West Chester University

Digital Commons @ West Chester University

Mathematics

College of the Sciences & Mathematics

2-2020

The Risk Assessment and Prediction Tool (RAPT) for Discharge Planning in a Posterior Lumbar Fusion Population

Gregory Glauser Matthew Piazza Benjamin Osiemo Scott D. McClintock Eric Winter

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.wcupa.edu/math_facpub Part of the Analytical, Diagnostic and Therapeutic Techniques and Equipment Commons

Authors

Gregory Glauser, Matthew Piazza, Benjamin Osiemo, Scott D. McClintock, Eric Winter, H. Isaac Chen, Zarina S. Ali, and Neil R. Malhotra



Gregory Glauser, BS* Matthew Piazza, MD* Ian Berger, BS* Benjamin Osiemo, MS^{‡§} Scott D. McClintock, PhD[§] Eric Winter, BS* H. Isaac Chen, MD* Zarina S. Ali, MD, MS* Neil R. Malhotra, MD*

*Department of Neurosurgery, Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; [‡]McKenna EpiLog Fellowship in Population Health, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; [§]The West Chester Statistical Institute, Department of Mathematics, West Chester University, West Chester, Pennsylvania

Correspondence:

Neil R. Malhotra, MD, Department of Neurosurgery, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, 3rd Floor Silverstein Pavilion, 3400 Spruce St, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA. Email: NRM@uphs.upenn.edu

Received, February 14, 2019. Accepted, July 10, 2019. Published Online, October 10, 2019.

Copyright © 2019 by the Congress of Neurological Surgeons

The Risk Assessment and Prediction Tool (RAPT) for Discharge Planning in a Posterior Lumbar Fusion Population

BACKGROUND: As the use of bundled care payment models has become widespread in neurosurgery, there is a distinct need for improved preoperative predictive tools to identify patients who will not benefit from prolonged hospitalization, thus facilitating earlier discharge to rehabilitation or nursing facilities.

OBJECTIVE: To validate the use of Risk Assessment and Prediction Tool (RAPT) in patients undergoing posterior lumbar fusion for predicting discharge disposition.

METHODS: Patients undergoing elective posterior lumbar fusion from June 2016 to February 2017 were prospectively enrolled. RAPT scores and discharge outcomes were recorded for patients aged 50 yr or more (n = 432). Logistic regression analysis was used to assess the ability of RAPT score to predict discharge disposition. Multivariate regression was performed in a backwards stepwise logistic fashion to create a binomial model.

RESULTS: Escalating RAPT score predicts disposition to home (P < .0001). Every unit increase in RAPT score increases the chance of home disposition by 55.8% and 38.6% than rehab and skilled nursing facility, respectively. Further, RAPT score was significant in predicting length of stay (P = .0239), total surgical cost (P = .0007), and 30-d readmission (P < .0001). Amongst RAPT score subcomponents, walk, gait, and postoperative care availability were all predictive of disposition location (P < .0001) for both models. In a generalized multiple logistic regression model, the 3 top predictive factors for disposition were the RAPT score, length of stay, and age (P < .0001, P < .0001 and P = .0001, respectively). **CONCLUSION:** Preoperative RAPT score is a highly predictive tool in lumbar fusion patients for discharge disposition.

KEY WORDS: Discharge disposition, Lumbar spine, Predictive scale, Spine

Neurosurgery 86:E140–E146, 2020

DOI:10.1093/neuros/nyz419

www.neurosurgery-online.com

www ith the advent of bundled healthcare payments, optimizing neurosurgical care and disposition is increasingly relevant for surgeons and patients.¹ In an attempt to reduce cost, surgeons have made efforts to reduce hospital length of stay (LOS). As a result, this approach may have generated increased discharge rates to expensive postacute

```
ABBREVIATIONS: AR, acute rehabilitation; ARF,
acute rehabilitation facility; BMI, body mass index;
CI, confidence interval; LOS, length of stay; OR, odds
ratio; RAPT, Risk Assessment And Prediction Tool;
SNF, skilled nursing facility
```

Neurosurgery Speaks! Audio abstracts available for this article at www.neurosurgery-online.com. CNS Journal Club Podcast and CME Exams available at cns.org/podcasts. care facilities, such as acute rehabilitation (AR) and skilled nursing facilities (SNFs).² In the setting of bundled care payments, surgeons and hospitals are incentivized to help patients avoid extended postacute inpatient care at rehabilitation centers and SNF when not needed.³ Although minimizing overutilization of postacute care inpatient resources may be accomplished through extended hospital LOS, it is inevitable that some patients will need the support provided at these postacute care facilities. Thus, there is an urgent need for a tool that effectively predicts postoperative disposition prior to surgical admission.

