



Personalization in the health care system: do personal health budgets impact on outcomes and cost?

Karen Jones¹, Julien Forder², James Caiels³, Elizabeth Welch⁴, Caroline Glendinning⁵ and Karen Windle⁶

could be same

Abstract

Objectives: In England's National Health Service, personal health budgets are part of a growing trend to give patients more choice and control over how health care services are managed and delivered. The personal health budget programme was launched by the Department of Health in 2009, and a three-year independent evaluation was commissioned with the aim of identifying whether the initiative ensured better health- and care-related outcomes at what cost when compared to conventional service delivery.

Methods: The evaluation used a pragmatic controlled trial design to compare the outcomes and costs of patients selected to receive a personal health budget with those continuing with conventional support arrangements (control group). Just over 1000 individuals were recruited into the personal health budget group and 1000 into the control group in order to ensure sufficient statistical power, and followed for 12 months.

Results: The use of personal health budgets was associated with significant improvement in patients' care-related quality of life and psychological wellbeing at 12 months. Personal health budgets did not appear to have an impact on health status, mortality rates, health-related quality of life or costs over the same period. With net benefits measured in terms of care-related quality of life on the adult social care outcome toolkit measure, personal health budgets were cost-effective: that is, budget holders experienced greater benefits than people receiving conventional services, and the budgets were worth the cost.

Conclusion: The evaluation provides support for the planned wider roll-out of personal health budgets in the English NHS after 2014 in so far as the localities in the pilot sample are representative of the whole country.

Keywords

quality of life, quantitative methods, research policy

Introduction

The personal health budget initiative was proposed in the 2008 National Health Service (NHS) Next Stage Review as a way to encourage the NHS to become more responsive to the needs of patients. It was argued that the provision of greater choice to patients around the type and extent of health care would ultimately result in improved system efficiencies.¹ The 2010 White Paper *Equity and Excellence: Liberating the NHS* re-affirmed the importance of ensuring that patients are involved in all decision making.¹ Subsequently, the Department of Health published two consultations outlining proposals to secure shared decision-making over care and treatment.^{2,3}

Senior Research Fellow

Professor + Director

¹Research Fellow, Personal Social Services Research Unit, University of Kent, UK

²Principal Research Fellow, Personal Social Services Research Unit, University of Kent, UK

³Research Officer, Personal Social Services Research Unit, University of Kent, UK

⁴Research Assistant, Personal Social Services Research Unit, University of Kent, UK

⁵Professor of Social Policy, Social Policy Research Unit, University of York, UK

⁶Reader, School of Health and Social Care, University of Lincoln, UK

Corresponding author:

Karen Jones, Personal Social Services Research Unit, University of Kent, Canterbury CT2, UK.

Email: K.C.Jones@kent.co.uk

and P-S-S-R-U, L-2
S-
of E-

OK

X

The principles underlying the personal health budgets initiative⁴ were drawn from the experience in social care with personal (individual) budgets⁵ and include the following:

1. Recipients know the resource level of the available ~~within~~ budget.
2. Patients are encouraged to develop a support/care plan that details how the resource will be used to meet their identified needs.
3. Patients decide how they would like the budget to be managed. There are three options: notionally, where the budget is held by the commissioner, but the budget holder is aware of the service options and their financial implications; managed by a third party; or as a direct payment.

Personal health budget pilot programme

The personal health budget pilot programme was launched by the Department of Health in 2009.⁴ An independent evaluation was commissioned to run alongside the pilot programme. The overarching aim was to identify whether personal health budgets ensured better health and care outcomes when compared to conventional service delivery and, if so, the best way for the initiative to be implemented. Of the 64 pilot sites involved in piloting personal health budgets, 20 sites were selected to be *in-depth* evaluation sites, with the remainder being *wider-cohort* sites. The *in-depth* sites offered personal health budgets to individuals with the following health characteristics: long-term conditions (including chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), diabetes and long-term neurological conditions; mental health issues; NHS Continuing Healthcare; and stroke).

