Short-term Outcomes for Medicare Beneficiaries After Low-Acuity Visits to Emergency Departments and Clinics

Matthew Niedzwiecki, PhD, Katherine Baicker, PhD,† Michael Wilson, PhD, MD,‡ David M. Cutler, PhD,†§ and Ziad Obermeyer, MD, MPH†*

Background: There is substantial interest in identifying low-acuity visits to emergency departments (EDs) that could be treated more appropriately in other settings. Systematic differences in illness severity between ED patients and comparable patients elsewhere could make such strategies unsafe, but little evidence exists to guide policy makers.

Objective: To compare illness severity between patients visiting EDs and outpatient clinics, by comparing short-term mortality and hospitalization, controlling for patient demographics, comorbidity, and visit acuity.

Research Design: Cross-sectional study of outcomes after medical encounters.

Subjects: Nationally representative 20% sample of Medicare fee-for-service beneficiaries discharged home from ED or clinic visit in 2011, and enrolled continuously for 1 year before the visit.

Measures: All-cause mortality and hospitalization in the 8, 15, and 30 days after discharge home from ED or clinic visits.

Results: After risk-adjusting for patient demographic, comorbidity, disability, and dual-eligibility status, as well as visit acuity as measured by a commonly used algorithm, we found that ED patients were more likely to die (risk-adjusted odds ratio = 2.75; 95% confidence interval, 2.56–2.96) or be hospitalized (odds ratio = 1.97; 95% confidence interval, 1.95–2.00) after discharge than clinic patients. Differences in short-term outcomes were observed even when comparing patients with the same discharge diagnoses after risk adjustment.

Conclusions: Patients presenting to EDs have worse risk-adjusted short-term outcomes than those presenting to outpatient clinics, even after controlling for acuity level of visit or discharge diagnosis. Existing measures of acuity using administrative data may not adequately capture severity of illness, making judgments of the appropriate setting for care difficult.

Key Words: emergency care, primary care, NYU algorithm, Medicare

(*Med Care* 2016;00: 000–000)

Reducing unnecessary emergency department (ED) utilization has emerged as a key priority as health care organizations move toward population health management with the implementation of the Affordable Care Act.[1] Multiple studies have suggested high rates of potentially avoidable or unnecessary ED visits,[2–4] and there is increasing interest in identifying these patients to divert them to other outpatient settings where the cost of care is lower. Several states have implemented increased cost-sharing provisions for nonemergent ED visits,[5] and the state of Washington recently debated a change to reimbursement policy that would reduce or deny reimbursement to hospitals for low-acuity ED visits that could have been managed in lower-intensity clinical settings.[6]

Two assumptions underlie efforts to divert nonemergent ED patients to other outpatient settings: that low-risk ED patients can be treated more cost-effectively in other settings, and that these patients can be accurately identified on the basis of the routinely collected data available to the majority of payers and providers. Prior work on classification of ED visit acuity[7] has been validated for identification of high-risk and low-risk ED patients on the basis of short-term outcomes after ED visits[8]; but despite explicitly categorizing some low-risk patients as "primary care treatable," this work did not specifically address the appropriateness of treating such patients in primary care settings. There is widespread belief that increased access to primary care would reduce the number of low-acuity ED visits,[9–11] but other studies find evidence that a patient's perceived need for timely care or general preferences for the ED also play an important role for where a patient chooses to receive care.[11–14] If a patient's decision to visit the ED rather than a clinic were correlated with illness severity, diversion to a lower-acuity care setting may be inappropriate, but there is little evidence to guide policy makers on this point.

From the *University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA; †Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA; ‡Harvard Medical School, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA; and §Department of Economics, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Scholars in Health Policy Research Fellowship (M.N.). NIH Common Fund DP5 OD012161 (Z.O.).

K.B. holds positions as MedPAC Commissioner and Director of Eli Lilly, but neither relationship has influenced the submitted work. The remaining authors declare no conflict of interest.

Reprints: Matthew Niedzwiecki, PhD, University of California San Francisco, School of Medicine, 1001 Potrero Avenue, San Francisco CA 94110. E-mail: Matthew.Niedzwiecki@ucsf.edu.

