#### Methods

• The Cincinnati-Dayton region participates in the Comprehensive Primary Care Initiative (CPCI).

• PCMH offices receive shared savings based on performance on Accountable Care Organization (ACO) quality

• Kroger and the PCMH office contracted to receive payment on a capitated model of a defined fee per patient pe month for an estimated 1,000 high risk patients to help achieve quality measures.

• Office-level outcomes were measured pre and post the start date and compared to a control group with similar baseline clinical outcomes using a chi square test.

• A retrospective review of patient-level data was analyzed using a paired t-test.

• SPSS version 22 was used for analysis and this study was approved by the University of Cincinnati IRB.

Kesuits								
ral	Aggregate Office-level Outcomes <sup>+</sup>							
			Pre	Post	p-value			
	A1c	Patients < 7%	457/1014 (45.1)	516/1188 (43.4)	0.441			
52%	BP	Number of patients with controlled BP*	1587/2664 (59.6)	1746/2951 (59.2)	0.757			
	Lipids	Total Cholesterol <200	1948/3491 (55.8)	2161/3769 (57.3)	0.187			
		LDL <100	1387/3491 (39.7)	1535/3769 (40.7)	0.387			
		HDL ≥40	2208/3491 (63.3)	2362/3769 (62.7)	0.609			
v n		Triglycerides <150	1854/3491 (53.1)	1993/3769 (52.9)	0.845			
ounseling		Lipid panel in 6 months	1811/2492 (72.7)	1899/2721 (69.8)	0.022			
ertension		Influenza	1611/6602 (24.4)	2096/7448 (28.1)	< 0.001			
า	Vaccines	Eligible Pneumococcal	1631/1875 (87.0)	1779/2084 (85.4)	0.14			

#### Poculto

\* BP <140/90, or <130/90 in diabetes or CKD, + There were no differences in the control group from pre to post intervention.



	Results								
	Reasons for Pharmacist Interventions								
	6, 6% 7, 7% 8, 8% 8, 8% 14, 13%	28, 27% 14, 13% 14, 13%	<ul> <li>Needs additional drug therapy</li> <li>Unnecessary therapy</li> <li>Insufficient dose/duration</li> <li>Cost-Efficacy</li> <li>Suboptimal drug</li> <li>Lifestyle modification</li> <li>Underuse</li> <li>Excessive dose/duration</li> <li>Administration/technique</li> </ul>						
nor	Patient-level Outcomes								
ber		Pre (Mean, SD)	Post (Mean, SD)	p-value					
	A1C (n=41)	8.7% (1.56)	7.8% (2.04)	0.002					
r	Systolic BP (n=12)	145 mmHg (22.65)	127mmHg (8.49)	0.014					
	Diastolic BP (n=12)	77mmHg (13.80)	76mmHg (9.17)	0.751					
	LDL (n=8)	101 mg/dL (45.79)	88mg/dL (22.63)	0.212					
	Weight (n=23)	112.11kg (22.56)	110 kg (22.78)	0.124					
e	Discussion								
	<ul> <li>This project showcases a successful partnership between a community pharmacy and a physician's office.</li> <li>The PCMH office is currently still contracted with Kroger Pharmacy using the same payment model.</li> <li>The pharmacist is now in the office only 4 hours per week, but continues to follow-up with patients at the pharmacy.</li> <li>Office-level outcomes were not substantially changed, however, the pharmacist only saw &lt;2% of the total patient population, making it difficult to show an impact on the office as a whole.</li> </ul>								

• However, flu vaccines were statistically increased, which was a focus of the pharmacist's interventions.

• Limitations:

While the retrospective data showed significant results, a lack of control group is a limitation.