Accurately predicting care components such as LOS and disposition based on preoperative patient evaluation is invaluable for surgeons to provide quality care and help patients and families plan for their intervention and align expectations. The Risk Assessment and Predictor Tool (RAPT) was developed to assess the need for postsurgical inpatient care within orthopedic surgery populations.⁴⁻⁸ The RAPT Score consists of 6 components, each assigned an individual score and summed for a combined score: age, sex, walk score, gait assist score, community support score, and home support score (Figure 1). Though RAPT has proven to accurately predict disposition to home in a heterogeneous neurosurgical patient population⁹ and a cervical spine surgical population,¹⁰ it has not been exclusively applied to patients undergoing elective lumbar surgery. The study herein seeks to evaluate RAPT, as well as other preoperative patient characteristics, in a population of posterior lumbar fusion patients and its ability to predict disposition to home, acute rehabilitation facility (ARF), or SNF.

METHODS

Patient Selection

All consecutive adult patients undergoing elective posterior lumbar fusion (n = 508) at a multihospital 1659 bed university health system from June 2016 to February 2017 were prospectively enrolled in this IRB approved study (Figure 2). A waiver of informed consent was granted by the IRB, as this study was considered to be minimal risk to patients. This study was approved by the IRB at the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania. IRB number for this study is: 826 300. All ethical guidelines and rules were followed to protect patient privacy. Patient RAPT score data, as well as relevant baseline and clinical variables, were captured in a prospective fashion during the presurgical office visit. Key data were acquired using the Neurosurgery Quality Initiative (NQII) EpiLog tool (University of Pennsylvania). EpiLog is a nonproprietary data acquisition system built and layered on top of the existing electronic health record architecture (by the senior author and department on the present paper) to enhance quality improvement efforts with low cost and minimal employee workflow impact.11

Patients were excluded if they were under the age of 50 because the RAPT score has not been validated in this population (n = 76). Discharge disposition was extracted for patients aged 50 yr or more (n = 432) using the EpiLog system, verified by a blinded reviewer, and broadly divided into home, AR, or SNF. In addition to RAPT score, the following variables were also obtained and assessed for capacity to predict discharge disposition: age, medical comorbidities, body mass index (BMI), American Society for Anesthesiologists Physical Status Classification System (ASA grade), and anatomic level of spine surgery. Comorbidities that were considered in the data included hypertension, diabetes mellitus, cancer, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, congestive heart failure, coronary artery disease, and chronic renal failure. The EpiLog system was used to extract all remaining data.

Statistical Analysis

Logistic regression analysis was used to assess the ability of RAPT score and other preoperative characteristics, in 2 models: predicting either home vs ARF vs SNF (Model A) or home vs ARF and/or SNF (Model B) (Table 1). For those variables that were significant in predicting discharge disposition in univariate analysis, multivariate regression was performed in a backwards, stepwise logistic fashion. Receiver Operating Characteristic analysis was used to compare the predictive power of RAPT score to the novel grading scales generated from multivariate analysis.

Age and BMI were included as continuous variables, whereas RAPT score, RAPT subcomponent, and ASA grade were included as ordinal variables. All other variables were categorical. A binomial model to predict discharge disposition defined by Model B was created using backward selection and variables significant on univariable analysis. This model excluded LOS, as this would not be known preoperatively. *P* values of .05 were used to define statistical significance. All analyses were performed using SPSS (IBM Analytics, Armonk, New York), R Statistics (R Core Team, Vienna, Austria, 2017), and SAS Version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc, Cary, North Carolina).

RESULTS

RAPT Score Prediction of Discharge Disposition

A total of 432 patients remained in the study after exclusions. Mean RAPT scores by model and disposition are shown in Table 1. RAPT scores effectively predicted discharge disposition in both Models A and B (P < .0001). For Model A, every unit increase in RAPT score increased the chance of home disposition by 55.8% and 38.6% than rehab and SNF, respectively (odds ratio [OR] 1.6; 95% CI [95% CI] 1.3-1.9) or SNF (OR 1.4; 95% CI 1.2-1.6) (Figure 3). However, there was no significant difference in RAPT scores between patients discharged to SNF or AR. For Model B, every unit increase in RAPT score increased the chance of disposition to home by 43.1% (OR 1.4; 95% CI 1.3-1.6).

Individual RAPT Components Predict Discharge Disposition

RAPT subcomponents included the following: walk, gait, and postoperative care. In brief, these consist of average number of blocks the patient can walk, use of gait assistance, and if someone at home can provide postoperative care. Model A demonstrated the RAPT walk, RAPT gait, and RAPT postoperative care scores to be predictive of home discharge (P < .0001). Every unit increase in RAPT walk score increased the chance of home dispositions by 1.4 times than SNF (P = .0004, OR 1.4; 95% CI 1.1-2.7). Each unit increase in RAPT gait scores increased the chance of home disposition by 2.31 times than rehab (P = .0001, OR 2.3; 95% CI 1.7-3.5) and 1.5 times higher to rehab than SNF (P = .0001, OR 2.5; 95% CI 1.1-4.2), whereas each incremental increase in RAPT postoperative care score (ie, from 0 to 3) increased the chance of home disposition by 1.4 times than SNF (P = .0039, OR 1.5; 95% CI 1.1-1.9) (Figure 4).