Supplemental Digital Content is available for this article. Direct URL citations appear in the printed text and are provided in the HTML and PDF versions of this article on the journal's Website, www.lww-medicalcare.com.

ISSN: 0025-7079/16/000-000

We used Medicare claims to investigate short-term outcomes for patients presenting to an ED or an outpatient primary care clinic, controlling for claims-based measures of visit acuity and underlying comorbidity. We identified Medicare beneficiaries discharged home from both settings and compared risk-adjusted near-term mortality and hospitalization rates for patients by location of care. Systematic differences in short-term outcomes and illness acuity between patients visiting EDs and clinics could indicate that not all patients are appropriately treatable in either setting.

METHODS

We examined the association between location of visit—clinic or ED—and short-term outcomes, controlling for measurable patient characteristics and acuity at the visit level.

Setting and Study Population

We used a nationally representative 20% sample of outpatient claims from Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in 2011. Patients with <1 full year of comorbidity data or not enrolled in Medicare fee-for-service were excluded. We identified only beneficiaries who were discharged home after a visit to an outpatient clinic or ED, on the basis that potentially discretionary or unnecessary visits were unlikely to be admitted. We defined an ED visit as a unique ED revenue center code (0450–0459 and 0980) occurring on a single calendar date; to avoid classifying certain outpatient services (eg, urgent dialysis) as an ED visit, we made a minor modification to the usual method of identifying ED visits,[15] described in the Appendix (Supplemental Digital Content 1, http://links.lww.com/MLR/B121). We defined clinic visits similarly, but using Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System codes for evaluation and management (99201–99215) from the Carrier (noninstitutional provider) file. Clinic visits to critical access hospitals were identified using the same Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System codes from the outpatient file as these physicians do not appear in the Carrier file. The study was approved by the National Bureau of Economic Research Institutional Review Board.

Classifying Visit Acuity

We implemented a previously published and validated algorithm for classifying ED visits on the basis of acuity, the New York University (NYU) algorithm. We classified visits using code provided by the authors, translating the SAS code for use with Stata 13.[7] The NYU algorithm assigns to each diagnosis probabilities that the diagnosed condition falls into 1 of 4 categories: (1) "nonemergent," (2) "emergent—primary care treatable," (3) "emergent—preventable/avoidable," or (4) "emergent—not preventable/avoidable." The visit was then classified according to the most "emergent" condition based on the probability that the diagnosis is "emergent—preventable/avoidable" or "emergent—not preventable/avoidable." We used the Ballard et al[8] modification of the NYU algorithm to classify ED visits as emergent or nonemergent, which has been demonstrated to predict short-term mortality and hospitalization. See Appendix for more details (Supplemental Digital Content 1, http://links.lww.com/MLR/B121).

Outcome Measures—Death and Hospitalization

We recorded mortality and hospitalization within 8, 15, or 30 days of the initial outpatient visit to the clinic or ED, by linking outpatient claims to Medicare inpatient and date of death data. Patients who died during the outpatient encounter or were directly transferred to another hospital were excluded.

Covariates

We controlled for patient sex, age group by sex (5-year intervals), race/ethnicity, and individual chronic conditions indicated in the Medicare chronic conditions file (see Appendix, Supplemental Digital Content 1, http://links.lww.com/MLR/B121 documentation for more details). We also included an indicator variable for each month of the calendar year and an indicator for whether the visit occurred on a weekend or federal holiday. An indicator variable was included for dual-eligible status, which is defined as having at least 1 month of Medicaid eligibility in 2011. At the area level, we control for hospital referral region fixed effects and median income in the patient's zip code.

Statistical Analysis

We used logistic regression to examine risk factors for mortality and hospitalization following an outpatient visit, and used indicator variables to capture whether a visit was: (1) nonemergent ED, (2) emergent clinic, or (3) emergent ED (nonemergent clinic is the omitted category). We used the 50% threshold as a baseline—visits are assigned to a category if the NYU ED algorithm assigns >0.5 probability of being in that category. Visits that are not assigned any probabilities by the algorithm and those that are assigned 0.5 probability of being both a nonemergent or emergent visit are excluded from the analysis (17,788,476 of 51,794,582 total visits are excluded). We also explored sensitivity to other thresholds, $P > 0.75$ and >0.9, and found similar results. We controlled for observable patient characteristics including demographics and comorbidity, as above.

