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ABSTRACT

Types of Co-existing Chronic Physical Conditions and Newly-diagnosed Depression, its Treatment and Economic Outcomes among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes

Rituparna Bhattacharya, B. Pharm., M.S.

Diabetes is a widely prevalent metabolic condition. Adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) also have many coexisting chronic physical conditions. Coexisting chronic physical conditions among individuals with T2DM may be concordant (conditions that overlap with T2DM in their pathogenesis and management plans such as cardiovascular diseases) or discordant (conditions with unrelated pathogenesis or management plans such as musculoskeletal disorders) or dominant (conditions whose severity eclipses all other illness management plans such as metastatic cancer). There is documented evidence on the negative consequences of depression in adults with T2DM. However, there is only limited knowledge on how the types of coexisting chronic physical conditions (defined as concordant, discordant or dominant conditions) influence the risk for developing depression, subsequent depression treatment patterns and economic consequences of depression treatment, among adults with T2DM. Therefore the aims of this dissertation were to examine (1) the association of risk of newly-diagnosed depression with types of coexisting chronic physical conditions among adults with T2DM (2) the association between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and depression treatment among adults with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression was analyzed and (3) whether the relationship between depression treatment and total and T2DM-related healthcare care expenditures vary by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions among non-elderly adult Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression. A retrospective longitudinal cohort study design was used. Patient-level data were obtained from multi-year, multi-state Medicaid claims. Non-elderly (ages 18-64), fee-for-service Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM who were depression free were followed for a period of 12 months to identify newly-diagnosed depression. The final study population consisted of 59,857 Medicaid beneficiaries of whom N=5,974 had newly diagnosed depression. After controlling for other risk factors, those with dominant conditions were at 17% higher risk (p=0.0006) and those with both concordant and discordant conditions were found to be at 30% higher risk (p<.0001) to develop newly-diagnosed depression as compared to those with concordant conditions only. Individuals with dominant conditions (p<0.05) were less likely to receive depression treatment with only antidepressants compared to those with discordant conditions only. Individuals with dominant conditions were more likely to receive depression treatment with only psychotherapy (p<.01) as compared to those with discordant conditions only. No statistically significant associations were observed between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and receipt of adequate depression treatment. As compared to no depression treatment, treating depression reduced total healthcare expenditures. As compared to no depression treatment, treatment with only antidepressants was associated with 17% reduction in total healthcare expenditures, treatment with only psychotherapy was associated with 22% reduction in total healthcare expenditures and treatment with both antidepressants and psychotherapy was associated with 28% reductions in total healthcare expenditures. As compared to no depression treatment, treatment with both antidepressants and psychotherapy was associated with reductions in total healthcare expenditures among all types of coexisting chronic physical condition groups. In summary, these results indicate that among adults with T2DM, newly-diagnosed depression rates, its treatment and economic benefits vary by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions.
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CHAPTER 1
CHAPTER 1: Background and Significance

Epidemiology of Type 2 Diabetes and Depression

Diabetes is a widely prevalent metabolic condition. According to a World Health Organization report recently updated in 2014, 347 million people around the world suffer from diabetes [1]. In the US, based on 2005-2008 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 25.6 million individuals i.e. 11.3% of the US population who were 20 years or older had diabetes [2]. It has been estimated that among adults with a diagnosis of diabetes, 90%-95% suffer from type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) [2, 3].

Depression is a highly disabling, yet very commonly prevalent psychiatric condition with worldwide new diagnosis (i.e. incidence) rates of 3%. Depression has been reported to be the second leading cause of disability as defined by years lived with disability (YLD) estimates [4]. In the US, over a period of 12 months, 5.28% of the population has been found to be affected by depression [5]. Coexisting depression leads to significant disease burden in terms of impaired cognition, reduced quality of life, increased mortality risk, social dysfunction and financial burden [6]. Presence of depression among adults with chronic medical illnesses is associated with high risk of mortality, increased disability and poor adherence to self-care regimens.

Adults with T2DM are considered to be a high risk of developing depression. Pooled estimates from two previous meta-analyses [7, 8] examining the association of T2DM and depression have found that the risk of developing depression among individuals with T2DM, range from 15% (Relative Risk (RR): 1.15; 95% CI 1.02-1.30) [8] to 24% (RR: 1.24; 95% CI 1.09-1.40) [7].
Coexisting chronic physical conditions, T2DM and Depression

Among adults with T2DM, coexisting chronic physical conditions are often the norm rather than exception and presence of such conditions affect the management of T2DM. Adults with T2DM and coexisting chronic physical conditions often experience confusion, frustration and feelings of being overwhelmed, perhaps due to several different and sometimes conflicting recommendations from clinicians with regard to management of their conditions [9]. Therefore, adults with T2DM and coexisting chronic physical conditions are at risk for developing depression. Using the Canadian National Population Health Survey (NPHS), a study found that as compared to the 2.8% (95% Confidence Interval (CI):2.2–3.4) rate of new major depressive episodes among those no long term medical condition, those with any long term medical condition had a 4% (95% CI: 3.3–4.7) rate of major depressive episode; long term medical conditions included hypertension, food allergies, other allergies, asthma, arthritis/‘rheumatism’, back problems, migraine headaches, sinusitis, diabetes, heart disease, peptic ulcers/gastritis and chronic bronchitis/emphysema [10]. Another study conducted in the US examined the risk of development of significant depressive symptoms after a new diagnosis of several different chronic conditions [11]. This study found that within 2 years of initial diagnosis, those with cancer were 3.55 times (Hazards Ratio (HR): 3.55; 95% CI: 2.79-4.52), those with chronic lung disease had 2.21 times (HR: 2.21; 95% CI:1.64-2.97) and those with heart disease had 1.45 times (HR:1.45; 95% CI: 1.09-1.93) higher risk of developing depressive symptoms [11].

Relationship between types of physical conditions and risk of depression

It is plausible that adults with T2DM and coexisting chronic physical conditions with similar disease management strategies may be at a lower risk for developing depression compared to those with coexisting chronic physical conditions that may require contradicting
clinical and self-management strategies. Only six these studies, controlled for types of coexisting chronic physical conditions while estimating the risk of developing depression among adults with T2DM [12-17] as compared to adults with no T2DM. Some of these studies [13] [17] found that coexisting chronic physical conditions were significantly associated with risk of depression, while other studies [12] [14] found that coexisting chronic physical conditions were not significantly associated with risk of depression. De Jonge et al., [16] controlled for the interaction of T2DM and coexisting chronic conditions in their model, but this interaction was not significantly associated with risk of newly diagnosed depression (p-value=0.26). Maraldi et al., [15] article did not report the estimates on the association between coexisting chronic conditions and newly diagnosed depression, but found that controlling for coexisting conditions, the significant association between T2DM and incident depression disappeared. Therefore, except the one study by De Jonge et al., [16] which controlled for an interaction term, no other study has examined the association between coexisting conditions and newly diagnosed depression among adults with T2DM. However, in this study coexisting conditions were measured by counting the number of medication classes prescribed. Therefore, no existing study has examined whether among individuals with T2DM, types of coexisting chronic physical conditions affect the risk of depression. As a majority of individuals with T2DM live with multiple other coexisting chronic physical conditions, it is essential to examine whether individuals with different types of coexisting chronic physical conditions are at higher risk of developing depression as compared to other groups.

**Relationship between types of chronic physical conditions and treatment of depression**

A handful of studies have indirectly examined the association between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and depression treatment patterns among individuals with
T2DM. However, coexisting chronic physical conditions in these studies were measured using either comorbidity indices [18, 19] or number of coexisting conditions [20]. Two of these studies found that the number of coexisting chronic condition variable or the comorbidity index variable was not significantly associated with receipt of depression treatment [18, 20]. On the contrary, in the study among Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM by Sambamoorthi et al., [19] it was reported that individuals with higher burden from coexisting conditions, were more likely to receive antidepressants compared to those with no burden from coexisting conditions. However, since these studies used comorbidity indices or number of chronic condition variable in their analyses, there is an existing knowledge gap regarding how different types of coexisting conditions may effect depression treatment among individuals with T2DM and coexisting chronic physical conditions.

Additionally, no study has examined the relationship between adequate depression treatment and types of chronic physical conditions, among non-elderly adults with T2DM. Coexisting chronic physical conditions may be associated with whether an individual received adequate depression treatment. For example, many adults with T2DM also have coexisting cardiovascular diseases, physicians may be cautious in prescribing adequate antidepressant treatment for adults with T2DM and coexisting chronic physical conditions such as hypertension and heart disease. As depression treatment often competes with treatment for other conditions, among individuals with multiple coexisting conditions, it is possible that even those who start depression treatment may not get the “adequate” treatment as per guidelines for depression treatment. Adequate depression treatment is one of the quality measures included in National Committee for Quality Assurance's (NCQA) Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set (HEDIS). These quality measures are used by various health plans including Medicaid and other
organizations in the US for the purpose of accreditation, accountability and quality improvement. Therefore, there is a need to analyze the association of adequate depression treatment with type coexisting chronic physical conditions, among individuals with T2DM and a newly diagnosed depression.

**Economic benefits of treating depression and its association with types of chronic physical conditions**

Studying the economic benefits of treating depression among adults with T2DM has become a necessity because of rising healthcare expenditures of T2DM and policy efforts towards cost-containment strategies. According to the American Diabetes Association, the direct medical care expenditures of diagnosed diabetes has increased from $245 billion in 2012 from $174 billion in 1997[21]. Among adults with diabetes, healthcare expenditures in specific populations are higher than others. For example, among individuals with diabetes, those with coexisting depression could have mean total annual healthcare expenditures 4.5 times higher ($247,000,000) compared to those without depression ($55,000,000) [22]. Healthcare payers need to understand if depression management is associated with reduced healthcare expenditures in presence of T2DM and multiple coexisting conditions. Randomized controlled trials [23-25] have shown that among individuals with T2DM, depression treatment with pharmacotherapy and/or psychotherapy using stepped care or algorithm based approach in collaborative care settings are cost-effective. However, the economic benefits of treating depression among adults with T2DM in real-world practices and how the relationship varies by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions are not known.

**Need for Using Non-Elderly Medicaid Population**

It is particularly important to study this association in non-elderly population given that, in recent years, the prevalence of multiple coexisting chronic conditions, which has traditionally
been thought of as a problem in the elderly population, has been increasing among non-elderly adults. In the US, among adults in the age group 45-64 years, the prevalence of multiple coexisting chronic conditions has grown from 24.5% in 2004 to 28.1% in 2010 [26]. In the US, State Medicaid Plans are a major provider of health insurance among non-elderly adults. As of 2010, 27% of US adults, 20-64 years of age were covered by Medicaid [16]. Adults with diabetes are disproportionately covered by Medicaid and four out of five Medicaid beneficiaries with diabetes suffer from a coexisting chronic physical condition. It has been reported that among Medicaid enrollees, those with diabetes spend 2.5 times more than those without diabetes [27]; 20% of Medicaid enrollees are diagnosed with depression [28, 29]. According to Agency of Healthcare Research and Quality 2011 statistical brief, mood disorders which includes depression ranks top most among the ten conditions for 30 day readmission in Medicaid resulting in 41,600 readmissions and costing $286 million [30]. Depression is also a major driver for poor health outcomes and future healthcare expenditures in T2DM [31]. Given such compelling statistics, it is apparent that Medicaid data provides a rich opportunity to conduct research of both depression and T2DM, and can lead to important findings that might influence clinical practice and policy. Therefore, delineating relationship between depression, its treatment and healthcare expenditures among Medicaid enrollees with T2DM and understanding how types of coexisting chronic physical conditions impact this association is necessary in the high risk Medicaid population.

Theoretical Framework Used to Categorize Types Of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions

Existing theoretical framework developed by Piette and Kerr has categorized forty-four different chronic physical illnesses commonly coexisting with T2DM into concordant, discordant and dominant conditions using ICD-9-CM codes [44]. Piette and Kerr had developed this novel
theoretical framework for categorizing coexisting chronic physical conditions based on how these conditions had an impact on the medical care, self-management, and healthcare outcomes of an individual with T2DM. This framework suggested that studies which used one-dimensional scores or number of coexisting conditions to assess the impact of coexisting conditions on T2DM care, implicitly assumed that all conditions have similar impact on T2DM care. However, such studies fail to identify whether characteristics specific to coexisting conditions impact patient priorities for T2DM care. Based on typologies of coexisting conditions, the theoretical framework developed by Piette and Kerr identified coexisting conditions among individuals with T2DM as: dominant (conditions whose severity eclipses all other conditions’ management plans such as metastatic cancer), concordant (conditions that overlap with T2DM in their pathophysiology and management plans such as cardiovascular diseases) and discordant (conditions with unrelated pathophysiology or management plans such as musculoskeletal disorders) [32].

Though this study does not assess outcomes related to T2DM, the same theory may be applied to development of newly-diagnosed depression. Based on disease pathophysiology and similarity or differences with T2DM management, dominant, concordant and discordant conditions may have different risks associated with development of newly-diagnosed depression, its treatment and economic outcomes of depression treatment. Therefore, based on Piette and Kerr’s framework, a hierarchical classification [33] was used to categorize forty four physical conditions which are found commonly coexisting with. Dominant conditions were given priority in the hierarchical classification because such conditions eclipse the management of other health conditions. Among those without dominant conditions, concordant and discordant conditions were identified. The types of coexisting chronic physical conditions
were classified as: 1) Dominant Conditions, 2) Concordant only, 3) Discordant only and 4) Both concordant and discordant. The conditions were identified using ICD-9-CM codes and are presented in Appendix A.