In this paper, we focus on the evaluation of the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of personal health budgets.

Method

The evaluation used a controlled trial with a pragmatic design to compare the experiences of people selected to receive personal health budgets with those continuing with conventional support arrangements during the study period. Participants were recruited to the study in one of two ways, based on how personal health budgets were being implemented within the pilot sites. In some pilot sites the personal health budget group was recruited by those health care professionals offering budgets, while a control group was recruited by non-participating health care professionals in the same site. Other sites randomized patients into either the personal

health budget group or the control group (25% of participants were randomly assigned).

Data about respondents were collected at baseline (between April 2010 and June 2011, after gaining informed consent from participants) and again 12 months later (April 2011 to June 2012).

The National Research Ethics Service conferred a favourable ethical opinion for the evaluation. Subsequently, the research was given Research Governance management authorization to commence the study in each pilot site.

Data collection

Figure 1 shows the sequencing of the main quantitative data collection within the *in-depth* pilot sites.

A number of validated outcome measures were used in the structured interviews, including the following:

- Health-related quality of life was measured using EQ-5D (Euro-Qol).⁶
- An early version of the Adult Social Care Outcome Toolkit (ASCOT) measure (Netten et al.⁷) that reflected level of need along nine care-related dimensions: personal care/comfort; social participation and involvement; control over daily life; meals and nutrition; safety; accommodation cleanliness and comfort; occupation and usual activities; anxiety; and dignity and respect.
- Subjective global scale based on the measure used by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) in the Integrated Household Survey (IHS) that captured general life happiness and satisfaction.⁶
- Psychological wellbeing as measured by the 12-item version of the General Health Questionnaire.⁸

In addition, demographic and socio-economic information was collected within the interviews, as well as information about current circumstances.

Participants' health condition, clinical indicators and their use of primary health care services were gathered from GP records, whilst their use of secondary care was extracted from the Hospital Episodes Statistics database (NHS Information Centre). Both sets of data were collected at two time-points during the study period: first, around the time of consent to explore the previous 12 months' activity; second, around 12 months after participants agreed to take part to gather information for the year following consent. The data collection allowed the evaluation team to explore whether personal health budgets had an impact on the use of either primary or secondary care compared to receiving conventional services.

For personal health budget holders, the support/care plan was used to extract information about the size of

at baseline. We compared our outcome indicators at follow-up between the two groups after subtracting any difference between the groups in the relevant indicator at baseline. The impact measure is therefore the follow-up difference net of any baseline difference in the indicator in question. This approach assumes that, without the intervention, the situation of the intervention group would change through time (on average) by the same amount as the control group. As an additional safeguard against selection bias, we also used multiple regression to account for any differences between groups in the *change* in costs and outcomes due to confounding baseline factors (such as sociodemographic and socioeconomic factors and health status: for example, health condition and comorbidities), not use of personal health budgets.

Regarding the second problem, we collected data from *samples* of people using personal health budgets and conventional service delivery. The value of collected indicator variables for each group therefore only imperfectly reflects the true value: they are subject to statistical noise. For this reason we calculated both parametric (i.e. assumed normally distributed) and non-parametric (bootstrapped) statistical error margins. We thus report the statistical significance of the results using the following significance levels for the interpretation: either a 10% ($P > 0.01$), 5% ($P > 0.05$) or 1% ($P < 0.01$) probability that an observed effect may have occurred by chance, as reported below.

A multiple imputation approach was used to tackle missing data. This technique uses information inherent in the whole dataset to predict what the random missing values would have been. It requires that the reasons for the data being missing must be accounted for by factors that do not have missing values.⁹ The pattern of missing data in the sample was as follows. Regarding EQ-5D, ASCOT, and General Health Questionnaire (GHQ) scores, at least some follow-up outcomes data were available in 1656 cases (74% of the active sample of 2235 cases). There were 2104 cases (94%) with at least some service data at follow-up and 2133 cases (95%) with either some follow-up outcomes data or some service data.