Model B demonstrated the RAPT walk and RAPT postoperative care scores to be predictive of home discharge (P < .0001). Every unit increase in RAPT walk and RAPT postoperative care scores increased the chance of home dispositions by 1.8 and 1.4 times, respectively, as opposed to SNF and AR combined.

Preoperative Patient Characteristics Influence on Postoperative Postacute Care Needs

Demographics for the cohort are shown in Table 2. Both models demonstrated that age, when assessed as a distinct

1. What is your age group? 50-65 years 66-75 years > 75 years > 1-2 blocks or more (+/- rests) 1-2 blocks (the shopping centre) Housebound (most of the time) 4. Which gait aid do you use? (a block is 200 meters) Two blocks or more (+/- rests) 1-2 blocks (the shopping centre) Housebound (most of the time) 4. Which gait aid do you use? (more often than not) None Single point stick Crutches/frame 5. Do you use community supports? (home help, meals-on wheels, district nurse) None or one per week Two or more per week 6. Will you live with someone who can care for you after your operation? Yes Your score (out of 12) KEY:Scores < 6 high risk prediction: discharge extended inpatient rehabilitation Scores > 9 low risk prediction: discharge directly home Scores 6-9 medium risk prediction: additional intervention to discharge directly home Score is discussed with the patient and a destination plan agreed to. Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination IGURE 1. RAPT scoring sheet. Score sheets that show the components of the RAPT tool and their respontals.	=2 =1 =0 =2 =1 =2 =1 =0 =2
66-75 years 2. Gender? Male Female 3. How far, on average, can you walk? a block is 200 meters) 1-2 blocks or more (+/- rests) 1-2 blocks (the shopping centre) 4. Which gait aid do you use? (more often than not) 6. Do you use community supports? (home help, meals-on wheels, district nurse) 5. Do you use community supports? (home help, meals-on wheels, district nurse) 5. Will you live with someone who can care for rou after your operation? Your score (out of 12) Yet Scores < 6 high risk prediction: discharge extended inpatient rehabilitation Scores > 9 low risk prediction: discharge directly home Scores 6-9 medium risk prediction: additional intervention to discharge directly home Score is discussed with the patient and a destination plan agreed to. Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination GURE 1. RAPT scoring sheet. Score sheets that show the components of the RAPT tool and their responsed.	=1 =0 =2 =1 =2 =1 =0 =2
> 75 years 2. Gender? Male 3. How far, on average, can you walk? Two blocks or more (+/- rests) 1-2 blocks (the shopping centre) 1-2 blocks (the shopping centre) 4. Which gait aid do you use? None (more often than not) Single point stick 5. Do you use community supports? None or one per week (home help, meals-on wheels, district nurse) Two or more per week 6. Will you live with someone who can care for you after your operation? Yes Your score (out of 12) Yes KEY: Scores < 6 high risk prediction: discharge extended inpatient rehabilitation Scores > 9 low risk prediction: discharge directly home Scores 6-9 medium riskprediction: additional intervention to discharge directly home Score is discussed with the patient and a destination plan agreed to. Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination GURE 1. RAPT scoring sheet. Score sheets that show the components of the RAPT tool and their respontation.	=0 =2 =1 =2 =1 =0 =2
2. Gender? Male 3. How far, on average, can you walk? Two blocks or more (+/- rests) 1-2 blocks (the shopping centre) Housebound (most of the time) 4. Which gait aid do you use? None (more often than not) Single point stick 5. Do you use community supports? None or one per week (home help, meals-on wheels, district nurse) Two or more per week 6. Will you live with someone who can care for you after your operation? Yes Your score (out of 12) Yes KEY:Scores < 6 high risk prediction: discharge extended inpatient rehabilitation Scores > 9 low risk prediction: additional intervention to discharge directly home Scores 6-9 medium riskprediction: additional intervention to discharge directly home Score is discussed with the patient and a destination plan agreed to. Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination IGURE 1. RAPT scoring sheet. Score sheets that show the components of the RAPT tool and their respontates	=2 =1 =2 =1 =0 =2
Female 3. How far, on average, can you walk? Two blocks or more (+/- rests) 1-2 blocks (the shopping centre) Housebound (most of the time) 4. Which gait aid do you use? None (more often than not) Single point stick 5. Do you use community supports? None or one per week (home help, meals-on wheels, district nurse) Two or more per week 6. Will you live with someone who can care for you after your operation? Yes Your score (out of 12) Your score (out of 12) KEY:Scores < 6 high risk prediction: discharge extended inpatient rehabilitation Scores > 9 low risk prediction: discharge directly home Scores 6-9 medium riskprediction: additional intervention to discharge directly home Scores is discussed with the patient and a destination plan agreed to. Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination MGURE 1. RAPT scoring sheet. Score sheets that show the components of the RAPT tool and their respontate.	=1 =2 =1 =0 =2
3. How far, on average, can you walk? Two blocks or more (+/- rests) 1-2 blocks (the shopping centre) 1-2 blocks (the shopping centre) 4. Which gait aid do you use? None (more often than not) Single point stick 5. Do you use community supports? None or one per week (home help, meals-on wheels, district nurse) Two or more per week 6. Will you live with someone who can care for you after your operation? Yes Your score (out of 12) Yes KEY:Scores < 6 high risk prediction: discharge extended inpatient rehabilitation Scores > 9 low risk prediction: discharge directly home Scores 6-9 medium riskprediction: additional intervention to discharge directly home Score is discussed with the patient and a destination plan agreed to. Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination Identities and a destination plan agreed to. RGURE 1. RAPT scoring sheet. Score sheets that show the components of the RAPT tool and their respontate.	=2 =1 =0 =2
(a block is 200 meters) 1-2 blocks (the shopping centre) Housebound (most of the time) 4. Which gait aid do you use? (more often than not) None Single point stick Crutches/frame 5. Do you use community supports? (home help, meals-on wheels, district nurse) None or one per week (home help, meals-on wheels, district nurse) 6. Will you live with someone who can care for you after your operation? Yes Vour score (out of 12) Your score (out of 12) KEY:Scores < 6 high risk prediction: discharge extended inpatient rehabilitation Scores > 9 low risk prediction: discharge directly home Scores 6-9 medium riskprediction: additional intervention to discharge directly home Score is discussed with the patient and a destination plan agreed to. Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination Induction indicates Score sheets that show the components of the RAPT tool and their respondates	=1 =0 =2