**Research Objectives and Hypotheses**

**Aim 1:** Among non-elderly (18-64 years) Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM, examine whether risk of newly-diagnosed depression vary by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions.

_Hypothesis 1.1:_ Adults with dominant, both concordant and discordant conditions and discordant conditions only would have higher risk of newly-diagnosed depression as compared to individuals with concordant conditions only

**Aim 2:** Objective 1.1: Examine the association between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and depression treatment (antidepressants only, psychotherapy only, both antidepressants and psychotherapy and none), after adjusting for other covariates among non-elderly (18-64 years) fee-for-service Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression,

_Aim 2: Hypothesis 1.1:_ As compared to individuals with discordant conditions only, those with concordant conditions would be less likely to receive treatment with antidepressants.

Aim 2: Objective 1.2: Evaluate the association between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and receipt of adequate depression treatment (yes, no), after adjusting for other covariates among non-elderly (18-64 years) fee-for-service Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression who received either antidepressants or psychotherapy.

_Aim 2: Hypothesis 1.2:_ As compared to individuals with discordant conditions only, those with dominant conditions would be less likely to receive adequate depression treatment.
Aim 3: Objective 3.1: Among non-elderly Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression, examine the association depression treatment categories and total and T2DM-related healthcare care expenditures.

Hypothesis 3.1: As compared to those with no depression treatment, those with depression treatment with only antidepressants, only psychotherapy or both, will have negative associations with total and T2DM-related healthcare expenditures as compared no depression treatment.

Aim 3.2: Among non-elderly Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression, examine whether the association between depression treatment and total and T2DM-related medical care expenditures vary by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions.

Hypothesis 3.2.1: As compared to no depression treatment, treatment within both antidepressants and psychotherapy will reduce total and T2DM related healthcare expenditures across all conditions.

Hypothesis 3.2.2: Depression treatment with only antidepressants will not be associated with T2DM related healthcare expenditures among those with concordant conditions only.
REFERENCES

CHAPTER 2
CHAPTER 2: Type of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions and the Risk of Newly-diagnosed Depression among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes

Introduction

Epidemiology of Diabetes

Diabetes is a widely prevalent metabolic condition. According to a World Health Organization report recently updated in 2014, 347 million people around the world suffer from diabetes [1]. In the US, based on 2005-2008 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 25.6 million individuals i.e. 11.3% of the US population who were 20 years or older had diabetes [2]. It has been estimated that among adults with a diagnosis of diabetes, 90%-95% suffer from type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) [2, 3].

Epidemiology of Depression

Depression is a highly disabling, yet very commonly prevalent psychiatric condition with worldwide new diagnosis (i.e. incidence) rates of 3%. Depression has been reported to be the second leading cause of disability as defined by years lived with disability (YLD) estimates [4]. In the US, over a period of 12 months, 5.28% of the population has been found to be affected by depression [5]. With the elimination of “bereavement exclusion” for clinical diagnosis of depression under Diagnostic and Statistical Manual-5 (DSM-5), the rates of new diagnosis of depression is expected to rise further [6].

T2DM and Risk of Newly-diagnosed Depression

Adults with T2DM are at a high risk of developing depression. Prospective and retrospective studies have examined the risk of developing depression among adults with T2DM by comparing them to those without T2DM [7-20]. These studies were based on data from different countries; four were from the Netherlands [7, 8, 10, 20], one each from Norway [9], Korea [11], Canada [12] and Taiwan[13] and six from the US [14-19]. Rates of newly-
diagnosed depression in these studies varied because of differences in study design, lengths of follow-up, settings and measurement of depression. The minimum length of follow-up was 2 years [11] and the maximum was 12 years [12]. Twelve [7-11, 14-18, 20] of these studies had a prospective design and the remaining three were retrospective observational in design [12, 13, 19]; two studies assessed rates of newly-diagnosed depression after combining data from two different time points (years 2 and 5) to [7, 8]. Some studies identified depression using diagnosis scales such as the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) [7, 16, 17], Edinburgh Depression Scale (EDS) [20], Beck Depression Inventory (BDI)[14], Mental Health Index (MHI-5), a five-item subscale of the Short-Form 36 Health Status [18], Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale - Depression (HADS-D) [9], Geriatric Mental State B3 Diagnostic Schedule with application of the Automated Geriatric Examination for Computer-Assisted Taxonomy algorithm (GMS-AGECAT) [8]; others used inpatient or outpatient diagnosis codes for depression as identified by physicians [13], alone or in conjunction with antidepressant drug use [12, 19], to identify newly-diagnosed depression.

The adjusted odds ratio (AOR) and 95% confidence interval (CI) estimates for newly-diagnosed depression in studies using diagnosis scales varied from (AOR: 0.73; 95% CI: 0.41–1.30) [14] to (AOR: 1.54; 95% CI: 1.13–2.09) [17] and the estimates ranged from (AOR: 1.10; 95% CI: 1.01–1.19) [12] to (AOR:1.48; 95% CI: 1.35–1.63) [19] for studies using diagnosis codes. Meta-analyses that have included majority of these studies have concluded that the risk of developing depression among individuals with T2DM, ranged from 15% (Adjusted Relative Risk (ARR): 1.15; 95% Confidence Interval: 1.02–1.30) [21] to 24% (ARR: 1.24; 95% CI 1.09–1.40) [22]. The Mezuk et al., meta-analysis [23] included 7 studies and the other meta-analysis by Nouwen et al., which was published later, included 11 studies [22].
Many of the above-mentioned studies did not differentiate between depressive symptoms and major depression. Often self-reported depression based on diagnostic scales was used [7, 9, 14-17]; newly-diagnosed depression was identified as appearance of “depressive symptoms”, defined by a pre-validated cut-off score on the diagnosis scales, e.g. >=16 on CES-D scale, >=12 on EDS, >=8 on HADS-D, <=52 on MHI-5. Self-reports may overestimate the extent of depressive symptoms and there is discordance between rates of newly-diagnosed depression identified by scores on self-reported depression scales and depression identified by diagnostic schedules such as Diagnostic Statistical Manual (DSM-IV) [24]. On the other hand, the study by Brown et al., [12] identified depression by including use of antidepressants along with physician recognized clinical diagnosis code for depression. However, studies have reported that two thirds of individuals with depression is often not treated [25]. Therefore, use of antidepressants as a criterion for identifying depression may lead to underestimated rates. Additionally, these studies compared risk of depression among those with T2DM as compared to those without T2DM. None of them examined whether risk of depression differed among subgroups of individuals with T2DM and coexisting conditions.

Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions among Adults with T2DM

Among adults with T2DM coexisting chronic physical conditions are often the norm rather than the exception and presence of such conditions affect the management of T2DM. According to Medical Expenditure Panel Survey data, majority of adults (88.6%) with T2DM in the United States (US) have at least one chronic condition and 15% have reported having four or more chronic conditions [26]. Based on similarity or difference from T2DM management and pathophysiology, types of coexisting chronic physical conditions among individuals with T2DM may be concordant (conditions that overlap with T2DM in their pathophysiology and
management plans such as cardiovascular diseases), discordant (conditions with unrelated pathophysiology or management plans such as musculoskeletal disorders), or dominant (conditions whose severity eclipses all other conditions’ management plans such as metastatic cancer) [27]. Among 42,826 Veterans with T2DM, it has been found that 12% had dominant conditions, 13% had concordant only, 30% had discordant only and 25% had both concordant and discordant [28]. There is evidence that types of coexisting chronic physical conditions affect T2DM management [28]

**Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions and Risk of Depression**

Coexisting depression in adults with chronic physical conditions often lead to impaired cognition, reduced quality of life, increased mortality, social dysfunction and financial burden [29]. Therefore, individuals with coexisting chronic physical conditions are at particularly high risk of developing depression. Using the Canadian National Population Health Survey, a study found that rates of new major depressive episodes among those with no long term medical conditions were lower as compared to those with any long term medical condition (2.8% (95% CI: 2.2–3.4) vs 4% (95% CI: 3.3–4.7); long term medical conditions included hypertension, food allergies, other allergies, asthma, arthritis/’rheumatism’, back problems, migraine headaches, sinusitis, diabetes, heart disease, peptic ulcers/gastritis and chronic bronchitis/emphysema [30].

Another study conducted in the US examined the risk of development of significant depressive symptoms after a new diagnosis of several different chronic conditions [15]. This study found that within 2 years of initial diagnosis, the risk of developing depressive symptoms was, 3.55 times higher among with cancer (Hazards Ratio (HR): 3.55; 95% CI: 2.79-4.52), 2.21 times higher among those with chronic lung disease had (HR: 2.21; 95% CI:1.64-2.97) and 1.45 times higher among those with heart disease (HR:1.45; 95% CI: 1.09-1.93) [15].
**Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions among Adults with T2DM and Risk of Depression**

Adults with T2DM and coexisting chronic physical conditions often experience confusion, frustration and feelings of being overwhelmed, perhaps due to several different and sometimes conflicting recommendations from clinicians with regard to management of their conditions [31]. Such feelings may eventually lead to poor emotional health and development of depression. To the best of our knowledge no study has evaluated the risk of newly-diagnosed depression by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions among adults with T2DM. Therefore, available evidence from studies that have examined the risk of newly-diagnosed depression after controlling for coexisting conditions, among adults with T2DM as compared to those without T2DM, has been parsed.

Only six of the fifteen studies that examined the risk of depression among adults with T2DM controlled for types of co-existing chronic physical conditions in their multivariable analyses [8, 10, 12, 16, 17, 19]. Some of these studies [12] [19] found that coexisting chronic physical conditions were significantly associated with an increased risk of depression, while other studies [10] [17] found that coexisting chronic physical conditions were not significantly associated with risk of depression. Maraldi et al., [16] did not report the estimates of the association between coexisting conditions and newly-diagnosed depression, but found that controlling for coexisting conditions, the significant association between T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression disappeared. The study by de Jonge et al., [8] controlled for the interaction of T2DM and coexisting conditions, but this interaction was not significantly associated with risk of newly-diagnosed depression (p-value=0.26). This may indicate that the risk of newly-diagnosed depression does not vary by coexisting conditions. However, in this study coexisting conditions were measured by counting the number of medication classes prescribed. Therefore,
except the one study by de Jonge et al., [8] which controlled for an interaction term, no other study has examined the association between coexisting conditions and newly-diagnosed depression among adults with T2DM.

**Need for the Study**

Presence of depression among adults with chronic medical illnesses is associated with high risk of mortality, increased disability, poor adherence to self-care regimens and high health care expenditures [32]. Identification of groups of individuals at high risk of depression can help in prevention, timely diagnosis and management of the disease. From the literature discussed, it is apparent that individuals with T2DM are at increased risk of developing depression. Presence of coexisting conditions may also increase the risk of depression. Since, majority of individuals with T2DM live with multiple other coexisting chronic physical conditions [26], it is essential to examine whether subgroups of individuals with T2DM and particular types of coexisting chronic physical conditions are at higher risk of developing depression as compared to other groups. However, with the conspicuous absence of studies relating to association between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions in adults with T2DM and risk of depression, a significant knowledge gap exists in this area. Therefore, this study intends to fill this knowledge gap by examining the risk of depression for different types of coexisting chronic physical conditions among adults with T2DM.

This study focused on adults with T2DM whose healthcare expenses are covered by state Medicaid programs. There are several reasons to examine this association among Medicaid enrollees. In the US, State Medicaid Plans are a major provider of health insurance among non-elderly adults. As of 2010, 27% of US adults, 20-64 years of age were covered by Medicaid outlaying 68% of federal spending [8]. Adults with diabetes are disproportionately covered by
Medicaid and four out of five Medicaid beneficiaries with diabetes suffer from a coexisting chronic physical condition. Medicaid enrollees with diabetes spend more than 2.5 times compared to those without diabetes [33] and 20% of Medicaid enrollees are diagnosed with depression [34, 35]. Mood disorders including depression ranks top most among the ten conditions for 30 day readmission in Medicaid programs and costs $286 million [36]. Additionally, depression contributes heavily towards poor health outcomes and future healthcare costs in T2DM [37]. Based on these statistics, it can be seen that Medicaid data provides a rich opportunity to conduct research of both depression and T2DM, and can lead to important findings that might influence clinical practice and policy.

This study identified newly-diagnosed depression from International Classification of Diseases 9th Revision ie.ICD-9-CM codes and mainly focused on new diagnoses of major depression. The focus on major depression was because, specific treatment guidelines are available for major depression, while treatment guidelines for minor depression are not clear [38]. Additionally, depression diagnosis from administrative claims data is cheaper compared to resource intensive prospective data collection. Additionally, these diagnosis codes have been identified by Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set, a tool used by 90% of US healthcare plans including Medicaid [23].
RESEARCH AIM AND HYPOTHESIS

Aim 1: Among non-elderly (18-64 years) Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM, examine whether risk of newly-diagnosed depression vary by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions.

Hypothesis 1.1: Adults with dominant, both concordant and discordant conditions and discordant conditions only would have higher risk of newly-diagnosed depression as compared to individuals with concordant conditions only
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

An adapted version of the conceptual framework on Determinants of Health Model was used to study the risk factors contributing to chronic diseases. In this framework, a variety of factors may influence the health and well-being of individuals including development of diseases. These factors include environmental factors, geographical location, socioeconomic characteristics, knowledge, attitudes and beliefs, health behaviors, psychological factors, safety factors, biomedical factors and individual physical and psychological makeup. This study focused on biomedical factors i.e. types of coexisting chronic physical condition as risk factor disease i.e. newly-diagnosed depression, after controlling for other factors which were chosen based on the this framework and the availability of variables in the dataset. The following figure presents the adapted theoretical framework used in this study.
METHODS

Study Design

A retrospective cohort study design was used for this study. A cohort of Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM who were free of depression during baseline were identified. This cohort was then followed in to the following calendar year. Those who received a diagnosis of depression in the following year were considered as having newly-diagnosed depression. Therefore, individuals classified as having a newly-diagnosed depression had at least a 365 day period free of any history of depression diagnosis or antidepressant use.

