

# Implementing a Predictive Model to Reduce Hospital Readmissions in a Safety Net Healthcare System

Arturo Gasga Avni Kothari Seth Goldman Jim Marks Jean Feng Lucas Zier\*  
University of California, San Francisco, United States

## 1. Introduction

Safety net health systems, healthcare delivery institutions committed to serving patients regardless of their insurance status or ability to pay, face the dual challenge of meeting pay-for-performance metrics without compromising patient outcomes. Hospital readmission reduction metrics often disproportionately penalize safety net health systems, despite risk-adjusted metrics (Ahmad et al., 2022; Figueroa et al., 2017) leading to reduced funding for health systems most in need.

Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital (ZSFG) is an urban, academic, safety net hospital within the San Francisco Health Network, which experienced elevated readmission rates before 2017. Failure to meet readmission reduction metrics imperiled \$1.2 million per year of funding. A pivotal analysis revealed that heart failure (HF) accounted for over 40% of unplanned readmission events and that reducing all-cause 30-day HF readmission rates would enable the health system to meet overall readmission reduction metrics. Critical drivers of 30-day unplanned readmission in HF patients included:

1. Difficulty identifying patients at the highest risk of readmission
2. Lack of standardized HF care, contributing to substantial care variation driven by underlying treatment biases.

ZSFG postulated that a machine learning algorithm predicting unplanned 30-day readmission risk for HF would allow for the identification of patients at the highest risk of readmission. Though readmission risk stratification was thought to be necessary to reduce readmission rates, it was not felt to be sufficient in isolation. Therefore, the ML algorithm was incorporated into a broader, point-of-care, electronic health record integrated, logic-based HF decision-support tool that would surface readmission risk to physicians and provide *actionable* decision-support guidance.

\* Corresponding Author: lucas.zier@ucsf.edu

Model name: 30-day unplanned readmission risk prediction model		ZUCKERBERG SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL Hospital and Trauma Center
<b>Summary:</b> This model uses electronic health record (EHR) data from heart failure (HF) patients at Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital. The model takes in 42 input features from the EHR to predict unplanned readmission risk within 30 days (based on CMS criteria) where high risk is any prediction exceeding 12%.		
<b>Mechanism:</b>		
<b>Output</b>	Predicted probability of unplanned readmission within 30 days	
<b>Target Population</b>	Inpatient heart failure patients and outpatient heart failure patients who were admitted within the past 30 days	
<b>Input Data Source</b>	Tabular data from Electronic Health Records	
<b>Time of Prediction</b>	Predictions are updated once per day	
<b>Model Type</b>	Gradient Boosted Tree	
<b>Feature Categories</b>	Lab results, demographics, flowsheet values, and patient orders	
<b>Most Predictive Features</b>	1) Number of previous emergency department encounters in the past year 2) The most recent lab value for B-Type Natriuretic Peptide 3) The most recent lab value for Lactate Dehydrogenase	
<b>Training Details:</b>		
<b>Time Period</b>	Aug 2019 - Mar 2024	
<b>Number of Unique Patients and Encounters</b>	2,728 and 21,218	
<b>Gender Breakdown</b>	Male: 63% Female: 37%	
<b>Age Breakdown</b>	18-34: 3% 35-49: 15% 50-64: 37% 65 and above: 45%	
<b>Demographics Breakdown</b>	Asian: 14% White: 19% Black or African American: 33% Other: 34%	
<b>Performance:</b>		
		Test
<b>AUC (90% CI)</b>		.73 (.68, .77)
<b>Positive Predictive Value</b>		.19
<b>Sensitivity</b>		.62
<b>Gender</b>		Test AUC (90% CI)
Male		.73 (.67, .77)
Female		.73 (.62, .82)
<b>Age</b>		Test AUC (90% CI)
18-34		.70 (.4, .9)
35-49		.73 (.62, .82)
50-64		.70 (.63, .78)
65 and above		.73 (.66, .81)
<b>Race</b>		Test AUC (90% CI)
Asian		.78 (.68, .88)
White		.69 (.61, .77)
Black or African American		.78 (.70, .85)
Other		.67 (.57, .77)

Figure 1: Model card for readmission risk prediction

## 2. Methods

**Development Team** The Pioneering Research and Organizational Solutions to Promote Equitable Care (PROSPECT) Lab is a digital innovation taskforce with the mission of applying technology and digital tools to improve health outcomes and equity in underserved populations. The PROSPECT Lab has a multidisciplinary team composed of experts in clinical medicine, ML, data science, social determinants of health and was tasked with the development of the ML algorithm and decision support tool.

**Model Development and Deployment Pipeline** Through the collaboration between the PROSPECT lab and analysts at ZSFG, we extracted EHR tables with information on patient demo-

57 graphics, insurance, lab results, diagnosis codes, etc.  
58 Initially all the EHR features for HF patients, across  
59 both inpatient and outpatient settings, were used  
60 to train several models such as logistic regression,  
61 random forests, and gradient boosted trees. These  
62 features were pared down to meet model deployment  
63 requirements and improve model transparency.  
64 The final model selected was a gradient boosted  
65 tree with 47 features. A model card summarizing  
66 the algorithm’s training procedure and evaluation  
67 performance can be found in Fig 1.