In an additional specification, we ran a patient fixed-effect regression to control for time-invariant, unobserved heterogeneity at the patient level. By using patient-level fixed effects, we were able to control for important patient factors that remained constant throughout the year of analysis, such as proximity to local providers and access to primary care clinics that would otherwise have been difficult or impossible to directly enter into the regression analysis. The fixed-effects models necessarily restricted the analysis to the subset of patients with variation in the outcome variable, for example, patients with visits after which they were and were not hospitalized within 8 days of the index visit. Sample selection is also predicated on within-patient variation in visit location, for example, patients who visited both the ED and the clinic. Interpretation of the fixed-effects results is limited to this particular subsample of patients.

RESULTS

Study Population

Of 10,016,372 Medicare beneficiaries alive and in the 2011 20% random sample, we identified 4,685,709 beneficiaries with at least 1 ED visit or 1 clinic visit in 2011. We identified 1,674,618 ED visits (0.36 visits per person) and 26.8 million clinic visits (5.72 visits per person). We restricted the sample to those visits that were discharged home. Table 1 shows that those who visit the ED are younger on average than those who visit the clinic and have fewer chronic conditions, but they are more likely to be disabled, dual eligible, or have end-stage renal disease.

Nearly 8.5% of patients visited both the ED and the clinic in just their first 2 visits of 2011. Regression analysis indicates that patients are more likely to visit clinics over time, but the effect is very small in magnitude [odds ratio (OR) = 1.00; 95% confidence interval (CI), 1.00–1.00].

Table 2 shows the most common primary International Classification of Disease (ICD) codes for each visit by location and acuity. Hypertension (not otherwise specified, NOS), bronchitis, back symptoms, and urinary tract infection are among the top 10 most common primary discharge diagnoses classified as "nonemergent" or "primary care treatable" for both ED and clinic visits in the sample. Atrial fibrillation, chest pain, asthma, sciatica, and diabetes with other manifestations were among the top 10 most common emergent primary diagnoses for both ED and clinic visits. Benign hypertension appeared as the primary diagnosis in both nonemergent and emergent clinic visits because the acuity classification incorporates potentially life-threatening secondary diagnoses in addition to the primary diagnosis.

Visit Acuity

Table 3 shows logistic regressions results using patient and visit characteristics to predict short-term mortality and hospitalization. Results for 8-day outcomes are reported in the main text, with results for 15 and 30 reported in the Appendix (Supplemental Digital Content 1, http://links.lww.com/MLR/B121). In the 8 days following ED visits, patients with "emergent" visits were more likely to die or be hospitalized compared with those with "nonemergent" visits. For ED visits, "emergent" diagnoses were associated with significantly higher 8-day mortality (OR = 2.31; 95% CI, 2.14–2.49) and hospitalizations (OR = 1.30; 95% CI, 1.28–1.32) compared with "nonemergent visits." This relationship also held for clinic visits (mortality rate OR = 1.80; 95% CI, 1.73–1.86; hospitalization OR = 1.65; 95% CI, 1.64–1.66). The ORs for these comparisons can be calculated by simply dividing the OR of group by another. Results using a fixed-effects specification, which controlled for time-invariant unobserved patient characteristics, were similar, as were results for 15- and 30-day outcomes (see Appendix, Supplemental Digital Content 1, http://links.lww.com/MLR/B121).

Relative to clinic visits, ED visits are associated with significantly higher rates of death and hospitalization after medical encounters across a range of acuity levels, including "nonemergent" and "primary care treatable" (mortality OR = 2.75; 95% CI, 2.56–2.96; hospitalization OR = 1.97; 95% CI, 1.95–2.00) and "emergent" conditions (mortality OR = 3.55; 95% CI, 3.35–3.75; hospitalization OR = 1.55; 95% CI, 1.53–1.57). Indeed, ED visits deemed "nonemergent" were associated with higher mortality (OR = 1.53; 95% CI, 1.42–1.65) and hospitalization rates (OR = 1.19; 95% CI, 1.18–1.21) than even clinic visits deemed "emergent" by the algorithm. The results were robust to different thresholds for the NYU classification variable ($P > 0.75$, >0.9) as well as using the probability measures as continuous variables (not reported). Similar results were found in the patient fixed-effects specification (also in Table 3) that compared ED and clinic outcomes for those patients with visits to both care locations over the study period, thereby controlling for fixed patient-level characteristics.