Among those with newly-diagnosed depression, the date of diagnosis was the “index date”. Among individuals with no newly-diagnosed depression, the index date was randomly chosen from the dates of inpatient and outpatient services received by an individual during the calendar year. Baseline period was defined as 12 months prior to the index date. Coexisting chronic physical conditions and health care utilization variables were identified during this baseline period.

Data Sources

Medicaid Analytic Extract (MAX) Files:

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services prepares the MAX files. These files comprise of enrollment (“personal summary”), inpatient claims, other therapy medical claims, and pharmacy claims files of Medicaid beneficiaries. These files were linked by beneficiaries’ unique identification number. Information on Medicaid eligibility and demographics characteristics were extracted from the personal summary files. Information on diagnoses, use of services and Medicaid payments were identified from the other claims files. This study used 8 years Medicaid data (2000-2007) from three states: New York (NY), Texas (TX), Illinois (IL).
Medicaid data use agreement policy specifies that cell sizes less than eleven cannot be displayed and percentages or other mathematical formulas may not be used if the result in display has cell sizes less than eleven [39]. To ensure that dependent and all independent variable categories had enough sample sizes, multiple years of Medicaid data were combined.

*Area Health Resource File (AHRF):*

The AHRF is a publicly available data file provided by Department of Health and Human Services [40] which contains county level information on more than six thousand variables. The Medicaid files were linked with ARF files with five digit county identification variable. This study used AHRF variables such as median household income, percent below poverty level and percent with college education in a county, whether the county of residence of the enrollee had been designated as a health professional shortage area (HPSA) for mental health services, metro status of the county, presence of a Community Mental Health Clinic (CMHC) and a Federally Qualified Healthcare Clinic (FQHC) in the county.

*Identification of Study Cohort: Individuals with T2DM and Free of Depression at Baseline*

Using Medicaid data from 2000-2007, seven 2-year cohorts (2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07) were identified. Those with at least one inpatient visit or two or more physician outpatient visits (which were at least 30 days apart) with a primary or secondary diagnosis of International Classification of Diagnosis Codes 9th Revision (ICD-9-CM) codes: 250.x0 or 250.x2, were identified as having T2DM. The study population excluded individuals with a diagnosis for depression and antidepressant medication use, in the calendar year. The eligible study population was then followed into the subsequent calendar year to identify newly-diagnosed depression.
Exclusion criteria for the study cohort were: (1) not having a diagnosis of at least one of the forty-four coexisting chronic physical conditions as identified by ICD-9-CM codes included in the appendix, during the baseline (2) no use of any inpatient or outpatient services during the subsequent calendar year i.e. the calendar year in which newly-diagnosed depression was identified (2) no continuous Medicaid eligibility and (3) enrollment in Medicare managed care at any point during the observation period; and (4) died during the study period.

**Dependent Variable**

**Newly-Diagnosed Depression:**

Among individuals with T2DM, no diagnosis of depression and no antidepressant use in a calendar year, those with at least one inpatient or outpatient diagnosis [41] corresponding to ICD9 CM codes: 296.2 (major depressive disorder, single episode), 296.3 (major depressive disorder, recurrent episode), 311 (depression not elsewhere classified), 309.1 (prolonged depressive reaction), 300.4 (neurotic depression) and 298.0 (depressive type psychosis) in the subsequent calendar year, were identified as having newly-diagnosed depression [42, 43]. These ICD-9-CM codes were recommended by National Committee for Quality Assurance and had been used in previous studies to identify depression among Medicaid enrollees [42-44]. These diagnosis codes are also widely used by health plans to identify depression [38].

**Independent Variables**

**Key Independent Variable: Types of coexisting chronic physical Conditions:**

Piette and Kerr had developed a novel theoretical framework for categorizing coexisting chronic physical conditions based on how these conditions had an impact on the medical care, self-management, and healthcare outcomes of an individual with T2DM. This framework suggested that studies which used one-dimensional scores or number of coexisting conditions to
assess the impact of coexisting conditions on T2DM care, implicitly assumed that all conditions have similar impact on T2DM care. However, such studies fail to identify whether characteristics specific to coexisting conditions impact patient priorities for T2DM care. Based on typologies of coexisting conditions, the theoretical framework developed by Piette and Kerr identified coexisting conditions among individuals with T2DM as: dominant (conditions whose severity eclipses all other conditions’ management plans such as metastatic cancer), concordant (conditions that overlap with T2DM in their pathophysiology and management plans such as cardiovascular diseases) and discordant (conditions with unrelated pathophysiology or management plans such as musculoskeletal disorders) [27]. Though this study does not assess outcomes related to T2DM, the same theory may be applied to development of newly-diagnosed depression. Based on disease pathophysiology pathophysiology and similarity or differences with T2DM management, dominant, concordant and discordant conditions may have different risks associated with development of newly-diagnosed depression. Therefore, based on Piette and Kerr’s framework, a hierarchical classification [28] was used to categorize forty four physical conditions which are found commonly coexisting with T2DM and this variable was to examine the association between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and risk of newly-diagnosed depression. These conditions were identified using ICD-9-CM codes and are presented in Appendix A. Dominant conditions were given priority in the hierarchical classification because such conditions eclipse the management of other health conditions. Among those without dominant conditions, concordant and discordant conditions were identified. The types of coexisting chronic physical conditions were classified as: 1) Dominant Conditions, 2) Concordant only, 3) Discordant only and 4) Both concordant and discordant.
Other independent variables:
The other independent variables were selected based on the Determinants of Health Model.

Individual Physical Make-up: The variables included were: age, sex, race/ethnicity [Whites, African Americans, Hispanics or other races]);

Psychological Factors: Defined by presence of other mental health conditions in the baseline. The other mental health conditions included bipolar disorder, schizophrenia, post-traumatic stress disorder, and alcohol and drug abuse.

Medication Use: The variables included were: number of oral antidiabetic medication classes and insulin use as identified by national drug codes (NDC), presence of polypharmacy identified by use of 6 or more drug classes in the 90 days prior to index date;

Healthcare Seeking Behavior: The variables included were: baseline healthcare utilization factors (number of emergency room visits in 180 days prior to index date, inpatient hospitalization, number of outpatient visits measured in quartiles);

Community Level Access to Care: The variables included were: whether county of residence had a community mental health clinic (CMHC) and federally qualified health clinic (FQHC), whether county of residence designated as urban area and Health Professional Shortage area (HPSA) for mental health;

Community Resources: The variables included were: median income in the county, whether percent below poverty level and percent with college education greater than national average based on US census estimates [45, 46].

Additionally, the model also controlled for year of observation.
**Statistical Analysis**

*Unadjusted Analyses:*

Descriptive analysis using frequency and mean and standard errors were conducted. Chi-square tests were used to examine unadjusted association between baseline characteristics and types of coexisting chronic physical conditions. Unadjusted associations between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and newly-diagnosed depression were also examined with chi-square tests. Chi-square tests were also used to examine the associations between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and newly-diagnosed depression for each group of the categorical independent variables.

*Adjusted Analyses:*

Multivariable complementary log-log regressions were performed used to examine the risk of newly-diagnosed depression associated with types of coexisting conditions. As the authors intended to estimate “risk” of newly-diagnosed depression instead of “odds”, the complementary log-log regressions were used instead of logistic regression, which are in general used to estimate the associations between independent variables and binary dependent variable. It has been shown that odds ratio often fail to give approximation of risk, especially when disease rates are close to 10% or more [47]. Complementary log-log regression has been shown to be an alternative statistical model to estimate risk [48] and has been used in previous studies [49]. Regression coefficients from complementary log-log regressions were exponentiated to derive the risk ratios (RR) and adjusted risk ratios (ARR) of newly-diagnosed depression associated with types of coexisting conditions; 95% upper and lower confidence intervals for RRs and ARRs were calculated by respectively adding and subtracting 1.96 from the exponentiated standard errors from complementary log-log regressions.
Self-management of conditions are especially difficult when coexisting conditions have widely varying modes of management; individuals with concordant conditions which have similar mode of management as T2DM may therefore may be at lesser risk of developing depression as compared to discordant or dominant conditions. Thus, “concordant conditions only” was used as the reference group in regression analyses. Multiple regression models were examined. In model 1, only types of coexisting conditions were included; in model 2 individual physical make-up and year of observation were included; in model 3 the presence of other psychological factors, medication use and healthcare seeking behavior were added and the final model 4 consisted of all the variables in model 3 and additionally included community level access to care and community resources variables. All analyses were done using Statistical Analytic Software (SAS) version 9.3.
RESULTS

Characteristics of the Study Population

The study population consisted of 59,857 non-elderly, fee-for-service and continuously enrolled Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM who were depression free during baseline, not dually eligible for Medicare and alive during the study period. Description of the study population is presented in Table 1. Majority of the study population were older adults (53.2%) between 55 and 64 years and females (62.9%); 25.2% were Whites and 30.4% were African Americans and 44.4% were other races. Majority of the counties of residence were metro areas (86.9%); 84.4% of counties had shortage of mental health professionals and 53.3% of counties did not have a CMHC.

Study Population Characteristics by Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions

Table 1 also presents a description of study population by types of coexisting conditions. In the study population, 11.2% had dominant conditions, 35.9% had concordant conditions only, 17.7% had discordant conditions only and 35.2% had both concordant and discordant conditions. All study characteristics differed significantly among the types of coexisting condition subgroups. For example, a greater percentage of individuals with dominant conditions were older i.e. 55-64 years (12.8% vs 6.7% in 18-44 years age-group), males (12.7% vs 10.3% in females), had presence of other mental health conditions (17.6% vs 10.1% with absence of other mental health conditions), inpatient hospitalizations (19.6% vs 6.7% in those without) and higher number of outpatient visits (19.6% in 4th vs 4.6% in 1st quartile).
Unadjusted Associations between Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions and Newly-Diagnosed Depression

Overall, 10% of Medicaid enrollees with T2DM had newly-diagnosed depression during the follow up year. The rate of newly-diagnosed depression was highest among those with dominant conditions (13.1%) followed by both concordant and discordant conditions (12.2%), discordant conditions only (8.7%) and concordant conditions only (7.5%). Chi-square analysis showed that newly-diagnosed depression rates significantly differed by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions (P<0.001). This significant association between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and newly-diagnosed depression was observed among all categories of independent variables.

Relationships between Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions and Newly-Diagnosed Depression

Model 1, adjusted for the type of coexisting chronic physical conditions. In this model, as compared to Medicaid beneficiaries with concordant conditions, those with dominant conditions were at 81% higher risk (Adjusted Risk Ratio (ARR): 1.81; 95% Confidence Interval (CI): 1.67,1.96; p<0.001), those with both concordant and discordant conditions were at 67% higher risk (AOR: 1.67; 95% CI: 1.57, 1.77; p<0.001) and those with discordant conditions were at 18% (ARR: 1.18; 95% CI: 1.09,1.28; p<0.001) higher risk to develop newly-diagnosed depression.

This statistically significant higher risk of newly-diagnosed depression among those with dominant, both discordant and concordant conditions and discordant conditions only as compared to those with concordant conditions only persisted in Model 2 which controlled for individual physical make-up such as age, sex and race and year of observation. In model 3, the
significant association between discordant conditions and newly-diagnosed depression disappeared, after additionally controlling for other psychological factors, medication use and healthcare seeking behaviors such as inpatient, outpatient and emergency room visits. After controlling for county level variables such as community level access to care and community resources variables in the fully adjusted model 4, those with dominant conditions were at were at 17% higher risk (ARR: 1.17; 95% CI: 1.07, 1.20; p=0.0006) and those with both concordant and discordant conditions were found to be at 30% higher risk (ARR: 1.30; 95% CI: 1.22, 1.39; p<.0001) to develop newly-diagnosed depression as compared to those with concordant conditions only. Results of multivariable complementary log-log regression analyses are presented in Table 3. Appendix B presents ARRs and 95% CIs of all independent variables controlled in the models.
DISCUSSION

This study examined whether the risk of newly-diagnosed depression differed by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions among non-elderly fee-for-service Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM. Overall, 10% of the study population had newly-diagnosed depression. Even after controlling for all baseline variables, it was found that Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM and dominant conditions and also those with both concordant and discordant conditions were at higher risk of developing newly-diagnosed depression as compared to those with concordant conditions only.

The dominant conditions in our study included diseases such as cancer, Alzheimer’s and Parkinson’s diseases. These diseases carry very high burden in terms of mortality and disability [50, 51]. Therefore, it is not surprising that individuals with T2DM and dominant conditions were at higher risk of developing newly-diagnosed depression, as compared to those with concordant conditions only. Coexisting life threatening illnesses such as cancer can negatively impact self-management behaviors among individuals with T2DM. For example, among those with both cancer and T2DM, Hershey et al., observed that, after 8 weeks of chemotherapy, individuals were able to perform significantly lower number of T2DM self-management behaviors; the most affected behaviors were exercising, ability to eat and drink, and blood sugar monitoring [52]. Neurological conditions such as Parkinson’s diseases has been said to cause changes in brain chemistry that may lead to depression [53].

