



Deprescribing Education vs Usual Care for Patients With Cognitive Impairment and Primary Care Clinicians: The OPTIMIZE Pragmatic Cluster Randomized Trial

National Institute on Aging (R21/33-AG057289)



Elizabeth Bayliss, MD, MSPH Institute for Health Research Kaiser Permanente Colorado

Professor of Family Medicine, University of Colorado School of Medicine



Cynthia Boyd, MD, MPH Professor of Medicine, Epidemiology and Health Policy and Management

Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine

Housekeeping

- All participants will be muted
- Enter all questions in the Zoom Q&A/chat box and send to Everyone
- Moderator will review questions and ask them at the end
- Want to continue the discussion? Associated podcast released about 2 weeks after Grand Rounds
- Visit impactcollaboratory.org
- Follow us on Twitter & LinkedIN:

@IMPACTcollab1
<u>https://www.linkedin.com/company/65346172</u>



US Deprescribing Research Network





DeprescribingResearch.org





- Pilot Awards
- Junior Investigator
 Intensive and Webinars
- Data and Resources
- Upcoming events
 - June Webinar
 - Possible Supplement on BZRA drugs and complementary and integrative health





Disclosures

- Cynthia Boyd co-authors a chapter on multimorbidity for UptoDate and reviewed a chapter on Falls for Dyna-Med.
- Elizabeth Bayliss has no disclosures.

Publications

Perspectives on Deprescribing Communication in Primary Care Journal of General Internal Medicine 36, 1122 (2021)

Deprescribing Education vs Usual Care for Patients With Cognitive Impairment and Primary Care Clinicians: The OPTIMIZE Pragmatic Cluster Randomized Trial

JAMA Intern Med. Published online March 28, 2022. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2022.0502









OPTIMIZE Cluster Randomized Pragmatic Trial

Learning Objectives

Upon completion of this presentation, you should be able to:

- Understand the approach used to conduct a pragmatic trial of deprescribing education in primary care
- Describe cognitively impaired populations that may benefit from deprescribing education in primary care
- Discuss potential adaptations of a deprescribing education intervention in a large health system







OPTIMIZE Team Susan Shetterly **Melanie Drace** Jonathan Norton Jennifer Wolff Ariel Green **Emily Reeve** Linda Weffald Matthew Maciejewski Orla Sheehan Kathy Gleason **Courtney Kraus** Jennifer Sawyer Mahesh Maiyani Leslie Wright **Elizabeth Bayliss** Cynthia Boyd





Deprescribing: Reducing or stopping medications for which potential harms outweigh potential benefits





Optimize Trial Development (R21 phase): Develop educational materials and intervention

Aim 1: Engage patient, family caregiver (care partner), clinician, and health system stakeholders to enhance and refine a primary care based deprescribing intervention among people with Alzheimer's Disease and Related Dementia(ADRD) and Multiple Chronic Conditions(MCCs) in Kaiser Permanente Colorado.

Aim 2: Pilot test the intervention to establish feasibility and acceptability among patients, family caregivers (care partners), clinicians, and health system stakeholders.





Intervention design: Stakeholder engagement

Establish trust

"I have complete trust in the doctor... He explains things well. 'If I'm going to stop this I'll replace it with this. Or... This medication... has these side effects. Would you prefer to stop it?"" (Patient)

Frame deprescribing as positive, routine

"I'm looking at the whole person and not just one organ system... These medications take years or decades... to have an effect. And I think that we should focus on what can help you right now." (Physician)

Align deprescribing with goals of dementia care, including symptom management

"You're going down this track. What good is [this medication]?... It's not going to prolong life." (Caregiver)

"I fought for the Ativan because... I know what we go through... I hear what they are saying but I will take that chance." (Caregiver)

Provide educational materials and suggested language

"[The brochure] is a good conversation starter [for older adults who may be accustomed to a time when] you did not question the doctor." (Caregiver)

"It's not an easy conversation to say, 'I think your life expectancy is about 3 years and this statin is not going to benefit you."" (Physician)

Engage the entire health care team

"We rely on [clinical pharmacists]—....we need their help sorting through it [or] giving us guidance on... the best plan to wean [a medication]." (Physician)

"There's not much substitute for frequent visits, close contact... And making sure they realize you care." (Physician)





Green, A.R., et al. *J GEN INTERN MED* **35**, 3556–3563 (2020).