Housebound (most of the time) 4. Which gait aid do you use? (more often than not) None 5. Do you use community supports? (home help, meals-on wheels, district nurse) None or one per week (home help, meals-on wheels, district nurse) 6. Will you live with someone who can care for you after your operation? Yes No Your score (out of 12) KEY:Scores < 6 high risk prediction: discharge extended inpatient rehabilitation Scores > 9 low risk prediction: discharge directly home Scores 6-9 medium riskprediction: additional intervention to discharge directly h Patient's expectation of discharge destination is also a determinant. The prediction indicate score is discussed with the patient and a destination plan agreed to. Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination IGURE 1. RAPT scoring sheet. Score sheets that show the components of the RAPT tool and their respondate.	=0
4. Which gait aid do you use? (more often than not) None Single point stick Crutches/frame 5. Do you use community supports? (home help, meals-on wheels, district nurse) None or one per week Two or more per week 6. Will you live with someone who can care for you after your operation? Yes No Your score (out of 12) Yes KEY:Scores < 6 high risk prediction: discharge extended inpatient rehabilitation Scores > 9 low risk prediction: discharge directly home Scores 6-9 medium riskprediction: additional intervention to discharge directly h Patient's expectation of discharge destination is also a determinant. The prediction indicate score is discussed with the patient and a destination plan agreed to. Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination IGURE 1. RAPT scoring sheet. Score sheets that show the components of the RAPT tool and their respondate.	=2
(more often than not) Single point stick Crutches/frame 5. Do you use community supports? None or one per week (home help, meals-on wheels, district nurse) 6. Will you live with someone who can care for you after your operation? Yes No 7. Wo or more per week Yes No 6. Will you live with someone who can care for you after your operation? Yes No Your score (out of 12) Yes KEY:Scores < 6 high risk prediction: discharge extended inpatient rehabilitation Scores > 9 low risk prediction: discharge directly home Scores 6-9 medium riskprediction: additional intervention to discharge directly h Patient's expectation of discharge destination is also a determinant. The prediction indicate score is discussed with the patient and a destination plan agreed to. Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination IGURE 1. RAPT scoring sheet. Score sheets that show the components of the RAPT tool and their respontals. Not the patient show the components of the RAPT tool and their respontals.	
5. Do you use community supports? None or one per week (home help, meals-on wheels, district nurse) Two or more per week 6. Will you live with someone who can care for you after your operation? Yes Your score (out of 12) Your score (out of 12) KEY:Scores < 6 high risk prediction: discharge extended inpatient rehabilitation Scores > 9 low risk prediction: discharge directly home Scores 6-9 medium riskprediction: additional intervention to discharge directly h Patient's expectation of discharge destination is also a determinant. The prediction indicates score is discussed with the patient and a destination plan agreed to. Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination IGURE 1. RAPT scoring sheet. Score sheets that show the components of the RAPT tool and their respectates.	=1
5. Do you use community supports? None or one per week (home help, meals-on wheels, district nurse) Two or more per week 6. Will you live with someone who can care for you after your operation? Yes you after your operation? KEY:Scores < 6 high risk prediction: discharge extended inpatient rehabilitation Scores > 9 low risk prediction: discharge directly home Scores 6-9 medium riskprediction: additional intervention to discharge directly home Score is discussed with the patient and a destination plan agreed to. Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination IGURE 1. RAPT scoring sheet. Score sheets that show the components of the RAPT tool and their responsed. Score soft tool and their responsed.	=0
(home help, meals-on wheels, district nurse) Two or more per week 6. Will you live with someone who can care for you after your operation? Yes No Your score (out of 12) Your score (out of 12) KEY:Scores < 6 high risk prediction: discharge extended inpatient rehabilitation Scores > 9 low risk prediction: discharge directly home Scores 6-9 medium riskprediction: additional intervention to discharge directly home Score is discussed with the patient and a destination plan agreed to. Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination IGURE 1. RAPT scoring sheet. Score sheets that show the components of the RAPT tool and their respondents. Score soft the response of the respon	=1
6. Will you live with someone who can care for you after your operation? Yes No Your score (out of 12) KEY:Scores < 6 high risk prediction: discharge extended inpatient rehabilitation Scores > 9 low risk prediction: discharge directly home Scores 6-9 medium riskprediction: additional intervention to discharge directly h Patient's expectation of discharge destination is also a determinant. The prediction indicate score is discussed with the patient and a destination plan agreed to. Patient's preference Prediction (Score) Agreed destination IGURE 1. RAPT scoring sheet. Score sheets that show the components of the RAPT tool and their responsed.	=0
you after your operation? No Your score (out of 12) Your score (out of 12) KEY:Scores < 6 high risk prediction: discharge extended inpatient rehabilitation	=3
Your score (out of 12) KEY:Scores < 6 high risk prediction: discharge extended inpatient rehabilitation	=0
KEY:Scores < 6 high risk prediction: discharge extended inpatient rehabilitation	
GURE 1. RAPT scoring sheet. Score sheets that show the components of the RAPT tool and their respo tals.	
IGURE 1. RAPT scoring sheet. Score sheets that show the components of the RAPT tool and their respontals.	
Lumbar neurosurgical procedures, from 6/2016-2/2017 (n=508)	tive nume
Patients < 50 years of age of	
incomplete discharge dispo data (n=76)	with
Patients utilized in the primary	with ition