Individual ICD Regressions

As a further sensitivity analysis, we performed additional logistic regressions restricted to a single primary diagnosis to account for differences in the composition of "nonemergent" and "emergent" visits to the clinic and ED. For example, nonemergent visits to the ED may have had a relatively higher share of diagnoses associated with higher short-term mortality than nonemergent visits to the clinic. Specifically, we identified the 10 most frequent primary diagnoses across ED and clinic groups, and ran separate regressions for each diagnosis. Regression specifications were similar to main specification except that we simply included an indicator for whether the patient visited the ED as there is no variation in NYU category within an ICD code. This sensitivity check ruled out the possibility that the composition of diagnoses, within a given acuity category, explains the different outcomes for ED and clinic visits. For regressions that were restricted to a single primary ICD code, we use 10-year age bins, not interacted with sex, and state-level (rather than hospital referral region-level) fixed effects to avoid over-fitting on the small subsamples.

Table 4 shows results from regression analyses comparing outcomes for ED versus clinic patients with the same primary discharge diagnosis for 6 of the 10 diagnoses common to the clinic and the ED (Table 2). For all diagnoses appearing in the top 10 most common diagnoses for each acuity and location group, see the online Appendix tables (Supplemental Digital Content 1, http://links.lww.com/MLR/B121). ORs for death ranged from 1.34 for chest pain (NOS) to 3.00 for hypertension (NOS). Most of the ORs for death were statistically significant, implying increased risk of death or hospitalization for ED patients. For asthma visits, for example, odds of death (OR = 2.57; 95% CI, 1.18–5.64) and hospitalization within 8 days (OR = 1.94; 95% CI, 1.72–2.19) were both significantly higher for ED versus clinic visits. Similarly, for hypertension (NOS) ED visits are associated with increased mortality (OR = 3.00; 95% CI, 1.58–5.70) and hospitalization (OR = 2.74; 95% CI, 2.47–3.04) within 8 days.

DISCUSSION

This paper is the first comparison with date of short-term outcomes for similar patients who seek care at the ED versus outpatient clinics. We find that patients who seek care

TABLE 1. Means Table (Patient-Visit Level)

	Clinic Visits		ED Visits	
Variables	**Mean**	**95% CI**	**Mean**	**95% CI**
Patient characteristics				
Age	73.21	73.21-73.22	67.67	67.65-67.70
Male	0.41	0.41-0.41	0.40	0.40-0.40
Dual eligible	0.21	0.21-0.21	0.40	0.40-0.40
Disabled	0.15	0.15-0.15	0.34	0.34-0.34
No. chronic conditions	7.74	7.74-7.74	7.62	7.61-7.62
Acute myocardial infarction, ever	0.052	0.05-0.05	0.06	0.06-0.06
Alzheimer disease	0.044	0.04-0.04	0.07	0.07-0.07
COPD	0.32	0.32-0.32	0.38	0.38-0.38
Congestive heart failure	0.33	0.33-0.33	0.35	0.35-0.35
Diabetes	0.44	0.44-0.44	0.42	0.42-0.42
End-stage renal disease	0.011	0.011-0.011	0.031	0.031-0.031
Ischemic heart disease	0.57	0.57-0.57	0.55	0.55-0.55
Depression	0.36	0.36-0.36	0.50	0.50-0.50
Asthma	0.18	0.18-0.18	0.23	0.23-0.23
Visit characteristics				
Nonemergent	0.66	0.66-0.66	0.50	0.50-0.50
Emergent	0.29	0.29-0.29	0.44	0.44-0.44
Weekend or holiday	0.030	0.03-0.03	0.32	0.32-0.32
Outcomes				
Died within 8 d	0.0005	0.00-0.00	0.003	0.00-0.00
Hospitalized within 8 d	0.024	0.02-0.02	0.062	0.06-0.06
Total number of visits	26,811,634		1,674,618	

Variables reported at the person-visit level. Data come from a 20% random sample of Medicare beneficiaries in 2011. See main text for more details on sample selection. "Age" and "Number of Chronic Conditions" are reported as means. All other variables are reported as the fraction of visits where the patient exhibited the characteristics described.