Aims for pragmatic trial (R33)

Aim 1: In a cluster randomized pragmatic trial, test the effectiveness of a primary care based, clinic-level deprescribing intervention on two primary outcomes: number of chronic medications and number of PIMs among seniors with ADRD-MCC.

Hypothesis: A patient-centered intervention will reduce number of chronic medications and number of potentially inappropriate medications (PIMs) among seniors with ADRD-MCC.

Aim 2: Evaluate the effect of the intervention on secondary outcomes of adverse drug events (falls, bleeding episodes, hypoglycemic episodes), reduction in dosage for selected PIMs (benzodiazepines, opioids, antipsychotics), hospital, emergency department and skilled nursing facility utilization, and activities of daily living.

Aim 3: Explore mechanisms of intervention effectiveness through post hoc qualitative interviews with patients, family caregivers, and clinicians and descriptive analyses quantifying outpatient office visit length.





Setting: Kaiser Permanente Colorado (KPCO)

- Integrated healthcare delivery system
 - Members choose a primary care provider (PCP)
 - -Primary and specialty care
- Over 569,000 members across 30 medical offices.
 - -Nineteen medical offices in the Denver/Boulder area
- Virtual data warehouse: Common data model
- Diagnosis, utilization, EHR clinical data, demographics, health plan enrollment, pharmacy dispensing





Optimize: Cluster Randomized Trial Design



Outcomes: Number of Chronic Prescribed Medications; Proportion of Individuals with One or More Potentially Inappropriate Medications (PIMs)

Patient / Family Members Educational Brochure







Providers: Deprescribing "Tip Sheet" for specific situations – handed out at monthly provider meetings for 1 year

;Optimize

INTRODUCING DEPRESCRIBING TO PATIENTS

"Deprescribing is normal. Deprescribing (like prescribing) is a normal part of high quality care."

Things to try:

When you prescribe a medication, mention that most people won't need that medication forever.

- Start a conversation about personal goals of treatment.
 - "What sorts of activities and events are most
 - important to you these days?"
- Share that medications could be one possible cause of symptoms.
 - "Well the first question is whether any of your
 - medications could be causing [xxx symptom]."

KAISER PERMANENTE

Optimize Team Contact: Liz Bayliss, MD, MSPH (Principal Investigator) 303-636-2472; elizabeth.bayliss@kp.org **Optimize**

DEPRESCRIBING TO IMPROVE TROUBLING SYMPTOMS

"For any troubling symptom, think about medication side effects first!"

Example medications: Nortriptyline, oxybutynin, selected anti-hypertensives

Try these phrases:

- The [symptom] you mention may be due to your [xxx] medicine"
- (*) "Certain medicines may cause new side effects because our
- bodies change over time."
- "Reducing your total number of medications may help you
- 🕑 feel better overall."

Make a plan to monitor symptoms:

Please call the nurse in 1 - 2 weeks to let us know how you are feeling without / with a lower dose of [medication]

KAISER PERMANENTE Institute for Health Research Optimize Team Contact: Liz Bayliss, MD, MSPH (Principal Investigator) 303-636-2472; elizabeth.bayliss@kp.org Appointment note Optimize brochure to patient