To tackle the fourth issue, we needed to make some assumptions, albeit based on discussion with study participants about some of the detail. A key assumption in this regard was the identification of personal health budgets provided in addition to or as a substitute for conventional services.

Cost-effectiveness was assessed by estimating whether the personal health budgets group experienced better quality of life than the control group who received conventional service delivery, after netting-off the difference in service and support costs between the groups. Quality of life (both EQ-5D and ASCOT) was

expressed in monetary terms – by applying willingness-to-pay (WTP) thresholds to the quality of life indicators – to allow the netting-off of costs. At the time of writing, the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) operates with willingness-to-pay thresholds of between £20,000 and £30,000: that is, if an intervention improves a person's quality of life by an amount corresponding to being in full health compared to a state that is no better than being dead over the course of a year, the value of this improvement in monetary terms is between £20,000 and £30,000.

Net monetary quality of life at any time is therefore equal to: quality of life level, times WTP threshold, minus costs of services used. The estimated probability of this value being greater for the personal health budget group at follow-up compared to the control group (after subtracting the respective baseline values to account for any baseline differences between the groups), can be interpreted as the probability that personal health budgets were (more) cost-effective than conventional service delivery.

Sensitivity analysis was conducted regarding assumptions about the costing of services used by the personal health budgets group, and about the assumptions used in the multiple imputation procedure. We tested the sensitivity of three types of assumptions:

- *Statistical assumptions.* For key analyses such as the cost-effectiveness estimates we used both parametric and non-parametric (bootstrapping) methods. We found very little difference in the results.
- *Costing assumption.* On testing the sensitivity of the main results to this assumption, we did not find any qualitative impact on the results until quite unrealistic assumptions were tried.
- *Multiple imputation.* To test the sensitivity of the main results, we first added a further five imputations to our main dataset with a different randomly selected seed value, and second, used a variant imputation model. The main results in both alternative cases were very similar to the original estimates, with, if anything, slightly better statistical significance. In particular, with both the alternative dataset and the alternative imputation model, the results for the whole sample analysis indicated that personal health budgets were cost-effective on the ASCOT scale at the 5% significance level rather than at 10%.

Results

Table 1 shows the primary health condition breakdown by personal health budget group and control group at baseline and at 12 months within the active sample.

Table 3. ASCOT and EQ-5D outcome difference-in-difference, personal health budget group, with control factors.

	Care-related quality of life (ASCOT)		Health-related quality of life (EQ-5D)	
	Coeff	Prob	Coeff	Prob
PHB group	0.028	0.047**	-0.018	0.167
Age	-0.002	<0.001***	-0.001	0.023**
Male	-0.004	0.741	0.011	0.432
ADL score	2.11E-04	0.813	-0.004	<0.001***
Receives benefits	-0.014	0.420	0.011	0.427
Uni/college educ.	0.010	0.701	0.019	0.175
Intermediate educ.	-0.004	0.840	0.022	0.198
Health condition				
Continuing healthcare	0.009	0.656	-0.074	0.001**
Stroke	-0.004	0.873	-0.001	0.977
Diabetes	0.044	0.146	-3.18E-04	0.988
Mental health	0.042	0.176	-0.012	0.635
COPD	0.040	0.140	0.016	0.514
Neurological	0.043	0.215	-0.022	0.298
Follow-up period	2.90E-04	0.319	2.95E-05	0.889
Consent date	-2.71E-05	0.810	7.55E-05	0.473
Area cost adjust	0.079	0.564	0.193	0.186
Area				
Town & fringe	0.026	0.310	0.014	0.639
Rural	0.019	0.578	0.036	0.114
Constant	0.385	0.858	-1.501	0.456
N	2235		2235	
Model F	2.010	0.011**	2.000	0.011**
Controls - Joint sig	1.670	0.052*	2.110	0.008**

Significance levels: *P < 0.10, **P < 0.05, ***P < 0.001.