CI indicates confidence interval; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; ED, emergency department.

at the ED are more likely to die or become hospitalized in the 8 days following the visit, a finding with 2 possible interpretations: either EDs provide lower quality care, perhaps because of worse continuity of care and a lack of follow-up, resulting in poorer outcomes for patients of similar acuity; or patients who visit the ED have higher underlying illness severity in ways that are unmeasured by administrative data.

TABLE 2. Top 10 Visits by Category and Location

Clinic (Nonemergent)			**ED (Nonemergent)**		
	ICD Code	**N**		**ICD Code**	**N**
1.	DM2 without complications	1107	1.	Abdominal pain	40
2.	Hypertension (NOS)	878	2.	Urinary tract infection (NOS)	26
3.	Benign hypertension	715	3.	Other chest pain	23
4.	Joint/leg pain	520	4.	Other cellulitis/abscess	22
5.	Chronic Ischemic heart disease (NOS)	464	5.	Acute bronchitis	19
6.	Acute bronchitis	432	6.	Headache	18
7.	Other back symptoms	384	7.	Other back symptoms	17
8.	Urinary tract infection (NOS)	327	8.	Hypertension (NOS)	13
9.	Other/unspecified hyperlipidemia	303	9.	Contusion face/scalp/neck	13
10.	Malignant neoplasm of prostate	292	10.	Contusion of thigh	12
Clinic (Emergent)			ED (Emergent)		
1.	Atrial fibrillation	997	1.	Chest pain (NOS)	34
2.	DM2 without complications	341	2.	Syncope and collapse	18
3.	Benign hypertension	272	3.	Open wound of nose (NOS)	13
4.	Sciatica	244	4.	Extrinsic asthma (NOS)	13
5.	Extrinsic asthma (NOS)	222	5.	Calculus of kidney	12
6.	Chest pain (NOS)	18	6.	Atrial fibrillation	10
7.	Congestive heart failure (NOS)	138	7.	Open wound of scalp	10
8.	Shortness of breath	137	8.	Sciatica	10
9.	Diabetes with other manifestations	111	9.	Bronchopneumonia	9
10.	Transient cerebral ischemia (NOS)	99	10.	Diabetes with other manifestations	8

Most common primary diagnosis codes for visits to primary care clinics or the emergency department (ED). Visits measured in thousands. Data come from a 20% random sample of Medicare beneficiaries in 2011. Data come from a 20% random sample of Medicare beneficiaries in 2011.

DM2 indicates type 2 diabetes mellitus; ED, emergency department; NOS indicates not otherwise specified.

TABLE 3. NYU Category Regression Results

	Logit			Logit (Patient Fixed Effects)		
	OR	**SE**	**95% CI**	**OR**	**SE**	**95% CI**
Death within 8 d						
Nonemergent						
Clinic	1.00			1.00		
ED	2.75	0.10	2.56-2.96	1.94	0.10	1.75-2.15
Emergent						
Clinic	1.80	0.033	1.73-1.86	1.62	0.04	1.54-1.70
ED	6.37	0.19	6.00-6.75	3.73	0.16	3.44-4.05
N	28,485,776			91,342		
Hospitalized within 8 d						
Nonemergent						
Clinic	1.00			1.00		
ED	1.97	0.013	1.95-2.00	1.32	0.01	1.30-1.34
Emergent						
Clinic	1.65	0.005	1.64-1.66	1.46	0.005	1.45-1.47
ED	2.56	0.017	2.53-2.59	1.54	0.011	1.51-1.56
N	28,486,232			3,652,777		

Regression analysis controls for the following: weekend day, month of the year, hospital referral region fixed effects, median zip code income, male, age group (5-year intervals) by sex, dual-eligible status, visit characteristics (alcohol related, drug related, injury related, ambulatory care sensitive, and psychiatric), and a dummy variable for several chronic condition (see Appendix for the full list of conditions). Fixed-effects regressions include patient fixed effects.

