

As the first multicenter clinical trials of airway management in adult OHCA, PART and AIRWAYS-2 suggest that, at best, ETI offers no survival advantage over the simpler LT and i-gel supraglottic airways.^{1,4} It is difficult to justify the more challenging technique, higher training burden, and adverse event profile of ETI when supraglottic airways offer simpler and equally effective alternatives.³ Airway management innovations, such as video laryngoscopy, deserve further study but would likely bring new technical, operational, and financial complexities. We advocate that rescuers “keep it simple” and use a strategy of initial LT or i-gel supraglottic airway insertion in the resuscitation of patients with OHCA.

Henry E. Wang, MD, MS
Robert H. Schmicker, MS
Mohamud R. Daya, MD, MS

Author Affiliations: Department of Emergency Medicine, The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, Houston (Wang); Department of Biostatistics, University of Washington, Seattle (Schmicker); Department of Emergency Medicine, Oregon Health and Science University, Portland (Daya).

Corresponding Author: Henry E. Wang, MD, MS, Department of Emergency Medicine, The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, 6431 Fannin St, JLL 434, Houston, TX 77030 (henry.e.wang@uth.tmc.edu).

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: All authors reported receiving grants from the National Institutes of Health/National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. Dr Wang also reported providing research consultation for Shire Inc.

1. Wang HE, Schmicker RH, Daya MR, et al. Effect of a strategy of initial laryngeal tube insertion vs endotracheal intubation on 72-hour survival in adults with out-of-hospital cardiac arrest: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2018;320(8):769-778. doi:10.1001/jama.2018.7044
2. Hopkins CL, Burk C, Moser S, Meersman J, Baldwin C, Youngquist ST. Implementation of pit crew approach and cardiopulmonary resuscitation metrics for out-of-hospital cardiac arrest improves patient survival and neurological outcome. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2016;5(1):e002892. doi:10.1161/JAHA.115.002892
3. Wang HE, Yealy DM. Out-of-hospital endotracheal intubation: where are we? *Ann Emerg Med*. 2006;47(6):532-541. doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2006.01.016
4. Bengier JR, Kirby K, Black S, et al. Effect of a strategy of a supraglottic airway device vs tracheal intubation during out-of-hospital cardiac arrest on functional outcome: the AIRWAYS-2 randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2018;320(8):779-791. doi:10.1001/jama.2018.11597

Potential Unintended Effects of Medicare's Bundled Payments for Care Improvement Program

To the Editor Dr Navathe and colleagues studied whether Medicare's Bundled Payments for Care Improvement (BPCI) program led to unintended consequences, including changes in volume and case mix.¹ Based on an estimated differential change in market volume between participating and nonparticipating markets of 0.32% (95% CI, -0.06% to 0.69%; $P = .10$), they concluded that BPCI participation “was not associated with changes in market-level lower extremity joint replacement volume.” This conclusion has statistical and practical problems.

The authors posited a null hypothesis of no differential change between BPCI and non-BPCI markets and then sought evidence against this null. When they did not find statistically significant results, they concluded that participation in the program was not associated with changes in volume or case mix.

However, failing to reject the null hypothesis is not the same as accepting the null. Failing to find statistically significant results and then concluding that the null is true is misleading^{2,3} and reflects misuse of P values noted by the statistical community.⁴

In fact, null results cannot be interpreted fully without also considering power. Power is often considered adequate if there is at least 80% probability of detecting an effect of some prespecified size. Well-powered studies have a 20% chance of missing an effect that large, if it exists. In reality, many medical studies have lower power, meaning a higher probability of missing practically significant effects.⁵

The article by Navathe and colleagues, however, gives no information about the power to detect a prespecified, practically significant effect. Rather, in the limitations section, they wrote that the study may have had “inadequate power to detect a statistically significant difference between the 3.8% and 4.4% changes in volume in non-BPCI and BPCI markets, respectively.”

Instead of concluding that an effect is practically significant based on whether it was statistically significant, the point estimate and confidence interval should instead be interpreted in the policy context. In this study, the confidence interval included differential changes in volume that ranged from 0.69% to -0.06%. If a change in volume of 0.69% or smaller would be important for Medicare's roll-out of bundled payments, then this study cannot rule out a potentially important unintended consequence at the 5% level. By contrast, if only changes larger than 0.69% would affect policy, this study can rule out practically important effects at the 5% level.

Alyssa Bilinski, MS
Laura Hatfield, PhD

Author Affiliations: Interfaculty Initiative in Health Policy, Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Cambridge, Massachusetts (Bilinski); Department of Health Care Policy, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts (Hatfield).

Corresponding Author: Alyssa Bilinski, MS, Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, 11 Story St, Fourth Floor, Cambridge, MA 02138 (abilinsk@g.harvard.edu).

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: Ms Bilinski reported receiving a grant from the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases. No other disclosures were reported.