68 The model was deployed using Epic’s Nebula cloud  
69 platform, which interfaces directly with live EHR  
70 data through the Chronicles database used in Epic.  
71 The cloud platform allows for the model code and  
72 outputs to be bundled through a docker container  
73 which is used for secure deployment into SFHN’s  
74 Epic platform. While in clinical use, a monitoring  
75 pipeline is setup to verify the ML model is aligned  
76 with the true readmission rate and accurately pre-  
77 dict the readmission risk for patients.

78 **Clinical Interface** As prior research in HF risk  
79 prediction has demonstrated that surfacing a predic-  
80 tion without actionable guidance does not improve  
81 outcomes (Joynt and Jha, 2013) significant attention  
82 was given to linking ML predictive outputs with ac-  
83 tionable decision support. We built a point-of-care  
84 decision support tool housed within a custom-built  
85 user interface. This tool surfaced patient-specific  
86 guideline-based recommendations about HF care to  
87 inpatient providers and guided them to place high-  
88 priority follow-up referrals to a specialized HF clinic  
89 for patients in the highest quartile of predicted read-  
90 mission risk. In this way, HF care was standardized;  
91 however, the patients at the highest risk of readmis-  
92 sion were rapidly triaged to a HF specialist.

### 93 3. Results

94 At ZSFG an interrupted time series analysis revealed  
95 that HF readmission rates declined from 27.9% in  
96 the pre-implementation period to 23.9% in the post-  
97 implementation period ( $p < 0.004$ ) by the end of  
98 2023. In comparison to five peer hospitals, the odds of  
99 30-day readmission were significantly higher at ZSFG  
100 in the pre-implementation period (OR 1.58 [CI 1.21-  
101 2.06],  $p < 0.001$ ), and readmission odds trended up-  
102 wards over time before implementation (OR 1.06 [CI  
103 1-1.13]/year,  $p = 0.065$ ). The decline in readmission  
104 odds following program implementation was signifi-  
105 cantly higher at ZSFG compared to peer hospitals  
106 (OR 0.91 [CI 0.84-0.98]/year,  $p = 0.015$ )

107 Cox proportional hazards models adjusted for age,  
108 sex, Charlson Comorbidity Index, and social depriva-  
109 tion index revealed a significant reduction in risk of  
110 mortality in HF patients in the post-implementation  
111 period in comparison to the HF patients in the three  
112 years before implementation (OR 0.82[CI 0.68-0.99],  
113  $p = 0.037$ )

114 The ML algorithm is applied to the entire HF pop-  
115 ulation in the SFHN. Over 200 providers have used  
116 the decision support tool during 2,130 inpatient en-  
117 counters. The model has a test AUC of .73 and per-  
118 forms consistently across various subgroups (Fig 1).

### 119 4. Discussion

120 This health system-wide performance improvement  
121 initiative in a safety net health system demonstrates  
122 the feasibility of utilizing machine learning predic-  
123 tion models to meet readmission reduction metrics  
124 while simultaneously improving mortality. Further-  
125 more, the success of this tool led the health system  
126 to retain over 7.2 million dollars of at-risk pay for  
127 performance funding.

128 Despite these successes, we encountered several  
129 hurdles during the implementation of this program.  
130 First, general interaction rates with EHR-based deci-  
131 sion support aids across our health system were meag-  
132 er. To ensure usage, we conducted workshops with  
133 providers utilizing the digital tool to integrate their  
134 design feedback and encourage buy-in to the tool’s  
135 success. Current metrics show that providers inter-  
136 act with the tool for decision support in 56-75% of  
137 inpatient HF patients. Further, deploying our cus-  
138 tom model through Epic Nebula presented significant  
139 challenges. Each EHR feature required individual  
140 mapping as an input to the model, a time-intensive,  
141 manual process that restricted us to a maximum of  
142 50 features from over 3,000 features in the EHR data.  
143 This limitation meant important engineered features  
144 could not be used for our deployed model leading to  
145 a decrease in accuracy.

146 Though outcomes have improved via deployment  
147 of the decision support tool and ML model, in the  
148 outpatient setting we believe further improvement in  
149 outcomes is possible by focusing on outpatient care.  
150 Therefore, the decision support tool and ML model  
151 have been adapted to the outpatient setting and are  
152 currently being deployed in a step wedge, cluster ran-  
153 domized trial to evaluate the effect on HF medication  
154 prescription rates, readmission rates, and mortality.

155 **References**

156 Tariq Ahmad, Nihar R Desai, Yu Yamamoto, Aditya  
157 Biswas, Lama Ghazi, Melissa Martin, Michael Si-  
158 monov, Ravi Dhar, Allen Hsiao, Nitu Kashyap,  
159 et al. Alerting clinicians to 1-year mortality risk in  
160 patients hospitalized with heart failure: the reveal-  
161 hf randomized clinical trial. *JAMA cardiology*, 7  
162 (9):905–912, 2022.

163 Jose F Figueroa, Karen E Joynt, Xiner Zhou, En-  
164 del J Orav, and Ashish K Jha. Safety-net hospitals  
165 face more barriers yet use fewer strategies to reduce  
166 readmissions. *Medical care*, 55(3):229–235, 2017.

167 Karen E Joynt and Ashish K Jha. Characteristics  
168 of hospitals receiving penalties under the hospi-  
169 tal readmissions reduction program. *Jama*, 309(4):  
170 342–343, 2013.