CI indicates confidence interval; ED, emergency department; OR, odds ratio; NYU, New York University.

We view the latter interpretation as more likely, given the results of other studies suggesting that patients who present to the ED relative to outpatient clinics are different in important ways that are unmeasured by administrative data.[16] Even controlling for time-invariant patient characteristics using patient-level fixed effects, there are still large differences in outcomes across ED and clinics for otherwise similar diagnoses. This indicates that for patients that have access to both types of providers, perceived symptom severity, which likely varies from encounter to encounter, may play an important role in dictating where the patient seeks care.

One other possible explanation is that the same diagnosis code may indicate visits for very different reasons. For example, the same diagnosis code might be sometimes be associated with a routine check-up or medication management, but other times might represent an unexpected flare up that requires timely acute care. Administrative data are not well suited to identify these differences. The NYU algorithm itself acknowledges this uncertainty by assigning visits probabilities of being emergent or nonemergent, rarely assigning a visit to 1 category with 100% certainty.

Although it is generally the case that ED visits are associated with higher mortality and hospitalization rates, this is not always the case. In Table 4, for example, patients who visit the ED with a diagnosis of chest pain and are subsequently discharged home, have a statistically significantly lower chance of being hospitalized within 8 days (OR = 0.61; 95% CI, 0.57–0.65). Although this is only 1 example, it may indicate that the ED may sometime be better suited than primary care clinics for providing timely diagnostic testing to identify those with truly high-acuity conditions.

Our analysis highlights an important limitation of current approaches to measure the acuity and appropriateness of visits to EDs. Although the NYU algorithm discriminates well among patients within a locus of care—for example, "emergent" conditions have higher rates of death and hospitalization than "nonemergent" for both ED and clinic patients—comparisons across settings are more complex: "nonemergent" ED visits are associated with higher short-term mortality and hospitalization rates than "emergent" clinic visits. This breakdown is troubling considering the algorithm explicitly labels some ED visits "nonemergent" and "primary care treatable." The fact that outcomes for ED patients are significantly worse than those for similar patients treated in primary care settings, even after controlling for diagnosis and patient characteristics, highlights that existing measures of acuity using administrative data might not adequately capture severity of illness.

TABLE 4. Individual ICD-9 Regression Results

Nonemergent	**OR**	**SE**	**[95% CI]**	**Emergent**	**OR**	**SE**	**[95% CI]**
Hypertension (NOS)				Chest pain (NOS)			
Died 8 d				Died 8 d			
ED	3.00	0.98	[1.58, 5.70]	ED	1.34	0.30	[0.86, 2.08]
Hospitalized 8 d				Hospitalized 8 d			
ED	2.74	0.14	[2.47, 3.04]	ED	0.61	0.02	[0.57, 0.65]
N	799,332			N	201,969		
Acute bronchitis				Asthma			
Died 8 d				Died 8 d			
ED	2.35	0.68	[1.34, 4.14]	ED	2.57	1.03	[1.18, 5.64]
Hospitalized 8 d				Hospitalized 8 d			
ED	1.50	0.075	[1.36, 1.65]	ED	1.94	0.12	[1.72, 2.19]
N	423,683			N	180,908		
Urinary tract infection				Atrial Fibrillation			
Died 8 d				Died 8 d			
ED	2.36	0.51	[1.55, 3.60]	ED	2.97	0.73	[1.84, 4.79]
Hospitalized 8 d				Hospitalized 8 d			
ED	1.84	0.064	[1.72, 1.97]	ED	1.19	0.06	[1.07, 1.31]
N	337,528			N	1,000,248		

Odds ratios (ORs) are relative to clinic visits with the same principal diagnosis code.

CI indicates confidence interval; ED, emergency department; NOS, not otherwise specified.