Presence of discordant conditions such as respiratory problems and arthritis are also highly disabling [54]. When such discordant conditions are present along with other concordant conditions, individuals may feel overwhelmed. It has been found that about one third of individuals with both T2DM and arthritis never or rarely exercise owing to reasons such as
concerns about aggravating arthritis pain, fear about causing further joint damage, uncertainty about which types and amounts of activity are safe for their joints [55]. In general, among individuals with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), dyspnoea i.e. breathlessness triggered by exercise severely limits physical activity [56, 57]. However, regular exercise is essential for management of concordant conditions such as hypertension and cardiovascular conditions. Thus coexistence of such conditions may be overwhelming and may cause poor self-management of conditions. It has been observed that among adults with diabetes, higher number of macro- and micro-vascular and non-diabetes related coexisting conditions are associated with poor self-management [58]. Inability to manage conditions effectively may lead to feelings of frustration and guilt, subsequently leading to depression.

Implications

The study results have important clinical and policy implications. As a part of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA) passed in 2010, many states have expanded their Medicaid coverage to individuals at or below 138% of the Federal poverty level. Therefore, a greater number of individuals who were previously uninsured are now covered by state Medicaid programs. Illinois and New York are among the twenty-eight states that decided to expand their Medicaid programs as of 2014. It is expected that with the new expansion, 571,000 individuals in Illinois and 631,000 individuals in New York may gain access to Medicaid [59]. An analysis of the 2009 Medical Expenditure Panel Survey data showed that 5% of uninsured individuals at or below 138% of Federal poverty level, who may become newly eligible for Medicaid as a result of the expansion had diabetes and 64% of these individuals had at least one coexisting chronic physical condition [33]. Based on the results of the current study, it may be speculated that these
individuals, if they already do not have prevalent depression, may be at high risk of developing newly-diagnosed depression.

Challenges of coexisting depression among those with T2DM are many and include increased risk of complications, increased health care expenditures and also increased risk of mortality [32]. Individuals with T2DM are considered to be at higher risk for newly-diagnosed depression [21]. Coexisting chronic physical conditions which may aggravate this risk should be closely monitored and screened for depression. Given the higher risk of newly-diagnosed depression among individuals with dominant and among those with both concordant and discordant conditions, such individuals should be regularly screened for depression in primary care settings. The U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) recommends depression screening in all adults and the recommendation has also been supported by American College of Preventive Medicine. Depression screening among adults with T2DM has also been recommended by American Diabetes Association [60]. However, these recommendation only applies to clinical settings with that have systems in place with care management and staff assistance for depression care as in absence of such systems, appropriate diagnosis, treatment plan and follow-up of depression may not be feasible [61], thereby rendering screening efforts ineffective.

The PPACA promotes such integrated care through patient centered medical homes (PCMH) and Accountable Care Organizations (ACO). The PCMH model promotes team based approaches to patient care. Such settings can form teams with primary care physicians, mental health care specialists and a care managers so as to regularly screen for depression among individuals with varying types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and do appropriate follow-up with care managers in case a diagnosis for depression is made [62]. Performance
measures for Accountable Care Organizations also include screening for depression [63]. Provision of such novel health care systems may go a long way in timely diagnosis of depression among individuals with T2DM and coexisting chronic physical conditions.

**Strengths and Limitations**

The study has many advantages. The use of administrative claims data allowed for the identification of T2DM, depression and a wide array of physical and other mental conditions and additionally, helped in establishing a 365 day depression free period. Unlike previous studies which have used a 120 day depression free period to define newly-diagnosed depression [64], using a greater look-back period of 365 days may minimize the misclassification of an episodic manifestation of chronic depression (where depression symptoms last for two or more years) as newly-diagnosed depression. The availability of healthcare encounters across a variety of providers enabled us to control for a comprehensive set of variables such polypharmacy, antidiabetes medication use, and propensity to seek healthcare. The use of a theoretical framework enabled us to summarize the forty-four coexisting conditions into four categories. To the best of the authors’ knowledge this is the first study to assess the risk of newly-diagnosed depression among different types of coexisting chronic physical conditions in adults with T2DM, using such framework.

However, this study also had some limitations. Depression was identified using diagnosis codes. Therefore there is a potential for underestimating newly-diagnosed depression rates owing to undiagnosed depression and under-coding of depression. However, the use of diagnoses codes that are recommended by HEDIS and extensively used by health plans in order to identify depression claims and the ability to identify physician/psychologist diagnoses of depression, offer a particularly attractive alternative to the substantial cost and complications associated with
prospective surveys supplemented with medical record data. T2DM and other coexisting conditions were also identified using diagnosis codes in medical claims. Incomplete or erroneous records submitted by healthcare providers, limited clinical detail in the ICD-9-CM codes and inaccurate demographic information might limit the accuracy of administrative data. As the study population was restricted to only fee-for-service Medicaid beneficiaries, the results are not generalizable to beneficiaries who are enrolled in managed care. In addition, we used only three states and results cannot be extrapolated to other states due to differing Medicaid eligibility and enrollment criteria.
CONCLUSION

One in ten Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM developed depression. The risk of developing depression among those with T2DM varied by types of coexisting conditions; Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM and dominant conditions and those with both concordant and discordant conditions were at higher risk of developing newly-diagnosed depression. This research built on previous research studies that indicated that individuals with T2DM may have high risk of depression and successfully identified non-elderly adults with T2DM who may even be at a higher risk of developing depression. The study findings suggest that to reduce this increased risk of newly-diagnosed depression, those with dominant conditions and combinations of concordant and discordant conditions need to be under constant surveillance. However, in order for surveillance to be effective, in case such individuals get diagnosed with depression, appropriate treatment and follow-up must be provided. Future research may examine specific dominant conditions and combinations of concordant and discordant conditions that may result in high risk of newly diagnosed depression among adults with T2DM.
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### TABLES & APPENDICES

#### Table 1: Description of the Study Population by Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, Multi State Medicaid Claims – 2000 – 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Dominant</th>
<th>Concordant Only</th>
<th>Discordant Only</th>
<th>Both Concordant &amp; Discordant</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL</strong></td>
<td>59,857</td>
<td>6,708 11.2</td>
<td>21,477 35.9</td>
<td>10,603 17.7</td>
<td>21,069 35.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Physical Make-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>11,676</td>
<td>19.5 777 6.7</td>
<td>4,896 41.9</td>
<td>2,494 21.4</td>
<td>3,509 30.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>16,314</td>
<td>27.3 1,847 11.3</td>
<td>5,496 33.7</td>
<td>3,184 19.5</td>
<td>5,787 35.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>31,867</td>
<td>53.2 4,084 12.8</td>
<td>11,085 34.8</td>
<td>4,925 15.5</td>
<td>11,773 36.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37,635</td>
<td>62.9 3,892 10.3</td>
<td>12,625 33.5</td>
<td>7,231 19.2</td>
<td>13,887 36.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22,222</td>
<td>37.1 2,816 12.7</td>
<td>8,852 39.8</td>
<td>3,372 15.2</td>
<td>7,182 32.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>15,090</td>
<td>25.2 1,625 10.8</td>
<td>5,339 35.4</td>
<td>2,837 18.8</td>
<td>5,289 35.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>30.4 2,088 11.5</td>
<td>6,223 34.2</td>
<td>3,337 18.3</td>
<td>6,552 36.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>26,567</td>
<td>44.4 2,995 11.3</td>
<td>9,915 37.3</td>
<td>4,429 16.7</td>
<td>9,228 34.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mental Health Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8,883</td>
<td>14.8 1,560 17.6</td>
<td>2,616 29.4</td>
<td>1,526 17.2</td>
<td>3,181 35.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50,974</td>
<td>85.2 5,148 10.1</td>
<td>18,861 37.0</td>
<td>9,077 17.8</td>
<td>17,888 35.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Antidiabetic Drugs (OADs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 OAD</td>
<td>17,996</td>
<td>30.1 1,890 10.5</td>
<td>6,288 34.9</td>
<td>3,511 19.5</td>
<td>6,307 35.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OADs</td>
<td>14,890</td>
<td>24.9 1,255 8.4</td>
<td>5,685 38.2</td>
<td>2,747 18.4</td>
<td>5,203 34.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ OADs</td>
<td>5,292</td>
<td>8.8 344 6.5</td>
<td>2,257 42.6</td>
<td>831 15.7</td>
<td>1,860 35.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No OAD</td>
<td>21,679</td>
<td>36.2 3,219 14.8</td>
<td>7,247 33.4</td>
<td>3,514 16.2</td>
<td>7,699 35.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulin Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18,885</td>
<td>31.6 2,362 12.5</td>
<td>7,098 37.6</td>
<td>1,791 9.5</td>
<td>7,634 40.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40,972</td>
<td>68.4 4,346 10.6</td>
<td>14,379 35.1</td>
<td>8,812 21.5</td>
<td>13,435 32.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polypharmacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18,774</td>
<td>31.4 2,475 13.2</td>
<td>4,892 26.1</td>
<td>2,931 15.6</td>
<td>8,476 45.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41,083</td>
<td>68.6 4,233 10.3</td>
<td>16,585 40.4</td>
<td>7,672 18.7</td>
<td>12,593 30.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued*
Table 1: Description of the Study Population by Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, Multi State Medicaid Claims – 2000 – 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Dominant</th>
<th>Concordant Only</th>
<th>Discordant Only</th>
<th>Both Concordant &amp; Discordant</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>59,857</td>
<td>6,708</td>
<td>21,477</td>
<td>10,603</td>
<td>21,069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Healthcare Seeking Behavior

|                                      |           |               |                 |                 |                               |     |
| Inpatient Hospitalization            |           |               |                 |                 |                               | ***|
| Yes                                  | 20,960    | 4,106         | 5,027           | 1,726           | 10,101                        | 48.2|
| No                                   | 38,897    | 2,602         | 16,450          | 8,877           | 10,968                        | 28.2|
| Outpatient Visits                    |           |               |                 |                 |                               | ***|
| 1st Q                                | 14,503    | 665           | 7,595           | 3,462           | 2,781                         | 19.2|
| 2nd Q                                | 14,973    | 1,134         | 5,833           | 3,125           | 4,881                         | 32.6|
| 3rd Q                                | 15,081    | 1,907         | 4,557           | 2,341           | 6,276                         | 41.6|
| 4th Q                                | 15,300    | 3,002         | 3,492           | 1,675           | 7,131                         | 46.6|
| Mean ± SE                            | 5.70±0.04 | 6.85±0.12     | 5.29 ± 0.06     | 4.10 ± 0.05     | 6.56 ± 0.07                   |     |
| Number of T2DM related office visits |           |               |                 |                 |                               |     |
| Number of ER Visits                  | 0.61±0.01 | 1.03±0.03     | 0.35 ± 0.01     | 0.42 ± 0.01     | 0.85 ± 0.01                   |     |

Access to Care

|                                      |           |               |                 |                 |                               |     |
| HPSA- Mental Health Care             |           |               |                 |                 |                               | **  |
| Yes                                  | 50,518    | 5,720         | 18,119          | 8,842           | 17,837                        | 35.3|
| No                                   | 9,339     | 988           | 3,358           | 1,761           | 3,232                         | 34.6|
| Metro                                |           |               |                 |                 |                               | ***|
| Yes                                  | 51,996    | 5,988         | 18,798          | 9,011           | 18,199                        | 35.0|
| No                                   | 7,861     | 720           | 2,679           | 1,592           | 2,870                         | 36.5|
| CMHC                                 |           |               |                 |                 |                               | ***|
| Yes                                  | 27,941    | 3,159         | 10,450          | 4,659           | 9,673                         | 34.6|
| No                                   | 31,916    | 3,549         | 11,027          | 5,944           | 11,396                        | 35.7|
| FQHC                                 |           |               |                 |                 |                               | ***|
| Yes                                  | 48,625    | 5,596         | 17,565          | 8,396           | 17,068                        | 35.1|
| No                                   | 11,232    | 1,112         | 3,912           | 2,207           | 4,001                         | 35.6|

Community Resources

|                                      |           |               |                 |                 |                               |     |
| Median Income                        |           |               |                 |                 |                               | ***|
| 1st Q                                | 14,958    | 1,526         | 5,271           | 2,489           | 5,672                         | 37.9|
| 2nd Q                                | 14,984    | 1,721         | 5,524           | 2,708           | 5,031                         | 33.6|
| 3rd Q                                | 14,951    | 1,737         | 5,319           | 2,846           | 5,049                         | 33.8|
| 4th Q                                | 14,964    | 1,724         | 5,363           | 2,560           | 5,317                         | 35.5|

(continued)
### Table 1: Description of the Study Population by Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, Multi State Medicaid Claims – 2000 – 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Dominant</th>
<th>Concordant Only</th>
<th>Discordant Only</th>
<th>Both Concordant &amp; Discordant</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>59,857</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>21,477</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>10,603</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,1069</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with GT 4yr college education &gt; 16%*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47,072</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>5,435</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>16,964</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12,785</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4,513</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% below poverty level GT 11.1%**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53,092</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>5,968</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>19,060</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6,765</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2,417</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>15,674</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>5,525</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>26,342</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>3,134</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>9,470</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>17,841</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>6,482</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Study sample comprised of adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus aged 18-64 years and with at least one coexisting concordant, discordant or dominant chronic physical condition and who were alive, not dually eligible for Medicare and continuously enrolled in fee-for-service Medicaid for at least 24 months (N=59,857); includes Medicaid data from three states: Illinois, Texas, New York

Asterisks (*) represent significant differences in study population characteristics and coexisting chronic physical conditions categories i.e. Dominant, Concordant Only, Discordant Only and Both Concordant and Discordant, derived from chi-square statistics and univariate ordinary least square regressions.