FIGURE 2. Flow chart of patient selection. Outlined are the number of patients included and excluded based on specified criteria.

independent variable, separate from RAPT score, was a significant predictor of discharge disposition (P < .0001). Older patients had an increased chance of being discharged to AR or SNF compared to home. Model B demonstrated that every year of age reduced the chance of being discharged home by 9.2% (OR 0.91; 95% CI 0.88-0.93).

The total number of a patient's medical comorbidities was not predictive of discharge disposition. When individually analyzing comorbidities, Model A showed that hypertension, coronary atherosclerotic disease and diabetes are significant predictors of discharge disposition (P = .0160, OR 2.3; 95% CI 1.3-4.2). However, in Model B, only hypertension predicted discharged disposition (P = .0043, OR 1.9; 95% CI 1.1-3.2). Nonsignificant factors included prior lumbar fusion, surgeon, BMI, and smoking among others.

Peri- and Postoperative Factors Influence Discharge Disposition

Hospital LOS was predictive of disposition in both Model A and Model B (P < .0001 and P < .0003, respectively). Patients

del and Discharge Disposition	30-d readmission (<i>P</i> < visit to the ER within		
	1 1 (1		

(n = 432)							
	Model A			I	Model B		
	Home	AR	SNF	Home	AR/SNF	p	
N	349 (81%)	23 (5%)	60 (14%)	349 (81%)	83 (19%)	-	
Mean	9.48	7.70	8.20	9.48	8.06	<.001	

TABLE 1. Mean RAPT Scores by Mo

that had an increased LOS had a decreased chance of being discharged to home. Additionally, Model B showed that each additional hour spent in the hospital decreased the chance of being discharged home by 1.0% (OR 0.99; 95% CI 0.99-0.99). Month and season of surgery, specific surgeon, and location of the surgery did not predict increased postacute needs.

Increasing the number of levels that are surgically treated decreased the likelihood of home disposition in both models (Model A, P = .0140, OR 0.69; 95% CI 0.5-0.9; Model B, P = .0078, OR 0.77; 95% CI 0.6-0.9). Using Model A, each additional treatment level led to a 31.52% decrease in chance of home disposition. Using Model B, each additional treatment level led to a 22.60% decrease in chance of home disposition.

Pilot RAPT Score Prediction of Cost and Readmission

Regression analysis found that RAPT was predictive of surgical supply cost (P = .0007), and each unit increase in RAPT score corresponded with a \$599 reduction in the supply and implant cost of surgery. RAPT score was able to significantly predict

30-d readmission (P < .0001, OR 1.4; 95% CI 1.2-1.7), but not a visit to the ER within 30 d. Each unit increase in RAPT decreased the chance of 30-d readmission by 42.6%. In addition, outpatient visits were analyzed to see if they influenced readmission and ER visit rates. An office visit within the postoperative follow-up period was not significantly associated with a decrease in either of these rates.

Enhancing Preoperative Disposition Prediction for Model B

The generalized multiple logistic regression model used for analysis was created with backward selection showed that RAPT score, LOS, and age together significantly enhance predictive capability (P < .0001; OR 1.5; 95% CI 1.2-1.7, P < .0001, OR 1.0; 95% CI 0.99-1.0, and P = .0001, respectively). With each unit increase in RAPT score, the chance of home disposition increased by 45.6% after accounting for LOS and age (P = .0063). Additionally, the chance of home disposition on average significantly reduces by 0.9% for every hour increase in LOS.