1. Navathe AS, Liao JM, Dykstra SE, et al. Association of hospital participation in a Medicare bundled payment program with volume and case mix of lower extremity joint replacement episodes. *JAMA*. 2018;320(9):901-910. doi:10.1001/jama.2018.12345
2. Bilinski A, Hatfield LA. Seeking evidence of absence: reconsidering tests of model assumptions. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1805.03273>. Revised August 21, 2018. Accessed August 21, 2018.
3. Hartman E, Hidalgo FD. An equivalence approach to balance and placebo tests. *Am J Pol Sci*. 2018;62(4):1000-1013. doi:10.1111/ajps.12387
4. Wasserstein RL, Lazar NA. The ASA's statement on P -values: context, process, and purpose. *Am Stat*. 2016;70(2):129-133. doi:10.1080/00031305.2016.1154108
5. Ioannidis JPA. Why most published research findings are false. *PLoS Med*. 2005;2(8):e124. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124

To the Editor Although Medicare's BPCI program for lower extremity joint replacement (LEJR) reduced health care costs by \$1166 per episode¹ (a 3.9% savings from about \$30 000), there

are concerns that the shift to bundled payments could encourage clinicians to increase volumes overall and preferentially treat healthier patients, possibly inappropriately so.^{2,3}

Dr Navathe and colleagues⁴ found no “changes in volumes or the majority of patient case-mix factors” when studying market-level changes in per-capita LEJR volumes and patient case-mix factors associated with BPCI.

Their article, however, provides little reassurance on these issues because their primary finding showed a trend toward higher volumes ($P = .10$), and many of their secondary findings pointed to both selection effects and increases in volume.

When compared with propensity-matched non-BPCI-participating hospitals, patients at BPCI-participating hospitals had fewer comorbidities and were less likely to be frail or recently to have used an inpatient rehabilitation facility (both $P < .10$); they also were less likely to have used a skilled nursing facility recently ($P = .01$). However, when compared with all non-BPCI-participating hospitals, Navathe and colleagues found that patients at BPCI-participating hospitals were statistically significantly less likely to be frail or to have had any institutional care use in the prior 12 months (eFigure 4 in the Supplement). It is not clear why the propensity-matched analysis should be accepted as definitive.

Regarding volumes, after adjustment for market factors and patient characteristics thought to influence LEJR volumes, the authors found a 0.39% relative increase in per-capita uncomplicated LEJR rates ($P = .04$) in markets with BPCI-participating hospitals and no significant increase in volumes in the propensity-matched hospital-level analysis. However, when comparing BPCI-participating hospitals with all non-BPCI hospitals, Navathe and colleagues found a 9.2% relative increase in LEJR volumes ($P = .008$) as well as a 1.0% increase in LEJR market share ($P = .03$; eTable 5). These findings are consistent with BPCI-related increased volumes, and it is not clear why they should be discounted, particularly if one is interested in the BPCI program’s overall effect on Medicare costs.

Bundled payments have the potential to improve care for Medicare beneficiaries by creating incentives to improve quality, safety, and care coordination, but they may also lead to less beneficial unintended consequences such as increased volumes, avoidance of less healthy patients (who may have more to gain), and conflict with other alternative payment models.^{2,3} Medicare should continue to rigorously evaluate the effect of bundled payment programs.

William B. Weeks, MD, PhD, MBA

Elliott S. Fisher, MD, MPH

Author Affiliations: Dartmouth Institute for Health Policy and Clinical Practice, Lebanon, New Hampshire.

Corresponding Author: William B. Weeks, MD, PhD, MBA, Dartmouth Institute for Health Policy and Clinical Practice, One Medical Center Dr, Lebanon, NH 03766 (wbw@dartmouth.edu).

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: Dr Fisher reported receiving personal and lecture fees from Signature Health Care Foundation and Affirmant Health Partners and being a board member of the Institute for Healthcare Improvement and Fannie E. Rippel Foundation. No other disclosures were reported.

1. Dummit LA, Kahvecioglu D, Marrufo G, et al. Association between hospital participation in a Medicare bundled payment initiative and payments and quality outcomes for lower extremity joint replacement episodes. *JAMA*. 2016; 316(12):1267-1278. doi:10.1001/jama.2016.12717
2. Weeks WB, Rauh SS, Wadsworth EB, Weinstein JN. The unintended consequences of bundled payments. *Ann Intern Med*. 2013;158(1):62-64. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-158-1-201301010-00012
3. Fisher ES. Medicare’s bundled payment program for joint replacement: promise and peril? *JAMA*. 2016;316(12):1262-1264. doi:10.1001/jama.2016.12525
4. Navathe AS, Liao JM, Dykstra SE, et al. Association of hospital participation in a Medicare bundled payment program with volume and case mix of lower extremity joint replacement episodes. *JAMA*. 2018;320(9):901-910. doi:10.1001/jama.2018.12345

In Reply We agree with Ms Bilinski and Dr Hatfield about the difference between failing to reject and accepting the null hypothesis. In our study, we failed to reject the null hypothesis that BPCI participation was not associated with differential changes in LEJR surgery volume.¹ Although we also agree that our analysis of beneficiaries within 306 markets could be underpowered to detect small effects, simulations suggested that large volume responses would be needed to overwhelm savings from BPCI participation. Toward that end and as a matter of practical significance, Medicare would still retain 83% of its savings from bundled payments if volume changes occurred at the upper bound of our confidence interval (a 0.69% increase in volume). This provides reassuring evidence that bundled payments for LEJR are associated with significant Medicare savings.