***P < .001; **.001 ≤ P < .01; *.01 ≤ P < .05.

‡ 16% Cut off was chosen based on 2000 Census Education attainment results

¶ 11.1% Cut off was chosen based on 1999 Census Poverty in 18-64 year results

HPSA: health professional shortage area; CMHC: Community Mental Health Clinic; FQHC: Federally qualified health clinic; GT: Greater Than; Q: Quartile
Table 2: Percentages of Newly-diagnosed Depression by Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, Multi-state Medicaid Claims data – 2000 – 2008

Percent with Newly-diagnosed depression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>Dominant</th>
<th>Concordant Only</th>
<th>Discordant Only</th>
<th>Both Concordant &amp; Discordant</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Physical Make-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-44 years</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mental Health Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Antidiabetic Drugs (OADs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 OAD</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OADs</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ OADs</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No OAD</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulin Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polypharmacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 2: Percentages of Newly-diagnosed Depression by Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, Multi-state Medicaid Claims data – 2000 – 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>Dominant</th>
<th>Concordant Only</th>
<th>Discordant Only</th>
<th>Both Concordant &amp; Discordant</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Seeking Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Hospitalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient Visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Q</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Q</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Q</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Q</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPSA- Mental Health Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQHC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Q</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Q</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Q</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Q</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with GT 4yr college education &gt; 16%¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% below poverty level GT 11.1%²

continued
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Table 2: Percentages of Newly-diagnosed Depression by Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, Multi-state Medicaid Claims data – 2000 – 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent with Newly-diagnosed depression</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>Dominant Concordant Only</th>
<th>Discordant Only</th>
<th>Both Concordant &amp; Discordant</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Study population comprised of adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus aged 18-64 years and with at least one co-existing concordant, discordant or dominant chronic physical condition and who were alive, not dually eligible for Medicare and continuously enrolled in fee-for-service Medicaid for at least 24 months (N=59,857).

Asterisks (*) represent significant differences in developing newly-diagnosed depression among coexisting chronic physical conditions categories i.e. Dominant, Concordant Only, Discordant Only and Both Concordant and Discordant for each of the categorical independent variable subgroups

***P< .001; **.001 ≤ P < .01; *.01 ≤ P < .05.

† 16% Cut off was chosen based on 2000 Census Education attainment results
‡ 11.1% Cut off was chosen based on 1999 Census Poverty in 18-64 year results

HPSA: health professional shortage area; CMHC: Community Mental Health Clinic; FQHC: Federally qualified health clinic; GT: Greater Than; Q: Quartile
Table 3: Adjusted Risk Ratios and 95% Confidence Intervals of Types of Coexisting chronic physical Conditions from Complementary Log-Log Regression on Newly-Diagnosed Depression among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, Multistate Medicaid Claims 2000-2008 (Reference Group: Concordant only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newly-Diagnosed Depression</th>
<th>Dominant</th>
<th>Discordant Conditions Only</th>
<th>Both Concordant and Discordant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1: Adjusted for Types of Coexisting chronic physical Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>RR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Ref :No)</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>[1.67,1.96]</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARR</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>ARR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2: Adjusted for: Model 1+Individual Physical Make-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Ref: No)</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>[1.76,2.08]</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3: Adjusted for: Model 1 + Model 2+Medication Use and Healthcare Seeking Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Ref: No)</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>[1.08,1.29]</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4: Model 1 + Model 2+Model 3+Community level Access to Care, Community Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Ref: No)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>[1.07,1.27]</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Study sample comprised of adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus aged 18-64 years and with at least one coexisting concordant, discordant or dominant chronic physical condition and who were alive, not dually eligible for Medicare and continuously enrolled in fee-for-service Medicaid for at least 24 months (N=59,857); includes Medicaid data from three states: Illinois, Texas, New York

Model 1: adjusted for types of coexisting chronic physical conditions.
Model 2 adjusted for gender, age, race/ethnicity and years of observation;
Model 3: Additionally Adjusted for adjusts for presence of other mental health conditions, number of oral antidiabetic medication classes and insulin use as identified by NDC codes, presence of polypharmacy number of emergency room visits, inpatient hospitalization, number of total and T2DM related office visits;
Model 4: Additionally adjusts for state of residence, whether county of residence had a community mental health clinic and FQHC, CMHC, metro and HPSA-mental health status of county, median income in the county, whether percent below poverty level and percent with college education greater than national average

Asterisks (*) indicate statistical significances are based on complementary log-log regressions with concordant conditions as reference group for types of coexisting chronic physical conditions. **P < 0.001; *.001 ≤ P < .01; .01 ≤ P < .05.

T2DM: type 2 diabetes mellitus; HPSA: health professional shortage area; CMHC: Community Mental Health Clinic; FQHC: Federally qualified health clinic; Ref: Reference Group
## Appendix A: ICD-9-CM Codes for Identifying Types of Coexisting chronic physical Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>ICD-9-CM Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concordant conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary Artery Disease</td>
<td>410,4100,4101,4102,4103,4104,4105,4106,4107,4108,4109,411,4110,4111,4118,41181,41189,412,413,4130,4131,4139,414,4140,41400,41401,41402,41403,41404,41405,4141,41410,41411,41419,4148,4149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestive Heart Failure</td>
<td>40201,40211,40291,40401,40411,40491,428,4280,4281,4289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrhythmia</td>
<td>423,4230,4231,4232,4238,4239,42731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>430,4351,4352,4353,4356,4358,4359,4380,4381,43811,43812,4382,4383,4384,4385,43850,4385,43852,43853,4388,43881,43882,43889,4389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral Vascular Disease</td>
<td>2507,4402,44020,44021,44022,44023,44024,44029,4408,4409,4422,4423,443,4430,4431,4438,44381,44389,44422,44481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral Vascular Disease-gangrene</td>
<td>7854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal</td>
<td>40311,40391,40412,40413,40492,40493,585,586,587,2741,27410,27411,27419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Renal Failure</td>
<td>40310,40390,40410,40411,40490,40491,581,5810,5811,5812,5813,5818,5819,582,5820,5821,5822,5824,5828,58281,58289,5829,583,5830,5831,5832,5834,5836,5837,5838,58381,58389,5839,5900,59000,59001,5936,5939,75312,75313,75314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Pathophysiology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetic Nephropathy</td>
<td>2504,25040,25041,25042,25043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute Renal Failure and Disease</td>
<td>40300,40301,40400,40401,40402,40404,40501,4533,584,5845,5846,5847,5848,5849,5850,5804,5808,58081,58089,5809,5901,59010,59011,59012,5903,5908,59080,59081,59381,866,8660,86600,86601,86602,86603,8661,86610,86611,86612,86613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retinopathy (excludes advanced retinopathy, blindness)</td>
<td>3620,36201,25050,25051,25052,25053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulcer</td>
<td>700,68110,68111,6827,7071,73070,73077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Diabetes Related Complications</td>
<td>25002,25003,25010,25011,25012,25013,25020,25021,25022,25023,25031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncontrolled Diabetes</td>
<td>25032,25033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term Diabetes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discordant Conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastro Intestinal Tract Related Disorders:</td>
<td>5301,5302,5303,53081,531,532,533,534,555,556,56211,56213,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERD/Esophagitis</td>
<td>575,576,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peptic ulcers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflammatory Bowel Disease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverticulitis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gall Bladder disease and stone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viral hepatitis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease</td>
<td>490,491,492,493,495,496,500,501,502,503,504,505,5064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gout</td>
<td>274,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hip problem</td>
<td>71905,71915,71925,71935,71945,71955,71965,71975,71985,71995,71996,71999,72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65,733314,73315,73342,820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>ICD-9-CM Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low back pain</td>
<td>720,7213,72142,72210,72252,72273,72283,72293,72402,7242,7243,7244,7245,7246,7247,7248,7249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteoarthritis</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arthritis</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheumatoid arthritis</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connective tissue rheumatological disease</td>
<td>7100,7101,7104,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blindness Single Eye</td>
<td>3696,3697,3698,3699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominant Conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Stage Renal Disease</td>
<td>E8791,V51,V56,V560,V5631,V5632,V568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Stage Liver Disease</td>
<td>5722,5723,5724,5728,4560,4561,4562,45620,45621,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blindness Both Eyes/ Advanced Retinopathy</td>
<td>36202,3690,3691,3692,3693,3694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-dementia Cognitive Impairment</td>
<td>294,2941,29283,2949,33183,78093,438,3330,3334,3315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dementia and Related Conditions</td>
<td>2900,29010,29011,29012,29013,29014,29021,29022,29023,29040,29041,29042,29043,2912,29410,29411,2948,3310,3311,3312,3317,33182,33189,3319,3320,0461,0463,0941,29282,3109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Sclerosis</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemiplegia Hemiparesis and Paraplegia</td>
<td>342,3441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinson’s Disease</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscular dystrophy</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinal cord injury</td>
<td>80600,80601,80602,80603,80604,80605,80606,80607,80608,80609,8061,9520,34400,34401,34402,34403,34404,34409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastroparesis</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Coexisting chronic physical conditions</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>ARR</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>ARR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordant Conditions Only</td>
<td>*** 1.18 [1.08,1.29] ***</td>
<td>1.17 [1.07,1.27] ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discordant Conditions Only</td>
<td>*** 1.09 [1.01,1.19] *</td>
<td>1.06 [0.98,1.16]</td>
<td>1.06 [0.98,1.15]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>*** 1.67 [1.57,1.77] ***</td>
<td>1.29 [1.21,1.38] ***</td>
<td>1.30 [1.22,1.39] ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-44 years</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>0.99 [0.92,1.06]</td>
<td>1.00 [0.93,1.07]</td>
<td>1.01 [0.95,1.08] ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>0.52 [0.48,0.55] ***</td>
<td>0.57 [0.54,0.61] ***</td>
<td>0.59 [0.55,0.63]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.24 [1.18,1.31] ***</td>
<td>1.41 [1.33,1.49] ***</td>
<td>1.42 [1.34,1.50]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>1.15 [1.07,1.23] ***</td>
<td>1.24 [1.15,1.32] ***</td>
<td>1.34 [1.25,1.44]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.02 [0.96,1.08]</td>
<td>1.14 [1.07,1.21] ***</td>
<td>1.26 [1.18,1.34]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological Factors</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.60 [2.45,2.76] ***</td>
<td>2.51 [2.36,2.66] ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
## Appendix B: Adjusted Risk Ratios and 95% Confidence Intervals from Complementary Log-Log Regression on Newly-diagnosed Depression among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, Multistate Medicaid Claims 2000-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medication Use</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Antidiabetic Drugs (OADs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 OAD</td>
<td>0.89 [0.80,0.98]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.91 [0.82,1.01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OADs</td>
<td>0.94 [0.85,1.04]</td>
<td>0.96 [0.86,1.06]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ OADs</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No OAD</td>
<td>0.94 [0.85,1.04]</td>
<td>0.97 [0.88,1.08]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulin Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.03 [0.97,1.09]</td>
<td>1.01 [0.96,1.07]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polypharmacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.06 [1.01,1.13]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.98 [0.92,1.04]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Healthcare Seeking Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inpatient Hospitalization</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.20 [1.13,1.27]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.19 [1.12,1.26]</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outpatient Visits</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Q Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Q</td>
<td>1.56 [1.42,1.72]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.61 [1.46,1.77]</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Q</td>
<td>1.92 [1.74,2.11]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2.02 [1.83,2.22]</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Q</td>
<td>2.19 [1.99,2.41]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>2.39 [2.16,2.64]</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of T2DM related office visits</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00 [1.00,1.01]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.00 [1.00,1.01]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of ER Visits</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.07 [1.06,1.08]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.07 [1.06,1.09]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARR</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>ARR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community level Access to Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPSA- Mental Health Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>[0.91,1.08]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>[0.93,1.17]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>[0.90,1.03]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQHC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>[0.94,1.12]</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Q</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>[0.74,1.00]</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Q</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>[0.82,1.01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Q</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>[0.81,1.00]</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Q</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with GT 4yr college education &gt; 16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>[0.96,1.20]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendix B: Adjusted Risk Ratios and 95% Confidence Intervals from Complementary Log-Log Regression on Newly-diagnosed Depression among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, Multistate Medicaid Claims 2000-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th></th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th></th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% below poverty level GT 11.1%§</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>[0.93,1.16]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>[0.75,0.88]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>[0.66,0.81]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>[0.75,0.88]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>[0.66,0.81]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>[0.99,1.19]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>[0.94,1.14]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>[0.93,1.15]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>[0.93,1.15]</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>[1.08,1.31]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>[1.02,1.23]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>[0.98,1.23]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>[0.92,1.11]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>[0.84,1.02]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>[0.82,1.01]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>[0.76,0.92]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>[0.71,0.86]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>[0.70,0.86]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>[0.67,0.81]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>[0.61,0.74]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>[0.56,0.71]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>[0.37,0.45]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>[0.34,0.42]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>[0.31,0.40]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Asterisks indicate statistical significances are based on complementary log-log regressions with concordant conditions as reference group for independent variable. ***P < 0.001; **.001 ≤ P < .01; *.01 ≤ P < .05.