DISCUSSION

The results of the present study substantiate the potential utility of the RAPT score as an accurate tool for predicting discharge disposition in a lumbar neurosurgical cohort. RAPT Score, and in particular, the RAPT walk, RAPT gait, and RAPT postoperative care score subcomponents were highly predictive of discharge disposition. Higher RAPT and subcomponent walk,







TABLE 2. Patient Demographics of the Analytic Cohort					
Variable Name	Overall (n = 432)				
Age, mean					
Home	60.64				
AR	76.43				
SNF	69.69				
Female sex	268 (53%)				
BMI, mean	37.8				
Smoking status, yes	116 (23%)				
Disposition					
Home	349 (69%)				
AR	23 (4.5%)				
SNF	60 (12%)				
LOS (hours), mean					
Home	94				
AR	174				
SNF	210				
ER visit within 30 d	6 (1%)				
Admission within 30 d	43 (8.5%)				
Office visit within 30 d	142 (28%)				

gait, and postoperative care scores equate to greater odds of discharge to home and lower odds of requiring postacute care inpatient needs. Important factors in predicting discharge disposition were additionally identified, including multiple representations of age and hospital LOS. Multivariate analysis identified these 2 variables, in addition to RAPT walk score, as independent predictors of discharge disposition. The evaluation of age as a distinct independent variable, separate from RAPT score, is valuable as many practicing surgeons may not have the quality infrastructure necessary to capture all components of the RAPT; however, age is easily captured.

Prior studies making use of the RAPT score have largely been focused within the orthopedic population. RAPT has twice been

assessed in neurosurgery, with one study validating the tool in a cervical spine population¹⁰ and another investigation applying RAPT in a general heterogeneous neurosurgical population.⁹ This is the first report in the literature to assess the utility of RAPT in a lumbar spine surgery population.

The predictive capability of RAPT and its subcomponent scores suggest that the capacity to ambulate unaided is critical to potentiating home disposition subsequent to surgical intervention. Of note, patients with poor baseline status are less likely to be able to fully participate in postoperative physical therapy and thus might require more services on discharge. Shamji et al¹² previously showed that patients with preoperative myelopathy utilize postacute care at higher rates. Risk scores similar to RAPT have been previously shown to predict discharge disposition, although it is unclear through which mechanism this occurs.¹³ RAPT, and perhaps RAPT walk specifically, can potentially be used to stratify patients and preoperatively reserve beds at postacute care facilities to expedite postoperative transfer. Alternatively, for patients with relatively high RAPT scores, it may be used to determine if they can avoid discharge to a facility by slightly increasing their time in the hospital.

Analysis demonstrates that an increase in the number of levels involved in the operation increased the likelihood of postdischarge resource utilization. Larger surgeries involve larger incisions, more postoperative pain, and more muscle dissection. Thus, these patients in the early phase of recovery are less likely to participate in recovery protocols that enable home discharge. The results of this study coincide with prior work that found, in a matched cohort, that patients undergoing posterior fusion were 3 times more likely to be discharged to facilities than anterior fusions.¹⁴ These patients may benefit from discharge planning prior to surgery, because the approach is known preoperatively.

The data herein additionally show that an increased LOS predicted discharge to a facility. This finding has been reported across a variety of surgical subspecialties, including posterior spinal fusion.¹⁵⁻¹⁸ Of note, it is important to consider potential effects of confounding in the impact of LOS, because of the requirement of a 3-d hospital stay in the Medicare population prior to eligibility for SNF discharge. Hence, there remains the possibility that patients with extended LOS are more likely to be Medicare patients, with LOS being prolonged simply to meet the requirement for SNF discharge eligibility. However, even when studied prior to implementation of Medicare guide-lines, increased LOS has historically predicted the need for postacute care admission in the author's own datasets and the literature.^{8,19} Nevertheless, it is possible, and merits additional study, that posterior lumbar fusion patients may be a target population for extended LOS to maximize opportunity for home discharge.

The present study importantly suggests that patients with decreased mobility preoperatively have increased 30-d readmission rates. Lee et al²⁰ previously found that 6-min walking distance was a risk factor for complications. Much of the prior literature has focused on postoperative ambulation as a method to predict discharge disposition. An example of this is inpatient step counts being associated with readmission rates in multiple contexts.^{21,22} Thus, ambulation status should be valued as an important predictor of postoperative need. Future research should explore employing knowledge of preoperative capacity to walk as an actionable predictive tool and perhaps, where possible, to pursue mechanisms to improve patient ambulation status preoperatively. However, patients who are able to change their preoperative ambulation status may be different from those who are not, and this result is unlikely to be captured by the RAPT scoring system.

This study interestingly did not find a significant relationship between BMI/ASA grade and discharge disposition. This result contrasts previous findings that also specifically analyzed lumbar neurosurgical populations. McGirt et al²³ identified ASA grade as a significant predictor of discharge disposition in patients undergoing lumbar spine surgery. Niedermeier et al¹⁹ studied patients undergoing lumbar posterior spinal fusion and found that BMI was predictive of inpatient rehabilitation postoperatively. Murphy et al²⁴ identified both BMI and ASA grade as significant predictors of nonhome discharge disposition in their study of 8627 patients undergoing lumbar decompressive surgery. Though it is unclear why this difference arose, the results of this study suggest that ambulation preoperatively is associated with postoperative disposition. It is possible that this result encompasses patients with increased BMI/poor ASA grade as they are likely to ambulate less preoperatively. Regardless, the very powerful predictive results demonstrated by this work must be confirmed in future work.