Drs Weeks and Fisher cite our secondary hospital-level findings to reiterate concerns about volume increases under bundled payments.² We vigorously disagree with their interpretation and worry that propagating concerns not based on the best evidence will lead to mistaken policies regarding bundled payments.

Changes in LEJR volume at BPCI-participant hospitals could occur for either of 2 reasons: (1) new LEJR procedures that increase overall volume and total Medicare spending or (2) growing LEJR market share that keeps overall procedural volume stable and lowers Medicare spending by shifting which hospitals perform LEJR for Medicare beneficiaries. Obviously, Medicare should continue to ensure that bundled payment policy does not increase the total volume of procedures. The hospital-level analyses emphasized by Weeks and Fisher cannot distinguish between these 2 explanations and address the central policy question of whether bundled payments increase overall Medicare spending. Only analyses of market-level volume like those conducted in our study can do so.

Weeks and Fisher also question our findings related to case-mix changes, noting results from secondary analyses comparing BPCI participant hospitals with all nonparticipant hospitals. Doubtless there are inherent limitations of claims data in identifying patient characteristics that might drive case-mix selection. However, BPCI participant hospitals are hardly representative of hospitals nationwide. Instead, they are more likely than nonparticipant hospitals to be high-volume, not-for-profit, teaching institutions.³ In view of these differences, propensity-matched comparisons provide stronger, albeit not

definitive, evidence compared with the non-propensity-matched comparisons referenced by Weeks and Fisher.

Overall, 3 important points need emphasizing. First, our study provides important evidence for informing bundled payment policy. Nevertheless, ongoing monitoring of the effect of policy on episode volume and potential selection of healthier patients is needed, especially with the expansion of LEJR bundles in BPCI Advanced.⁴ Second, our study also suggests that future work on voluntary payment programs should leverage more sophisticated methods to address potential selection bias based on unobservable patient characteristics and the effect on patient case mix. Third, our findings highlight the importance of updating the collective understanding based on the best evidence available, rather than cherry picking data.

Amol S. Navathe, MD, PhD
Joshua M. Liao, MD, MSc
Ezekiel J. Emanuel, MD, PhD

Author Affiliations: Department of Medical Ethics and Health Policy, University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine, Philadelphia (Navathe, Emanuel); Department of Medicine, University of Washington School of Medicine, Seattle (Liao).

Corresponding Author: Amol S. Navathe, MD, PhD, Department of Medical Ethics and Health Policy, University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine, 1108 Blockley Hall, 423 Guardian Dr, Philadelphia, PA 19104 (amol@wharton.upenn.edu).

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: Dr Navathe reported receiving personal fees from Navvis and Co, Navigant Inc, Lynx Medical, Indegene Inc, and Sutherland Global Services; personal fees and equity from NavaHealth; an honorarium from Elsevier Press; and grants from Hawaii Medical Service Association and Oscar Health. Dr Emanuel reported receiving speaking fees from numerous entities, stock ownership in Nuna, and investment partnership in Oak HC/FT. No other disclosures were reported.

1. Navathe AS, Liao JM, Dykstra SE, et al. Association of hospital participation in a Medicare bundled payment program with volume and case mix of lower

extremity joint replacement episodes. *JAMA*. 2018;320(9):901-910. doi:10.1001/jama.2018.12345

2. Fisher ES. Medicare's bundled payment program for joint replacement: promise and peril? *JAMA*. 2016;316(12):1262-1264. doi:10.1001/jama.2016.12525

3. Joynt Maddox KE, Orav EJ, Zheng J, Epstein AM. Participation and dropout in the Bundled Payments for Care Improvement Initiative. *JAMA*. 2018;319(2):191-193. doi:10.1001/jama.2017.14771

4. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. BPCI Advanced. <https://innovation.cms.gov/initiatives/bpci-advanced>. Accessed October 15, 2018.

Guidelines for Letters

Letters discussing a recent *JAMA* article should be submitted within 4 weeks of the article's publication in print. Letters received after 4 weeks will rarely be considered. Letters should not exceed 400 words of text and 5 references and may have no more than 3 authors. Letters reporting original research should not exceed 600 words of text and 6 references and may have no more than 7 authors. They may include up to 2 tables or figures but online supplementary material is not allowed. All letters should include a word count. Letters must not duplicate other material published or submitted for publication. Letters not meeting these specifications are generally not considered. Letters being considered for publication ordinarily will be sent to the authors of the *JAMA* article, who will be given the opportunity to reply. Letters will be published at the discretion of the editors and are subject to abridgement and editing. Further instructions can be found at <http://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/pages/instructions-for-authors>. A signed statement for authorship criteria and responsibility, financial disclosure, copyright transfer, and acknowledgment and the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest are required before publication. Letters should be submitted via the *JAMA* online submission and review system at <https://manuscripts.jama.com>. For technical assistance, please contact jama-letters@jamanetwork.org.

Section Editor: Jody W. Zylke, MD, Deputy Editor.