T2DM: type 2 diabetes mellitus; HPSA: health professional shortage area; CMHC: Community Mental Health Clinic; FQHC: Federally qualified health clinic
CHAPTER 3
CHAPTER 3: Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions and Treatment for Depression among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression

INTRODUCTION

Coexisting Depression among Individuals with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (T2DM)

Presence of depression among individuals with type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (T2DM) serves as a prototype example of Agency of Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ)’s definition of a complex patient who has “two or more chronic conditions where each condition may influence the care of the other condition(s) through limitations of life expectancy, interactions between drug therapies, difficulties in establishing adequate care coordination, and/or direct contraindications to therapy for one condition by other conditions” [1]. Depression has considerable adverse impact on both psychological well-being and T2DM related outcomes. Coexisting depression among individuals with type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) is significantly associated with adverse T2DM related outcomes such as poor processes of care (glycated hemoglobin i.e. A1C testing, LDL testing and eye examination)[2], non-adherence to the T2DM treatment regimens [3-8] and poor foot care [7, 9-11].

Treatment for Depression among Individuals with T2DM

Randomized clinical trials have been conducted to examine the effect of antidepressant treatment for depression among individuals with T2DM and coexisting depression. These trials have evaluated reduction in depressive symptoms, remission from depression, and T2DM-related outcomes. As compared to placebo, eight weeks of treatment with nortriptyline resulted in a significant reduction in depressive symptoms (reduction in Beck’s Depression Inventory score: -10.2 vs -5.8, p = .03). However, among 28 individuals with coexisting T2DM and depression, randomized double-blind placebo-controlled trial found that glycemic control worsened among
individuals who were treated with nortriptyline [12]. As compared to placebo, eight weeks of treatment with fluoxetine resulted in reduction in depressive symptoms (reduction in BDI score: -14.0 vs. -8.8, \( P = 0.03 \)) among sixty patients with diabetes (did not distinguish between type 1 and type 2). This trial did not report any significant differences in glycemic control between placebo and treatment groups [13]. Another randomized placebo-controlled double-blind maintenance treatment trial that included individuals who responded to open label sertraline treatment, found that as compared to placebo, individuals who continued treatment with sertraline had significantly lower risk of depression recurrence (hazard ratio = 0.51; 95% CI, 0.31-0.85; \( P = .02 \)); again no significant differences were observed for glycemic control [14].

Double blind treatment with paroxetine as compared to placebo, conducted among 49 mildly depressed individuals, recruited from an outpatient setting in Finland, showed significant improvements in quality of life (mean difference in SF-36 score: 11.0 points, \( p = 0.039 \)) as well as glycemic control (mean difference in HbA1C: 0.59% units, \( p = 0.018 \)) at 3 months, but the effect did not persist at 6 months [15]. Treatment of depression among 51 individuals with 10 weeks of cognitive behavioral therapy has been shown to result in more remission rates as compared to control group that received no specific antidepressant treatment (85% in CBT group vs 27% in control group); HbA1C levels at 6 month after follow-up though significantly lower in CBT group (9.5% compared with 10.9% in control; \( P = 0.03 \)), was above the widely accepted 9% cut-off for uncontrolled HbA1C in both treatment and control groups [16]. Therefore, it may be concluded that depression treatment may be beneficial for favorable depression related outcomes; however, evidence for T2DM related outcomes is inconclusive. These findings suggest that among individuals with coexisting T2DM and depression, depression treatment may be favored to reduce depressive symptoms.
Depression Treatment Patterns among Individuals with T2DM

Only a few studies have examined rates of depression treatment in real-world practice settings among individuals with T2DM and coexisting depression. Findings from the handful of studies indicate that depression among individuals with T2DM is undertreated; for example, Katon and colleagues found that in a study that included both elderly and non-elderly participants (mean age 59 years), only 43% of those with diagnosed depression and T2DM received treatment with 1 or more antidepressants and only 6.7% received at least 4 psychotherapy sessions during a follow-up period of 12-months [17]. A study among veteran clinic users examined guideline consistent depression treatment within 6 months after diagnosis. This study found that only 51% of individuals with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression received any antidepressant treatment [18]. Another study, also among veterans, but restricted to women with newly-diagnosed depression and T2DM, coronary artery disease or hypertension found that 54% of those with T2DM only used antidepressants alone and 28% used psychotherapy [19].

Some studies have compared depression treatment rates among individuals with and without T2DM. The rates of depression treatment for those with T2DM were parsed from these studies and are reported below. A study using Medicaid claims data files from Alabama, Georgia, New Jersey, and Wisconsin reported that among Medicaid enrollees with depression, those with diabetes had higher rates of antidepressant treatment (78%). A nationally representative study of non-institutionalized US population aged 16 years or older that examined the association of treatment modality for depression and burden of comorbid chronic conditions using the Medical Expenditure Panel Survey data, reported that while among individuals with diabetes (did not distinguish between type 1 and type 2) and depression, 21% did not receive any treatment, about 58% were treated with antidepressants alone and 14% were treated with both
antidepressants and psychotherapy [20]. Another study that used the MedStat MarketScan Commercial Claims and Encounters and Medicare Supplemental and Coordination of Benefits databases, found that 93% of individuals with diabetes (did not distinguish between type 1 and type 2) and depression were using antidepressants, selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors being the most prescribed class (64%) [21]. Therefore, among individuals with T2DM rates of depression treatment with antidepressants in the reviewed literature varied from a moderate rate of 43% to as high as 93%; only one study examined depression treatment rates with psychotherapy.

**Depression Treatment among Individuals with Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions**

Although not specific to T2DM, treatment for depression has been shown to “compete”, often unsuccessfully among individuals with multiple coexisting chronic physical conditions [22, 23]. For example, one study found that among 240 individuals with 5 or more depressive symptoms, number of other chronic coexisting chronic physical conditions was inversely associated with the attention given to depression in a physician office visit [22]. Using a sample of 92 participants from the same study, it was found that only 17% of individuals completed depression treatment and additionally, severity of other coexisting chronic physical conditions reduced the odds of initiating depression treatment even among patients who were enthusiastic about depression treatment [24]. Therefore, these studies indicate that those with multiple chronic conditions are less likely to be treated for depression suggesting that depression treatment among those with T2DM and coexisting chronic physical conditions may be under-treated. However, other existing studies have indicate that competing demands do not affect depression treatment among individuals with multiple coexisting chronic conditions [25-28]. For example, a study using 2007 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey from found that
individuals with multiple chronic physical conditions were as likely as those with single condition to report depression treatment [28]. With such conflicting results in previous studies, depression treatment rates among those with T2DM and other multiple coexisting chronic physical conditions remains to be explored.

**Depression Treatment among Individuals with T2DM and Coexisting Chronic Physical conditions**

A handful of studies already mentioned above, have indirectly examined the association between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and depression treatment patterns among individuals with T2DM. However, coexisting chronic physical conditions in these studies were measured using either comorbidity indices [18, 29] or number of coexisting conditions [19]. Two of these studies found that the number of coexisting chronic condition variable or the comorbidity index variable was not significantly associated with receipt of depression treatment [18, 19]. On the contrary, in the study among Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM by Sambamoorthi et al.,[29] it was reported that individuals with higher burden from coexisting conditions, were more likely to receive antidepressants compared to those with no burden from coexisting conditions. However, since these studies used comorbidity indices or number of chronic condition variable in their analyses, there is an existing knowledge gap regarding how different types of coexisting conditions may effect depression treatment among individuals with T2DM and coexisting chronic physical conditions.

**Adequate Depression Treatment**

Guidelines for depression treatment suggest that during the first four months after depression diagnosis, those with depression should be treated for at least 84 days with antidepressants [1, 30] and/or at least 8 sessions of psychotherapy [31]. Adequate depression
treatment either with antidepressants or psychotherapy has both been found to be associated with improvements in depression symptoms [32], whereas, early discontinuation of depression treatment, specifically with antidepressants has been found to be associated with high risk of relapse [33, 34].

Among individuals who received depression treatment, the duration of treatment has been found to be often inadequate. An analysis of the National Comorbidity Survey Replication reported that in the US, among individuals with major depression and who received treatment, only 10% got adequate treatment [35]. Another study that analyzed Medicaid managed care data from a large Mid-Atlantic state in the US, found that, 30% of enrollees received adequate antidepressant treatment, 63% of enrollees received adequate psychotherapy defined as four or more psychotherapy visits.

**Adequate Depression Treatment among Individuals with T2DM and Coexisting Chronic Physical conditions**

Similarly, individuals with T2DM and coexisting depression do not receive adequate depression treatment. For example, Katon et al found that among individuals with diabetes and depression, who were enrolled in a private health maintenance organization, 31% received adequate antidepressant treatment and only 6.7% received four or more sessions of psychotherapy [17]. The study by Tiwari et al., among veterans with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression also found that only 31% received adequate antidepressant treatment [18]. This study controlled for Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI) in their logistic regression model for examining the odds of receiving adequate depression treatment. The odds ratio for the CCI variable was not statistically significant, suggesting that coexisting conditions was not associated with receipt of adequate depression treatment among veterans with T2DM. Treatment with
psychotherapy was not examined in this study. As depression treatment often competes with treatment for other conditions, it is possible that even those who start depression treatment may not get the “adequate” treatment as per guidelines for depression treatment. However, to the best of the authors’ knowledge no study has examined whether different types of coexisting chronic physical conditions are associated with receiving adequate depression treatment among individuals with T2DM and depression.

Need for the Study

The existing literature on patterns of depression treatment among individuals with diabetes have focused primarily on antidepressant treatment even though guideline consistent depression treatment includes both psychotherapy and antidepressant treatment [36]. One of these studies has used self-reported information to identify medical conditions and medication use [20]. Additionally, these studies have often controlled for comorbidity indices such as Charlson comorbidity index [18, 29] or for number of comorbidities [19, 20] or have not considered impact of comorbidities at all [37]. By only controlling for comorbidity numbers or indices, one cannot conclude whether the types of coexisting chronic physical conditions are associated receipt of depression treatment with antidepressants only, psychotherapy only, both or receiving no treatment at all. Examining this association is especially important as often treatment for depression is not given priority in presence of multiple coexisting chronic conditions [22, 23]. Therefore this study aimed to analyze the association between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and receipt of depression treatment with antidepressants only, psychotherapy only, both or receiving no treatment at all.

Additionally, the current knowledge on receipt of “adequate” depression treatment by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions among individuals with T2DM is very limited.
Adequate depression treatment is one of the quality measures included in National Committee for Quality Assurance's (NCQA) Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set (HEDIS). These quality measures are used by various health plans including Medicaid and other organizations in the US for the purpose of accreditation, accountability and quality improvement. Therefore, it is essential to examine whether among individuals with T2DM, risk of not receiving adequate depression treatment varies by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions. This study also attempted to analyze the association between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and receipt of adequate depression treatment among Medicaid enrollees with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression.

The study population included Medicaid enrollees. Medicaid is a major payer for non-elderly adults in the US and it accounts for 68% of federal spending [38]. Traditionally, Medicaid has been a primary source of health insurance for those with low socioeconomic status, which incidentally is a risk factor for developing depression [39]. Additionally, it has been estimated that, 27% of the African-Americans population in the US receive their health insurance from Medicaid from Medicaid [40]. African-Americans with major depression have been reported to have inadequate depression treatment [41]. Additionally, individuals with diabetes are disproportionately covered by Medicaid, 80% of Medicaid beneficiaries with diabetes suffer from a coexisting chronic physical condition and 20% of Medicaid enrollees are diagnosed with depression [27, 28]. Based on these statistics, it can be seen that Medicaid data provides a rich opportunity to conduct research on treatment of depression among individuals with T2DM, depression and coexisting T2DM.
RESEARCH AIM AND HYPOTHESIS

Aim 2: Objective 1.1: Examine the association between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and depression treatment (antidepressants only, psychotherapy only, both antidepressants and psychotherapy and none), after adjusting for other covariates among non-elderly (18-64 years) fee-for-service Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression,

Aim2: Hypothesis 1.1: As compared to individuals with discordant conditions only, those with concordant conditions would be less likely to receive treatment with antidepressants.

Aim 2: Objective 1.2: Evaluate the association between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and receipt of adequate depression treatment (yes, no), after adjusting for other covariates among non-elderly (18-64 years) fee-for-service Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression who received either antidepressants or psychotherapy.

Aim2: Hypothesis 1.2: As compared to individuals with discordant conditions only, those with dominant conditions would be less likely to receive adequate depression treatment.
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual framework used was based on a modified version of a behavioral model on use of health services, widely known as the Andersen Behavioral Model (ABM) [42]. The ABM posits that utilization of health services varies as a function of 1) each individual’s unique predisposition for using services (predisposing factors); 2) the means available to each individual for obtaining services (enabling factors); 3) each individual’s level of need; 4) personal health practices; and 5) the external environment. The model is presented below. The behavioral health model is very flexible and was easily adapted to analyze the relationship between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and depression treatment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim 2 – Dependent Variable: Depressi...</th>
<th>Predisposing factors:</th>
<th>Enabling factors:</th>
<th>Need Factors:</th>
<th>External Environment:</th>
<th>Personal Health Practices:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depression Treatment Categories Adequate Depression Treatment</td>
<td>Gender, age, race/ethnicity</td>
<td>Medicaid Eligibility</td>
<td>Types of coexisting physical conditions, Other Mental Health Conditions, Number of chronic conditions</td>
<td>e.g. County level social determinants of health County Median Income, State, % with college education and % below poverty level and Community level healthcare infrastructure e.g. presence of CMHC, FQHC in a county</td>
<td>e.g Health care Seeking Behavior: Medication use, use of inpatient and emergency room services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
METHODS

Study Design

A retrospective cohort study design was used for this study. Individuals with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression formed the cohort. The date of newly-diagnosed depression was considered as the “index” date. Baseline period was defined as twelve months prior to the index date. All the independent variables were identified during the baseline period. Individuals were followed for a period of 4 months following the index date to examine receipt and depression treatment. This study selected a 4-month follow up period based on the Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set (HEDIS) definition for acute phase of depression treatment [43]. The HEDIS measures antidepressant medication use in the acute phase as 114 days from the date of newly-diagnosed depression i.e. index date [43].