Comorbidities, in aggregate or individually, were of minimal importance in the present analysis, with only hypertension as a significant individual predictor of discharge disposition in both models and no observed relationship between number of comorbidities and disposition. This contrasts prior studies which report comorbidity burden predicts unfavorable discharge disposition.²³⁻²⁵ This difference may reflect varied definitions of comorbidity burden in these studies compared to the present analysis.

The present study found that increasing RAPT score predicted a reduction in surgical supply costs. For the purpose of this analysis, costs included all off-shelf equipment used in surgery (such as thrombin, arterial line equipment, antibiotic irrigation, and instrumentation implants). Prior data suggest that less healthy patients have higher supply utilization or cost of care.^{26,27} The authors believe RAPT is a useful surrogate for degree of health and thus hypothesized that patients with lower RAPT scores would, alike the literature, result in higher supply utilization. An example of this might be that a patient with severe renal disease commonly might also have a lower RAPT score as an indicator of overall health (mobility, etc.). That same patient would be expected to have platelet dysfunction. Patients with platelet dysfunction might require higher use of hemostatic agents during surgery, such as Floseal (Baxter International Inc, Deerfield, Illinois). Higher Floseal use would be associated with higher hospital costs. The authors recognize this is only an initial assessment in this line of inquiry; however, this finding suggests that RAPT may offer useful information for cost management, which warrants further investigation.

Strengths

A strength of the study herein is that identifying patients likely to require AR or SNF early on in their care might be employed to increase coordination between care teams to selectively decrease, and increase, length of hospitalization as appropriate. Patients strongly predicted to be discharged home might benefit from extended LOS as needed in order to facilitate a home discharge. The cost of a longer hospital stay would likely offset the cost of utilization of AR of SNF in these patients. Alternatively, patients strongly predicted to benefit from postacute care might be discharged earlier in the postoperative course of care in order to maximize recovery supports and eliminate unnecessary acute care hospitalization. Future studies will focus on assessing the predictive power of RAPT on specific subpopulations of neurosurgical patients by presenting diagnosis.

Limitations

When assessing the data herein the reader must note inherent selection bias present in a study in which patients were enrolled through a single neurosurgery department. Though the results of this study may not be equally applicable throughout all departments, patients were drawn from multiple hospitals in a tertiary care system that serves a heterogeneous, diverse metropolitan community. There may additionally be unmeasured socioeconomic variables, not included in the regression model, which may impact the decision to discharge a patent home or to a facility. Although numerous institutions have incorporated RAPT, no published study has documented its economic impact, which must be verified before its widespread adoption for that purpose. However, RAPT potentially provides valuable information to patients and surgeons in order to calibrate postoperative expectations. RAPT has not been validated for patients younger than 50 yr old, thus this group was excluded from analysis. Moving forward, RAPT and the model utilized in this study must undergo validation in younger patients before being applied.

CONCLUSION

As the healthcare payment system becomes increasingly scrutinized, minimizing costs while optimizing patient care in and out of the hospital is a delicate balance. Utilizing tools such as the RAPT score preoperatively to anticipate patient needs during admission and postoperatively may help improve recovery by selectively increasing LOS, for patients identified as likely to be discharged to home, in order to favor a home discharge instead of another facility. Similarly, RAPT may aid in safely expediting patients to ARF or SNF if there is a low chance of disposition to home. These strategies may improve cost of care, average LOS, postdischarge recovery, and unexpected returns to care. Surgeons and staff can provide more individualized expectations for recovery for patients during preoperative consultation while optimizing healthcare resource usage.

Disclosures

This study received financial support from the Kevin and Bernadette McKenna Family Research Fund. The authors have no personal, financial, or institutional interest in any of the drugs, materials, or devices described in this article.

REFERENCES

- Siddiqi A, White PB, Mistry JB, et al. Effect of bundled payments and health care reform as alternative payment models in total joint arthroplasty: a clinical Review. *J Arthroplasty.* 2017;32(8):2590-2597.
- Ackerly DC, Grabowski DC. Post-acute care reform-beyond the ACA. N Engl J Med. 2014;370(8):689-691.
- Welch WP. Bundled Medicare payment for acute and postacute care. *Health Affairs*. 1998;17(6):69-81.
- Dauty M, Schmitt X, Menu P, Rousseau B, Dubois C. Using the Risk Assessment and Predictor Tool (RAPT) for patients after total knee replacement surgery. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med.* 2012;55(1):4-15.
- Hansen VJ, Gromov K, Lebrun LM, Rubash HE, Malchau H, Freiberg AA. Does the Risk Assessment and Prediction Tool predict discharge disposition after joint replacement? *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2015;473(2):597-601.
- Konopka JF, Hansen VJ, Rubash HE, Freiberg AA. Risk assessment tools used to predict outcomes of total hip and total knee arthroplasty. *Orthop Clin North Am.* 2015;46(3):351-362, ix-x.
- Oldmeadow LB, McBurney H, Robertson VJ. Predicting risk of extended inpatient rehabilitation after hip or knee arthroplasty. *The Journal of Arthroplasty*. 2003;18(6):775-779.
- Tan C, Loo G, Pua YH, et al. Predicting discharge outcomes after total knee replacement using the Risk Assessment and Predictor Tool. *Physiotherapy*. 2014;100(2):176-181.
- Piazza M, Sharma N, Osiemo B, et al. Initial assessment of the risk assessment and prediction tool in a heterogeneous neurosurgical patient population. *Neurosurgery*. 2018;85(1):50-57.