Limitations

There are a number of limitations to Medicare claims that should be noted, as they are particularly germane to our results. Our sample only contains Medicare enrollees, a group with higher rates of mortality and hospitalization than the general population, which limits generalizability. Although claims data do not suffer from recall bias and are therefore more complete than survey data, unmeasured comorbidity and other patient factors (eg, behavioral, access to care, etc.) can impact results. We attempt to control for time-invariant patient characteristics, including proximity and accessibility of EDs and clinics and comorbidities that do not

worsen or improve over the sample period, but time varying characteristics may still persist. In addition, the fixed-effects specification restricts the sample to patients with multiple visits with both outcomes, for example, hospitalized within 8 days and not, and visits of different types, for example, nonemergent clinic and nonemergent ED, which eliminates a large part of the sample and reduces the generalizability of that portion of the analysis. It is worth noting that the results from the fixed-effects regressions are nearly identical to those on the larger sample, so it is plausible that the restricted sample is representative.

CONCLUSIONS

Despite limitations, we show that short-term outcomes after discharge are worse for patients with nonemergent diagnoses who presented to the ED as compared with those who presented to the clinic. This is likely due to imperfect measurement of visit severity, conditional on diagnosis, as a remaining source of variation. It seems that patients sort themselves, but it is impossible to rule out the possibility that clinics cause better outcomes.

These results have important implications for payers and policy makers. Although current approaches to categorization of ED visits have been validated for use within a given care site—ED or clinic—more research is needed before these can be translated into policy and patient care. Efforts to provide incentives, or penalties, to redirect patients from EDs to clinics may be premature as we do not know what causes patients to seek care at different sites nor do we fully understand how outcomes may change if we alter current patterns of care seeking.

REFERENCES

1. Wilson M, Cutler DM. Emergency department profits are likely to continue as the Affordable Care Act expands coverage. *Health Aff*. 2014;33:792–799.
2. Joynt KE, Gawande AA, Orav EJ, et al. Contribution of preventable acute care spending to total spending for high-cost Medicare patients. *JAMA*. 2013;309:2572–2578.
3. Weinick RM, Burns RM, Mehrotra A. Many emergency department visits could be managed at urgent care centers and retail clinics. *Health Aff*. 2010;29:1630–1636.
4. Alpert A, Morganti KG, Margolis GS, et al. Giving EMS flexibility in transporting low-acuity patients could generate substantial Medicare savings. *Health Aff*. 2013;32:2142–2148.
5. Mortensen K. Copayments did not reduce Medicaid enrollees' non-emergency use of emergency departments. *Health Aff*. 2010;29:1643–1650.
6. Ostrom CM. State Medicaid program to stop paying for unneeded ER visits. 2012. Available at: http://seattletimes.com/html/localnews/2017449883_emergency08m.html. Accessed July 22, 2014.
7. NYU ED. Classification Algorithm. Available at: http://wagner.nyu.edu/faculty/billings/nyued-background. Accessed July 10, 2014.
8. Ballard DW, Price M, Fung V, et al. Validation of an algorithm for categorizing the severity of hospital emergency department visits. *Med Care*. 2010;48:58–63.
9. Kellerman AL, Weineck RM. Emergency departments, medicaid costs, and access to primary care – understanding the link. *N Engl J Med*. 2012;366:2141–2143.
10. Billings J, Parikh N, Mijanovic T. Emergency department use in New York City: a substitute for primary care? Issue Brief (Commonwealth Fund). 2000;433:1–5.
11. Cunningham PJ. What accounts for differences in the use of hospital emergency departments across US communities? *Health Aff*. 2006;25:324–336.
12. Ragin DF, Hwang U, Cydulka RK, et al. Reasons for using the emergency department: results of the EMPATH study. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2005;12:1158–1166.
13. Young GP, Wagner MB, Kellermann AL, et al. Ambulatory visits to hospital emergency departments: patterns and reasons for use. *JAMA*. 1996;276:460–465.
14. Uscher-Pines L, Pines J, Kellermann A, et al. Deciding to visit the emergency department for non-urgent conditions: a systematic review of the literature. *Am J Manag Care*. 2013;19:47–59.
15. Merriman K, Caldwell D. How to identify emergency room services in the Medicare claims data. Available at: http://www.resdac.org/resconnect/articles/144. Accessed July 22, 2014.
16. Raven MC, Lowe RA, Maselli J, et al. Comparison of presenting complaint vs. discharge diagnosis for identifying 'nonemergency' emergency department visits. *JAMA*. 2013;309:1145–1153.