Data Sources

Medicaid analytic extract (MAX) files:

MAX files are prepared and produced by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. The MAX files comprise of enrollment (“personal summary”), inpatient claims, other therapy medical claims, and pharmacy claims files of Medicaid beneficiaries. These files were linked by beneficiaries’ unique identification number. The person summary file provides information on eligibility, demographics, managed care enrollment, a utilization summary and Medicaid payments. The other files contain information on a variety of factors associated with service provided such as date of service, diagnosis or medication codes associated with the service provided and total amount paid by Medicaid for each service used. This study used 9 years Medicaid data (2000-2008) from three states: New York (NY), Texas (TX), Illinois (IL). It Studies using data that is nationally representative of US population have observed that over the years rates of depression treatment with antidepressants had increased, while rate of treatment
with psychotherapy decreased in the time period between 1998-2007 [44]. To ensure that enough sample sizes were available for all depression treatment categories, multiple years of claims data were thus combined in this study.

**Area Health Resource File (AHRF):**

The AHRF is national county-level health resource information provided by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration [45]. The dataset contains more than 6,000 variables providing county level information on health facilities, health professions, resource scarcity, health status, economic activity, health training programs, and socioeconomic and environmental characteristics [45]. The AHRF file was linked with Medicaid data using the Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) county codes. County-level social determinants of health such as median income, percentage below poverty level in a county and county-level healthcare infrastructure such as federally qualified healthcare clinics, health professional shortage area and others (explained in the section on independent variables) were derived from this file.

**Identification of the Study Cohort**

**Medicaid Beneficiaries with T2DM:**

Individuals with T2DM in a calendar year were identified as those with at least one inpatient visit or two or more physician outpatient visits (which were at least 30 days apart) with a primary or secondary diagnosis of T2DM identified by International Classification of Diagnosis Codes 9th Revision (ICD-9-CM) codes: 250.x0 or 250.x2. The study population comprised of all individuals with (1) a diagnosis of T2DM (2) no diagnosis for depression and (3) no antidepressant medication use, in the calendar year.

**Medicaid Beneficiaries with Newly-diagnosed Depression:**
Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM and who were depression free were followed in the subsequent calendar year to identify newly-diagnosed depression. Individuals with at least one outpatient visit or an inpatient admission with a primary or secondary diagnosis of depression in the subsequent calendar year were identified as having a newly-diagnosed depression [46]. Depression was identified using ICD9 CM codes: 296.2 (major depressive disorder, single episode), 296.3 (major depressive disorder, recurrent episode), 311 (depression not elsewhere classified), 309.1 (prolonged depressive reaction), 300.4 (neurotic depression) and 298.0 (depressive type psychosis) [19, 29]. The first observed date of outpatient visit or inpatient discharge with diagnosis of depression was the “index date.” Therefore, individual classified as having a newly-diagnosed depression had no history of depression diagnosis or antidepressant use for at least a period of 365 days prior to the index date. It has to be noted that previous studies have used a 120 day depression free period to define new episode of depression [18]. However, to minimize misclassification of an episodic manifestation of chronic depression (where depression symptoms last for two or more years) as new episode of depression, the longer look-back period of 365 days was used.

Individuals were excluded from the study cohort if they (1) did not have a diagnosis of at least one coexisting chronic physical conditions (identified by ICD-9-CM codes included in the appendix) during the baseline period (2) did not have continuous fee-for-service Medicaid eligibility during the observation period; (3) were enrolled in Medicare managed care at any point during the observation period; (4) died during the study period; and (5) did not use inpatient or outpatient Medicaid services during the study period.

**Dependent Variables**

**Depression Treatment during the Acute Phase:**
Depression treatment consisted of pharmacotherapy with antidepressants and psychotherapy. *Antidepressant Use:* Antidepressants were identified using National Drug Codes (NDC) and included selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors, selective norepinephrine reuptake (inhibitors), tricyclic antidepressants, monoamine oxidase inhibitors, mirtazapine and bupropion. *Psychotherapy Use:* Psychotherapy was identified using Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) codes. The following psychotherapy types were identified: (i) psychotherapy diagnostic interview (90801, 90802) (ii) individual psychotherapy [individual psychotherapy 20-30 min (90804, 90816, 90805, 90817), 45-50 min (90806, 90818, 90807, 90819), 75-80 min (90808, 90821, 90809, 90822); interactive individual psychotherapy 20-30 min (90810, 90823, 90811, 90824), 45-50 min (90812, 90826, 90813, 90827), 75-80 min (90814, 90828, 90815, 90829)] (iii) other psychotherapy [family psychotherapy (90846, 90847, 90849), group psychotherapy (90853), interactive group psychotherapy(90857)] [47].

Depression treatment during the four months of follow-up after newly-diagnosed depression was classified as: (1) Antidepressants only: These individuals received at least one prescription for antidepressant, but no psychotherapy visit during the follow-up.; (2) Psychotherapy only: These individuals received at least one psychotherapy visit, but no prescription for antidepressant drugs during the four months of follow-up. (3) Both antidepressants and psychotherapy: These individuals received a minimum of one prescription for antidepressants and one psychotherapy visit (4) No treatment: These individuals received neither a prescription for antidepressants nor a psychotherapy visit.

*Adequate Depression Treatment during the Acute Phase:*

*Adequate antidepressant treatment:* Among individuals who received depression treatment with antidepressants, adequate treatment was defined using the HEDIS criteria. The HEDIS defines
adequate antidepressant treatment as receiving 84 or more days of prescription for any antidepressant drug during the first 114 days following the index date of depression diagnosis. Based on this definition, individuals with antidepressant prescription during 70% of the follow-up days (84/114*100=0.71) were considered as receiving adequate treatment with antidepressants [1, 30]

*Adequate psychotherapy treatment:* Among individuals who received depression treatment with psychotherapy, receipt of adequate treatment was defined as receiving at least 8 sessions (the minimum length of evidence based psychotherapy depression treatment and anxiety disorders) [31, 48] during the 120 days of follow-up.

Individuals who received either adequate antidepressant treatment or adequate psychotherapy were defined as having adequate depression treatment. Individuals who did not have adequate antidepressant treatment and who did not have adequate psychotherapy treatment were considered as not having adequate depression treatment.

**Independent Variables**

**Key Independent Variable: Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions:**

Based on the theory that coexisting conditions had an impact on the medical care, self-management, and healthcare outcomes of an individual with T2DM, Piette and Kerr developed a framework that classified coexisting conditions among individuals with T2DM into dominant (conditions whose severity eclipses all other conditions’ management plans such as metastatic cancer), concordant (conditions that overlap with T2DM in their pathophysiology and management plans such as cardiovascular diseases) or discordant (conditions with unrelated pathophysiology or management plans such as musculoskeletal disorders) [49].
Following this framework, it may be assumed that presence of dominant, concordant and discordant conditions among individuals with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression may affect the choice of depression treatment. Therefore, following a hierarchy defined in a previous study using this framework [50], forty four physical conditions commonly coexisting with T2DM were categorized into: 1) dominant; 2) concordant only, 3) discordant only and 4) both concordant and discordant conditions. Dominant conditions were given priority because such conditions eclipse the management of other health conditions. Concordant and discordant conditions were thus defined only among those without dominant conditions. These conditions were identified using ICD-9-CM codes and are presented in Appendix A.

Other independent variables:

Other independent variables were chosen based on Andersen’s Behavioral Model. These variables were:

*Predisposing Factors:* The variables included were: demographics (gender, age, race/ethnicity [Whites, African Americans, Hispanics or other races]).

*Enabling Factors:* The enabling factors were defined using Medicaid eligibility status such as eligibility due to poverty (yes/no), medical needs (yes/no) and waiver (yes/no).

*Need Factors:* The variables included were clinical characteristics such as presence of other mental health conditions and number of conditions during baseline. The other mental health conditions included bipolar disorder, schizophrenia, post-traumatic stress disorder, and alcohol and drug abuse.

*Personal Health Practices:* As an individual’s propensity to seek treatment may influence receipt of depression treatment, the study controlled for healthcare seeking behavior by controlling for baseline healthcare utilization characteristics such as number of emergency room visits in 180
days prior to new-onset depression, inpatient hospitalization, number of oral antidiabetic medication classes and insulin use as identified by NDC codes, presence of polypharmacy identified by use of 6 or more drug classes in the 90 days prior to new-onset depression, number of outpatient visits measured in quartiles;

*External Environment*: External environment variables included state of residence, community level access healthcare infrastructure and community level social determinants of health variables. Community level access healthcare infrastructure variables included presence of community mental health clinic (CMHC) and federally qualified health clinic (FQHC) in a county, whether county of residence was designated as Health Professional Shortage area (HPSA) and density of social workers in a county. Community level social determinants of health variables were defined as external environment variables. The variables included were urban/rural status of a county, median income in the county and whether percent below poverty level and percent with college education in the county were greater than national average based on US census estimates [51, 52].

*Statistical Analysis*

*Unadjusted Analyses:*

Descriptive analysis was conducted using frequency, mean and standard errors. Chi-square tests were used to examine the unadjusted association between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and depression treatment. The association between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and depression treatment were also examined within each category of the independent variables and statistical significance of the associations were assessed using the chi-square tests. Same set of statistical analyses were performed to examine the factors associated with adequate depression treatment.
Adjusted Analyses:

Multinomial logistic regression analyses were used to examine adjusted association between types of coexisting conditions and depression treatment after controlling for the other independent variables. Adjusted logistic regression analyses were used to examine adjusted association between types of coexisting conditions and adequate depression treatment after controlling for predisposing, enabling, need, personal health practices and external environment variables. Given that prescription of antidepressants is contraindicated in some concordant and dominant conditions included in the study, in all regression analyses “discordant conditions only” group was used as the reference group. Statistical Analytic Software (SAS 9.3) was used for all analyses.
RESULTS

Characteristics of the Study Population

The study population consisted of 5,837 non-elderly adults Medicaid fee-for-service beneficiaries with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression who were not enrolled in Medicare and alive during the study period (Table 1). In the study population 67% were females, 39.7% were in the 55-64 years, 30.2% were African-Americans, 36.5% used polypharmacy and 49.9% had baseline inpatient hospitalizations; based on county of residence characteristics majority lived in area designated as metro (89.2%), HPSA for mental health (83.5%), areas with FQHCs (82.4%) and percentage of persons with income below poverty level greater than national average (88.5%). Details on the description of the study population are presented in Table 1.

Study Population Characteristics by Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions

The description of the study population by types of coexisting chronic physical condition categories are also presented in Table 1. In the study population, 14.7% had dominant conditions; 27.0%, 15.4%, and 43.0% of the study population had concordant only, discordant only, and both concordant and discordant conditions respectively. Significant group differences in types of coexisting conditions were observed for all the other independent variables included in the study. A higher proportion of individuals with dominant conditions were older i.e. 55-64 years (18.7% vs 9% in 18-44 years age-group), males (18.4% vs 12.9% in females), had presence of other mental health conditions (18.6% vs 12.6% with absence of other mental health conditions), inpatient hospitalizations (21.3% vs 8.2% in those without) and higher number of outpatient visits (22.9% in 4th vs 6.1% in 1st quartile). Table 1 presents the description of the study population characteristics by types of coexisting conditions.
**Depression Treatment: Percentages**

In the study population, 57.3% received any depression treatment; 27.6% received treatment with antidepressants only, 18.1% received treatment with psychotherapy only and 11.6% received treatment with both antidepressants and psychotherapy, 42.7% did not receive any treatment.

**Unadjusted Associations between Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions and Depression Treatment Categories**

A significantly lower percentage of individuals with dominant conditions (20.2%) and concordant conditions only (27.9%) had treatment with antidepressants only as compared to those with discordant conditions only (33.1%); a significantly higher percentage of individuals in dominant conditions (27.9%) and concordant conditions only (17.2%) received treatment with psychotherapy only as compared to individuals with discordant conditions only (13.4%). Similar relationships were observed when types of coexisting conditions and depression treatment were examined for each subgroup of the categorical independent variables. For example, among women 20.8% and 31.2% in the dominant and concordant conditions only groups were treated with only antidepressants as compared to 34.1% in discordant conditions only group; 23.4% and 13.2% in the dominant conditions and concordant conditions only groups were treated with psychotherapy only as compared to 11.6% in discordant only group. Percentages of individuals receiving treatment with antidepressants only, psychotherapy only and both antidepressants and psychotherapy for each category of types of coexisting conditions are presented in Table 2; results for no treatment group are not presented in tabular form, but can be furnished on request.

**Adjusted Associations between Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions and Depression Treatment Categories**
The associations observed in unadjusted analyses, remained in adjusted analyses. In adjusted analyses using multinomial logistic regression, the reference group for the dependent variable was “No depression treatment”. The reference group for types of coexisting chronic physical conditions was “discordant condition only”. The results from the multinomial logistic regression revealed that as compared to individuals with discordant conditions only, those with dominant conditions (AOR: 0.77; 95% Confidence Interval (CI): 0.59, 0.99; p<0.05) and those with concordant conditions only (Adjusted Odds Ratio (AOR): 0.80; 95% CI: 0.65, 0.98; p<0.05) were less likely to receive depression treatment with antidepressants only. In comparison to those with discordant conditions only, treatment of depression with psychotherapy was more likely among individuals with dominant conditions (AOR: 1.61; 95% CI: 1.21, 1.15; p<.01) and concordant conditions only: AOR: 1.32; 95% CI: 1.01, 1.72; p<.05). There was no statistically significant association between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and receipt of both antidepressant and psychotherapy treatment. The results are presented in Table 3.