- Berger I, Piazza M, Sharma N, et al. Evaluation of the risk assessment and prediction tool for postoperative disposition needs after cervical spine surgery. *Neurosurgery.* 2019;85(5):E902-E909.
- Gawande AA. Why doctors hate their computers. *The New Yorker*. November 12, 2018. https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2018/11/12.
- Shamji MF, Cook C, Tackett S, Brown C, Isaacs RE. Impact of preoperative neurological status on perioperative morbidity associated with anterior and posterior cervical fusion. *J Neurosurg Spine*. 2008;9(1):10-16.
- Ashley BS, Courtney PM, Gittings DJ, et al. Can an arthroplasty risk score predict bundled care events after total joint arthroplasty? *Arthroplast Today*. 2018;4(1):103-106.
- Tanenbaum JE, Lubelski D, Rosenbaum BP, Benzel EC, Mroz TE. Propensitymatched analysis of outcomes and hospital charges for anterior versus posterior cervical fusion for cervical spondylotic myelopathy. *Clin Spine Surg.* 2017;30(9):E1262-E1268.
- Crouch DS, McLafferty RB, Karch LA, et al. A prospective study of discharge disposition after vascular surgery. J Vasc Surg. 2001;34(1):62-68.
- Hatcher JL, Bell EB, Browne JD, Waltonen JD. Disposition of elderly patients after head and neck reconstruction. *JAMA Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* 2013;139(11):1236-1241.
- Beaulieu RA, McCarthy MC, Markert RJ, Parikh PJ, Ekeh AP, Parikh PP. Predictive factors and models for trauma patient disposition. *J Surg Res.* 2014;190(1):264-269.
- London DA, Vilensky S, O'Rourke C, Schill M, Woicehovich L, Froimson MI. Discharge disposition after joint replacement and the potential for cost savings: effect of hospital policies and surgeons. *J Arthroplast*. 2016;31(4):743-748.
- Niedermeier S, Przybylowicz R, Virk SS, Stammen K, S Eiferman D, Khan SN. Predictors of discharge to an inpatient rehabilitation facility after a single-level posterior spinal fusion procedure. *Eur Spine J.* 2017;26(3):771-776.
- Lee L, Schwartzman K, Carli F, et al. The association of the distance walked in 6 min with pre-operative peak oxygen consumption and complications 1 month after colorectal resection. *Anaesthesia*. 2013;68(8):811-816.
- Fisher SR, Graham JE, Ottenbacher KJ, Deer R, Ostir GV. Inpatient walking activity to predict readmission in older adults. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2016;97(9):S226-S231.
- Takahashi T, Kumamaru M, Jenkins S, Saitoh M, Morisawa T, Matsuda H. In-patient step count predicts re-hospitalization after cardiac surgery. *J Cardiol.* 2015;66(4):286-291.
- McGirt MJ, Parker SL, Chotai S, et al. Predictors of extended length of stay, discharge to inpatient rehab, and hospital readmission following elective lumbar spine surgery: introduction of the Carolina-Semmes Grading Scale. J Neurosurg Spine. 2017;27(4):382-390.
- Murphy ME, Maloney PR, McCutcheon BA, et al. Predictors of discharge to a nonhome facility in patients undergoing lumbar decompression without fusion for degenerative spine disease. *Neurosurgery*. 2017;81(4):638-649.
- Sharma M, Sonig A, Ambekar S, Nanda A. Discharge dispositions, complications, and costs of hospitalization in spinal cord tumor surgery: analysis of data from the United States Nationwide Inpatient Sample, 2003-2010. *J Neurosurg Spine*. 2014;20(2):125-141.
- Genther DJ, Gourin CG. Effect of comorbidity on short-term outcomes and cost of care after head and neck cancer surgery in the elderly. *Head Neck*. 2015;37(5): 685-693.
- Wald MS, Robinson JS. Economic impact of comorbidities in spine surgery. J Neurosurg Spine. 2011;14(3):318-321.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the Neurological Surgery Quality Improvement (NQII) EpiLog Project.

Neurosurgery Speaks! Audio abstracts available for this article at www.neurosurgeryonline.com.

CNS Journal Club Podcast and CME Exams available at cns.org/podcasts.