Conversion of National Veterans Affairs Health Cost Data into the OMOP CDM: Preliminary Transformation
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Veterans Affairs Healthcare Data

- Integrated care network, includes
  - Inpatient hospitals
  - Outpatient primary care
  - Subspecialist clinics
  - Outpatient pharmacies
  - Rehabilitation facilities
  - Long-term care facilities
  - Domiciliaries, etc

- All VA personnel use the same EHR, Veterans Information Systems and Technology Architecture/Computerized Patient Record System
- Data from all sites are stored in the Corporate Data Warehouse (CDW)
- Provisioned by the VA Informatics and Computing Infrastructure (VINCI)
OMOP Development in VA

- Starting in 2015, VINCI began transforming VA CDW into OMOP
  - From six months release to monthly release
- Starting in 2017, VINCI began cooperating with VIReC (VA Information Resource Center) to transform CMS data into OMOP
- Starting in 2019, VINCI began cooperating with HERC (VA Health Economics Research Center) to transform cost data into OMOP
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VA HealthCare Cost Data

- Produced and Managed by VA Managerial Cost Accounting Office (MCA)
  - Inpatient/outpatient related services
  - Widely used in research

- The MCA inpatient cost has six subtotals:
  - Bed-day of care (nursing & residential care),
  - Radiology,
  - Surgery,
  - Pharmacy,
  - Laboratory,
  - All other.

- The costs within each subtotal are summed into three categories: fixed direct, fixed indirect, and variable direct. The sum of these cost categories equals the total cost for each encounter.

- Several cost components are associated with different types of services provided to a patient, such as technician labor, provider labor, supply costs, and equipment depreciation.
Cost OMOP

- We sought to transform the MCA cost data into OMOP
- Integrated with CDW OMOP
- Mapping logic
  - The CDW and the MCA use different business rules
  - And CDW and OMOP use different granularity in defining clinical events
- Start from inpatient cost
  - We developed logic to adapt MCA cost to the visit level.
- Version 5.3 + 6
Inpatient Cost

• Map MCA data between October 1999 and May 2020.
• MCA and CDW use the same PERSON_ID.
• MCA data cleaning
  • Encounter and location based
  • Earlier admit date and latest discharge date for the encounter.
  • Discharge date imputation
• Map MCA cost to CDW OMOP visit under the concept of
  • Inpatient care
  • Long term care
  • Inpatient observation care
Cost Distribution Logic

• Same hospital stay
  • MCA total cost to one OMOP visit (4a)
  • Two encounters in MCA cost have one visit in CDW OMOP
  • Two encounters in MCA cost have two visits in CDW OMOP
Cost Distribution Logic

• Not same hospital stay
  • MCA total cost to more than one OMOP visits, which formulated as one visit era. (4b)

    MCA cost period
    Visit 1    Visit 2
    Visit 3

• MCA total cost to OMOP visits that fall in cost period but were not identified in above. (4c)

    MCA cost period
    Visit 1    Visit 2
    Visit 3
Results

• These rules improved our ability to match MCA and CDW OMOP encounters.
  • More than 9 million inpatient cost find direct hospital visits in CDW OMOP.
  • For the cost records that don’t have a direct matched hospital stay in CDW OMOP but have a matched one after OMOP visit era were created, 0.5 million cost records were distributed to more than 1.2 million CDW OMOP clinical visits.
  • About 0.1 million cost records that could not find a matched one after OMOP visit era created but contain at least one or partial hospital stay, were linked to 0.4 million CDW OMOP visits.
Conclusion and Future Work

• We demonstrate that MCA inpatient cost data can be successfully transformed into OMOP CDM COST with events identified from CDW OMOP based on the logic we developed.

• The next step is to map outpatient costs and encounters
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