Intervention cohort







Characteristics of study population

Characteristic		Control	P value*	
	N=1,433 (47.6%)	N=1,579 (52.4%)		
Baseline:				
Mean age in years (SD)	80.1 (7.22)	79.9 (7.48)	0.48	
Female sex	56.3%	55.4%	0.62	
Ethnicity / Race			<0.001	
Hispanic	8.2%	16.4%		
Non-Hispanic White	77.9%	77.2%		
Non-Hispanic, non-white	12.8%	5.3%		
Missing	1.1%	1.1%		
Mean number (SD) of chronic medications at baseline	7.0 (2.13)	7.0 (2.15)	0.83	
Percent with 1+ PIM at baseline	30.1%	29.6%	0.58	
Mean number (SD) of chronic conditions at baseline	8.5 (3.19)	8.6 (3.20)	0.32	
Mild Cognitive Impairment diagnosis only	22.3%	21.7%	0.69	
Received (or eligible for) second brochure mailing	28.5%	30.7%	0.19	
History of hospice at baseline	1.6%	2.1%	0.33	
Follow-up:				
Died during 6-month follow up	6.2%	6.0%	0.77	
Disenrolled from health plan during 6-month follow up	2.2%	1.8%	0.52	
Hospice during 6-month follow up	4.2%	4.1%	0.85	
*P value, 0.05 was used as a significance threshold from Chi-square tests except for age and mean number of chronic meds and conditions at baseline				
(T-test). SD: Standard deviation; PIM: Potentially Inappropriate Medication				





Intervention vs. Control: Number of Long-term Medications

Study population	N	Group	Outcome estimates at six months (CI) ^b	Unadjusted difference (CI) p value	Adjusted difference ^c (CI) p value
Full cohort (N=3,012)	1,433	Intervention	6.42 (6.32, 6.52)	-0.10	-0.10
	1,579	Control	6.52 (6.43, 6.61)	(-0.23, 0.03) p=0.12	(-0.23, 0.04) p=0.14
Restricted to 90+ days follow-up (N=2,898)	1,374	Intervention	6.43 (6.33, 6.53)	-0.13	-0.12
	1,524	Control	6.56 (6.46, 6.65)	(-0.27, 0.01) p=0.07	(-0.20, 0.02) p=0.08
^a Chronic medication counts at 6 months and associated intervention minus control differences were estimated using linear regression models adjusting for					

baseline counts of medications and a random clinic effect.

^bCl=95% confidence intervals.

^cAdditionally adjusted for baseline age, sex and race/ethnicity.

^dPercentage of persons on a PIM at 6 months and associated intervention minus control differences in logistic regression models adjusting for baseline number of PIMs and a random clinic effect.





Intervention vs. Control: Percentage of Persons With a PIM

Study population	Ν	Group assignment	Outcome estimates at six months (CI) ^b	Unadjusted difference (CI) p value	Adjusted difference ^c (CI) p value
Full cohort (N=3,012)	1,433 1,579	Intervention Control	17.8% (15.4, 20.5) 20.9%	-3.1% (-6.2, 0.4) p=0.08	-3.2% (-6.2, 0.4) p=0.08
Restricted to persons with 90+ days follow-up	1,374	Intervention	(18.4, 23.6) 17.5% (15.0, 20.2)	-3.2%	-3.2%
(N=2,898)	1,524	Control	20.7% (18.2, 23.4)	(-6.2, 0.4) p=0.08	(-6.3, 0.4) p=0.08

^aChronic medication counts at 6 months and associated intervention minus control differences were estimated using linear regression models adjusting for baseline counts of medications and a random clinic effect.

^bCI=95% confidence intervals.

°Additionally adjusted for baseline age, sex and race/ethnicity.

^dPercentage of persons on a PIM at 6 months and associated intervention minus control differences in logistic regression models adjusting for baseline number of PIMs and a random clinic effect.





Subgroups: Number of Chronic Medications



Estimated differences from linear regression models accounting for baseline counts of medications, age, sex, race and ethnicity, and a random clinic effect. Subgroup models added the appropriate subgroup variable and an interaction with study group. Error bars indicate 95% Cls.

- ^a Patients taking 7 or more medications vs 5 to 6 medications (*P* = .28 for interaction).
- ^b Two mailings vs 1 mailing (*P* = .70 for interaction).
- ^c Alzheimer disease or dementia vs mild cognitive impairment (*P* = .50 for interaction).