Table 4. GHQ-12 and subjective wellbeing difference-in-difference, personal health budget group, with control factors.

	Psychological wellbeing (GHQ-12)		Subjective wellbeing	
	Coeff	Prob	Coeff	Prob
PHB group	-0.852	0.096*	0.762	0.213
Age	0.027	0.028**	-0.042	0.022**
Male	1.030	0.059*	-0.669	0.110
ADL score	0.113	0.013**	-0.041	0.306
Receives benefits	-0.291	0.604	0.132	0.865
Uni/college educ.	-0.334	0.561	0.446	0.457
Intermediate educ.	0.288	0.648	-0.755	0.266
Health condition				
Continuing healthcare	1.423	0.060*	-1.391	0.165
Stroke	-1.801	0.033**	0.569	0.633
Diabetes	-1.891	0.047*	1.563	0.101
Mental health	-0.459	0.653	2.233	0.066*
COPD	-1.278	0.136	1.141	0.350

(continued)

Table 6. Difference in mean NMB-change for EQ-5D, whole sample, various CE thresholds.

	PHB	Control	Difference	Sig prob ($p \neq 0$)	90% CI-	90% CI+
Benefits						
EQ-5D change	-0.011	0.000	-0.011			
£-Value of EQ-5D change:						
£40,000	-420	0	-420			
£30,000	-310	0	-310			
£20,000	-210	0	-210			
£10,000	-100	0	-100			
Costs						
Cost change	800	1920	-1120			
Net benefit						
NMB change:						
£40,000	-1220	-1920	700	0.613	-1710	3110
£30,000	-1110	-1920	810	0.536	-1450	3060
£20,000	-1010	-1920	910	0.459	-1200	3030
£10,000	-900	-1920	1020	0.386	-980	3020

Significance levels: * $P < 0.10$, ** $P < 0.05$, *** $P < 0.001$.

WTP = Willingness-to-Pay.

NMB = Net Monetary Benefit.

Another tension in the design of the evaluation was between allowing sufficient elapsed time after baseline for the effects of personal health budgets to be felt on the one hand, and minimizing loss to follow-up on the other. The experience from the evaluation of the individual budgets pilots in social care (Glendinning et al.⁵) was that a six-month follow-up period was unlikely to be sufficient, and so we opted for a main follow-up period of one year. As a consequence, although final recruitment rates were good, drop-out rates were an issue and potentially impacted on the robustness of the evaluation findings and the extent to which results can be extrapolated. The study population was also in the most part very frail, with much lower than population-average health status and wellbeing scores. We expected drop-out rates to be higher for this study population as a result, but we could argue that the reasons for drop-out are due to baseline factors to a significant extent, and are therefore not a source of bias in the evaluation.

The quality of the structured interview outcome data was good, particularly the main subjective instruments. As we had to rely on local site tracking and records regarding mortality data, we were less able to rate their quality. Service data were drawn from a number of sources. Where possible, we did not rely on self-reported use; instead, we interrogated care plans, medical records and hospital episode statistics. Another issue was the sheer range of services and support that could be purchased, which resulted in a number of assumptions being made to produce like-with-like cost

estimates between personal health budget and control groups.

A final consideration is that such a complex intervention presents methodological challenges necessarily resulting in the development of appropriate underpinning assumptions. We explored the sensitivity of the main findings by re-estimating net benefit differences with changes in the following:

- Imputation dataset (created by adding further imputations);
- Imputation models;
- Budget level that constitutes personal health budgets substituting for, rather than being provided in addition to, conventional services.

In the main, the sensitivity analysis demonstrated a higher degree of statistical significance of the key results. Systemic interventions such as personal health budgets preclude the use of fully double-blinded randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and, although we used a range of methods to tackle the consequences of a more pragmatic design, it is important to be aware of the discussed associated limitations.

Conclusion

In conclusion, despite the study limitations, the evaluation did find that personal health budgets were cost-effective and had a positive impact on subjective outcomes. Generally, the findings provide support for the