JAMA Intern Med. Published online March 28, 2022. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2022.0502





Subgroups: Proportion with ≥ 1 PIM



Estimated differences from logistic regression models accounting for baseline PIM, age, sex, race and ethnicity, and a random clinic effect. Subgroup models added the appropriate subgroup variable and an interaction with study group. Error bars indicate 95% CIs.

- Patients taking 7 or more medications vs 5 to 6 medications (P = .19 for interaction).
- ^b Two mailings vs 1 mailing (P = .70 for interaction).
- ^c Alzheimer disease or dementia vs mild cognitive impairment (*P* = .31 for interaction).

JAMA Intern Med. Published online March 28, 2022. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2022.0502





Safety monitoring: Hospitalizations 'likely' due to recent medication discontinuation intervention vs. control

Mortality: Intervention Arm N=1,433



Mortality: Delayed Control Arm N=1,579







Results summary

- No reduction in number of chronic medications or proportion of individuals with PIM in primary study population
- Individuals taking 7+ medications may be better target population for similar interventions
- No evidence of serious adverse events from deprescribing education





Implications

- Feasible to conduct large scale, pragmatic cluster randomized trial in delivery system
- Taken to scale, this educational approach could....
 - -Improve more distal deprescribing outcomes
 - -Provide a foundation for additional medication management strategies.







Pragmatic Changes: Delayed Control Intervention

Process learnings: Patients/ family members

- Variable recollection of receiving mailings
- Caregiver role important in cognitively impaired patient population
- Appreciation for deprescribing awareness prompted conversations with clinicians
 - Good PCP-patient relationship essential
- Limited (reported) effect on medication change
- Variable preferences on brochure mailing vs. clinic handout





Process learnings: Clinicians

- Consider handing out brochures in clinics (vs mailing)
- Translate materials into Spanish
- Expand population to include those age 75+ without cognitive impairment
- Consider focusing on 7+ medications (vs. 5+ medications)
- COVID-19 effects
 - More Virtual meetings email Clinician Tip Sheets
 - Virtual visits could be medication review opportunities





Pragmatic changes: Delayed control design

- Expand target population
 - Age 65+, 5+ meds, with cognitive impairment
 - Age 75+, 5+ meds, without cognitive impairment
- Increase likelihood of reaching eligible patients
 - Clinic-based intervention, no need to mail brochures
 - Research team flags appointments, medical assistant hands out brochure during rooming
- Accommodate more virtual provider meetings
 - Clinician Tip Sheets sent via email (embedded)





Delayed control patient intervention process

Research team scrubs schedule daily

Appointment note Optimize brochure to patient added to flag patient for MA (also notifies provider)

MA: We are working with a research team at Kaiser's Institute for Health Research. Here is a brochure on "Medication Management". Please have a look while you are waiting for the doctor.



KAISER PERMANENTE.

Why did I receive this Managing Medications brochure?

Also available

in Spanish!

Kaiser Permanente Colorado is participating in a research project to provide extra information to members about decisions to continue or discontinue medications.

Do I need to do anything?

- Look through the brochure while you are waiting to see the doctor.
- Ask your doctor any questions that you have about your medicines.

Your doctor may talk about medicines today or suggest setting up another visit or phone call.

Coptimize KAISER PERMANENTE

Why did I receive this Managing Medications brochure?

Provider options during visit

Right now, you need all your medications and there is no need to discontinue any, but we may want to discuss this again in the future.

Right now, you need all your prescription medications but let's talk about OTC products. I think you may be able to discontinue/ cut back on [medication] because [improvement in symptoms/ safety/ etc.]. Here is how you can do this.....

I think you may be able to discontinue/ cut back on [medication], but we have other important issues to address today so let's put this on the agenda for our next visit or phone call. I think you may be able to discontinue/ cut back on [medication], and I'd like to have one of our clinical pharmacists call you to discuss all your medications

Pragmatic features of Optimize

- Embedded in healthcare delivery system
- Cluster randomization at the clinic level
- Intervention supplements but does not replace usual care (educational)
 - Delayed control intervention education integrated with usual care
- Eligibility and Outcomes measured with clinical EHR data
- No individual level informed consent
- Prespecified sub-analyses inform future intervention deliver





Organizational engagement: Pragmatic trials

- Upper-level operations understanding, endorsement, buy-in are essential
 - Alignment with organizational goals very helpful
- Understand and work with individual clinic processes
- Follow up with clinics maintain contact
- Clinicians are supportive of relevant projects that do not increase their work





Optimize – How we compare to other deprescribing trials?

Differences

- Targeted drugs in general
- Pragmatic outcome measurement
- Dispensing data: unique in the U.S.
- Primary care vs. Pharmacy vs. Payor

Similarities

- Patient and family education
- Linking with a care delivery place
- Measuring number of medications







OPTIMIZE Intervention Resources

OPTIMIZE Intervention Materials

- Available for use at DeprescribingResearch.org
- <u>https://deprescribingresearch.org/network-activities/data-and-resources/irb-dsmp-repository/optimal-medication-management-in-alzheimers-disease-and-dementia-optimize/</u>

OPTIMIZE Intervention Materials²

- Patient Brochure (English)
- Patient Brochure (Español)
- Clinician Tip Sheets

² © Use freely, with credit to the authors. Not for commercial use. Materials developed as part of the OPTIMIZE research project funded by the National Institute on Aging (grant# R33AG057289) are licensed under Attribution NonCommercial 4.0 international. To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/.



Bayliss EA. Shetterly SM. Drace ML. Norton JD. Maiyani M. Gleason KS. Sawyer JK. Weffald LA. Green AR. Reeve E. Maciejewski ML. Sheehan OC. Wolff JL. Kraus C. & Boyd CM. Deprescribing Education vs Usual Care for Patients With Cognitive Impairment and Primary Care Clinicians: The OPTIMIZE pragmatic cluster randomized trial JAMA Intern Med. Published online March 28. 2022. doi.10.1001/Jamaintemmed.2022.0502



Optimize IRB approach

Aim	Activity	Target population	Requested consent process
Aim 1: In a cluster randomized pragmatic	Send educational	Patients and care partners.	Waiver of informed consent. Mailing
trial, test the effectiveness of a primary	materials to patients	Estimated 60-350 members per	contains informational letter about the
care based, clinic-level deprescribing	(brochure and brief	clinic.	study. Letter specifies that discussing
intervention on two primary outcomes: number of chronic medications and	questionnaire).	9 clinics randomized to intervention and 9 to delayed control.	medications with PCP is optional.
number of potentially inappropriate	Educational	Primary care clinicians who care for	Waiver of informed consent.
medications (PIMs) among seniors with	presentation at	adults.	Information on the study presented to
ADRD-MCC.	department meeting.		clinicians at initial department meeting
	Tip sheets to clinicians		as part of 15-minute deprescribing
	at monthly department		all clinician materials
	meetings.		
Aim 2: Evaluate the effect of the	Analysis of secondary	N/ A	N/A
intervention on secondary outcomes of	outcomes.		
adverse drug events (falls, bleeding			
episodes, hypoglycemic episodes),			
reductions in dosage for selected PIMs			
(benzodiazepines, opioids,			
antipsychotics), hospital, emergency			
department and skilled nursing facility			
utilization, and activities of daily living.			





Deprescribing and deimplementation: Time for transformative change (A) (B) All Interventions (N=43)









- Elizabeth Bayliss, Institute for Health Research, KPCO (elizabeth.bayliss@kp.org)
- Cynthia Boyd, Division of Geriatric Medicine and Gerontology, Johns Hopkins University (<u>cyboyd@jhmi.edu</u>)





Questions?





IMPACTcollaboratory.org



deprescribingresearch.org



Designing a Pragmatic Trial



Loudon K et al. BMJ 2015;350:h2147

The PRagmatic-Explanatory Continuum Indicator Summary 2 (PRECIS-2) wheel.