**Adequate Depression Treatment**

*Descriptive, Unadjusted and Adjusted Associations with Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions:*

Among those who received depression treatment (N=3,347), 32.5% received adequate treatment either with antidepressants or psychotherapy. Bivariate chi-square and multivariate logistic regression analyses did not show any significant associations between types of coexisting conditions and adequate depression treatment.

*Other Independent Variables Associated with Adequate Depression Treatment*

From multivariate analyses, it was observed that Whites as compared to African Americans (AOR: 1.44; 95% CI:1.17, 1.78;p<0.001), 1 OAD (AOR:1.40; 95% CI:1.05, 1.88;
p<0.05) and 2 OADs (AOR:1.45; 95% CI:1.08, 1.95; p<0.05) users as compared to users of 3+OADs and those with number of outpatient visits in the fourth quartile as compared to first quartile (AOR:1.79; 95% CI:1.39, 2.31; p<0.001) were more likely to get adequate depression treatment. (Results not presented in tabular form).
DISCUSSION

This study examined the association between types of coexisting conditions and depression treatment, after adjusting for other predisposing, enabling, need, personal health practices and external environment factors, among non-elderly fee-for-service Medicaid Enrollees from multiple states who had T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression. Depression treatment rates found in this study I somewhat lower than those found in the T2DM population. Less than 40% of the study population in this received treatment with antidepressants. Though not specific to individuals with T2DM, Marcus et al., reported that among individuals with depression, antidepressant and psychotherapy treatment rates in a nationally representative sample of the US population in 2007 were 75% and 43% respectively. The antidepressant treatment rates among individuals with newly-diagnosed depression and T2DM have been found to vary between 93% [21]to 43% [17]. Therefore, antidepressant treatment rates in this study were low as compared to other studies.

Nearly, 30% of the study population received psychotherapy. Psychotherapy treatment rate in nationally representative US sample was 43% in 2007 [44]. Among those with T2DM, psychotherapy rates have been found to be 28% in veterans’ population. Therefore, psychotherapy treatment rates may be comparable to other studies. However, still 43% of individuals did not receive any depression treatment. Additionally, only 33% of those were treated, got adequate depression treatment.

It was observed among individuals with T2DM, those with coexisting conditions that were either related to T2DM pathophysiology or management i.e. concordant conditions only or those with potentially life threatening conditions i.e. dominant conditions were less likely to get prescribed antidepressants and more likely to avail psychotherapy as compared to individuals
with T2DM and other coexisting conditions that were unrelated to T2DM in terms of pathophysiology or management plans i.e. discordant conditions.

This study found that among individuals with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression, those with concordant conditions only were less likely to receive treatment with antidepressants only and more likely to receive treatment with psychotherapy only. These results are not surprising given that antidepressants have not yet proven to be highly efficacious for treating depression in presence of concordant conditions such as heart disease [53] [54] [55]. It has been reported that 15%-25% of individuals with heart disease and depression who were initiated on antidepressants, discontinue their treatment because of adverse events [56]. The American Heart Association suggests that if antidepressant treatment is initiated among individuals with heart disease, then these individuals should be closely monitored to ensure medication compliance and to detect and manage any adverse event [57]. Given that presence of T2DM itself is associated with high cardiovascular event risk [58], physicians may avoid prescribing antidepressants to individuals with T2DM and concordant conditions such as heart disease. On the other hand, treating depression with psychotherapy such as cognitive behavioral therapy among individuals with heart disease have been shown to be effective in individuals not getting treatment with antidepressants; the ENRICHD trial showed that 12-16 sessions of CBT over 12 weeks help in achieving remission from moderate to severe depression [59].

Individuals with dominant conditions as compared to those with discordant conditions only were more likely to receive depression treatment with only psychotherapy. This may be due to the proven beneficial effects of treating depression with psychotherapy among individuals with dominant conditions[60]. For example, a meta-analysis of six randomized clinical trials found that compared to treatment as usual, psychotherapies such as supportive-
expressive group therapy, cognitive behavioral therapy, and problem-solving therapy, had significant clinical benefits in reducing depressive symptoms among individuals with advanced cancer [61]. Psychotherapy such as cognitive behavioral therapy has also proven to be beneficial for individuals with end stage renal disease [62]. The effectiveness of antidepressants for depression treatment in patients with terminal illness such as cancer and end stage renal disease remains inconclusive. Additionally, as it may take four to eight weeks to evaluate effectiveness of antidepressants, physicians may be reluctant in initiating treatment with antidepressants in individuals with limited life expectancy [63, 64]. Furthermore, the use of antidepressants for depression treatment in presence of neurological conditions such as dementia [65], Parkinson’s [66] and epilepsy [67] (which were also included under definition for dominant conditions) have not been shown to be clinically effective in improving quality of life, and functional and cognitive outcomes and sometimes[68] even in reducing depression symptoms [65].

This study additionally examined the association between types of coexisting conditions and adequate depression treatment among those who were treated for depression after adjusting for predisposing, enabling, need, personal health practices and external environment variables; however, no statistically significant associations between adequate depression treatment and types of coexisting chronic physical conditions were observed. Previous research, although not specific to T2DM, a study using data on veterans also observed similar relationships [69]. This study reported that among veterans with coexisting depression and multiple chronic conditions (cardiovascular/cerebrovascular diseases, arthritis, peptic ulcer, diabetes, respiratory diseases, substance/alcohol abuse and cancer), there were no significant associations between coexisting chronic illnesses and adequate antidepressant treatment [69].
Implications

Individuals with both physical (i.e. T2DM, coexisting chronic physical conditions) and mental health (i.e. depression) often have complex health care needs which may not be fully met in traditionally short (often channeled in to 15 minute time slots) primary care visits [70]. To provide quality care to such individuals, healthcare teams with expertise in providing both physical and mental health care may be more appropriate. Evidence from randomized clinical trials have shown that collaborative care among individuals with depression and T2DM, significantly improved the depressive symptom score and HbA1c level, compared with control conditions [71]. However, even in collaborative care settings, the selection of the healthcare team is important. Meta-regression analysis of randomized clinical trials on collaborative care for depression treatment have shown that characteristics of the intervention provided such as whether case managers were regularly supervised by psychiatrists and the mental health background of case managers had more favorable effect on outcomes [72]. Therefore, such carefully selected teams with backgrounds in both physical and mental health care delivery may improve quality of depression treatment. The novel healthcare delivery models such as Accountable Care Organizations (ACO) and Patient Centered Medical Home (PCMH) created under the 2010 Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, provide options for such integrated care models. Future research may focus on quality of depression treatment provided to individuals with both physical and mental health conditions in such settings.

Strengths and limitations

The current study has many advantages. The use of administrative claims data with dates of services enabled us to follow a cohort of patients with T2DM over time. Medicaid claims also enabled us to capture the healthcare experiences of Medicaid beneficiaries across a variety of
providers in different locations. The presence of diagnoses enabled identification of T2DM, depression and other physical and mental health conditions. The study used a comprehensive list of independent variables by merging Medicaid claims data with the county-level data from the ARF. A pragmatic practice-based theoretical framework was used to identify the numerous coexisting chronic physical conditions into manageable and clinically meaningful categories. This was the first study to examine whether depression treatment patterns among individuals with T2DM varied by coexisting chronic physical conditions with similar or different management and/or pathophysiology from that of T2DM.

However, the study also has some limitations. As administrative claims data can only identify diseases through diagnosis codes, there is the potential for underestimating depression prevalence or incidence because of under-coding of depression. Identifying depression is one of the more difficult problems in administrative data research and perfection may not be attainable. However, claims data contain physician/psychologist diagnoses of depression and offer a particularly attractive alternative to the substantial cost and complications associated with prospective surveys supplemented with medical record data. Additionally, this study included only filled prescriptions and it is not known whether the antidepressants were actually used. This study did not include alternative forms of treatment for depression. The study included fee-for-service Medicaid beneficiaries enrolled three states, thus results might not be generalizable to other populations.
CONCLUSIONS

Types of coexisting conditions were associated with depression treatment categories among non-elderly adult fee-for-service Medicaid beneficiaries; however once treatment was received, whether the individual obtains adequate treatment is not associated with coexisting conditions. The study findings suggest that management for other chronic physical conditions may compete with treatment for depression. Future studies that adjust for physician factors may need to be conducted to explore the management priorities. The findings from this study needs to be replicated in the general population.
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Table 1: Description of the Study Population by Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions Among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression Multi-state Medicaid Claims Database – 2000 - 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Dominant</th>
<th>Concordant Only</th>
<th>Discordant Only</th>
<th>Both Concordant &amp; Discordant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predisposing Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-44 years</td>
<td>1,448 24.8</td>
<td>131 9.0</td>
<td>470 32.5</td>
<td>273 18.9</td>
<td>574 39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>2,072 35.5</td>
<td>294 14.2</td>
<td>500 24.1</td>
<td>339 16.4</td>
<td>939 45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>2,317 39.7</td>
<td>433 18.7</td>
<td>606 26.2</td>
<td>284 12.3</td>
<td>994 42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3,911 67.0</td>
<td>504 12.9</td>
<td>1,036 26.5</td>
<td>656 16.8</td>
<td>1,715 43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,926 33.0</td>
<td>354 18.4</td>
<td>540 28.0</td>
<td>240 12.5</td>
<td>792 41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>1,564 26.8</td>
<td>229 14.6</td>
<td>413 26.4</td>
<td>265 16.9</td>
<td>657 42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>1,765 30.2</td>
<td>271 15.4</td>
<td>432 24.5</td>
<td>266 15.1</td>
<td>796 45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2,508 43.0</td>
<td>358 14.3</td>
<td>731 29.1</td>
<td>365 14.6</td>
<td>1,054 42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Need Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mental Health Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,022 34.6</td>
<td>377 18.6</td>
<td>506 25.0</td>
<td>308 15.2</td>
<td>831 41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3,815 65.4</td>
<td>481 12.6</td>
<td>1,070 28.0</td>
<td>588 15.4</td>
<td>1,676 43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enabling Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Eligibility-Cash Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5,031 86.2</td>
<td>752 14.9</td>
<td>1,331 26.5</td>
<td>750 14.9</td>
<td>2,198 43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>806 13.8</td>
<td>106 13.2</td>
<td>245 30.4</td>
<td>146 18.1</td>
<td>309 38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Eligibility-Medical Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>732 12.5</td>
<td>126 17.2</td>
<td>214 29.2</td>
<td>118 16.1</td>
<td>274 37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5,105 87.5</td>
<td>732 14.3</td>
<td>1,362 26.7</td>
<td>778 15.2</td>
<td>2,233 43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Eligibility-Waiver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>359 6.2</td>
<td>41 11.4</td>
<td>105 29.2</td>
<td>72 20.1</td>
<td>141 39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5,478 93.8</td>
<td>817 14.9</td>
<td>1,471 26.9</td>
<td>824 15.0</td>
<td>2,366 43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Health Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Antidiabetic Drugs (OADs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 OAD</td>
<td>1,660 28.4</td>
<td>203 12.2</td>
<td>458 27.6</td>
<td>291 17.5</td>
<td>708 42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OADs</td>
<td>1,343 23.0</td>
<td>164 12.2</td>
<td>376 28.0</td>
<td>230 17.1</td>
<td>573 42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ OADs</td>
<td>490 8.4</td>
<td>41 8.4</td>
<td>167 34.1</td>
<td>69 14.1</td>
<td>213 43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No OAD</td>
<td>2,344 40.2</td>
<td>450 19.2</td>
<td>575 24.5</td>
<td>306 13.1</td>
<td>1,013 43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulin Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,055 35.2</td>
<td>321 15.6</td>
<td>572 27.8</td>
<td>158 7.7</td>
<td>1,004 48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3,782 64.8</td>
<td>537 14.2</td>
<td>1,004 26.5</td>
<td>738 19.5</td>
<td>1,503 39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polypharmacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,128 36.5</td>
<td>345 16.2</td>
<td>385 18.1</td>
<td>315 14.8</td>
<td>1,083 50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3,709 63.5</td>
<td>513 13.8</td>
<td>1,191 32.1</td>
<td>581 15.7</td>
<td>1,424 38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Hospitalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,910 49.9</td>
<td>619 21.3</td>
<td>586 20.1</td>
<td>251 8.6</td>
<td>1,454 50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2,927 50.1</td>
<td>239 8.2</td>
<td>990 33.8</td>
<td>645 22.0</td>
<td>1,053 36.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued
<p>| Table 1: Description of the Study Population by Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions Among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression Multi-state Medicaid Claims Database – 2000 - 2008 |
|-----------------|------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | All | Dominant | Concordant Only | Discordant Only | Both Concordant &amp; Discordant |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient Visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Q</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Q</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Q</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Q</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean ± SE</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.97±0.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.85±0.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.34±0.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.56±0.4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of T2DM related office visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.97±0.12</td>
<td>7.85±0.3</td>
<td>6.48±0.4</td>
<td>5.34±0.4</td>
<td>7.56±0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ER Visits</td>
<td>1.23±0.03</td>
<td>1.68±0.1</td>
<td>0.68±0.1</td>
<td>0.78±0.1</td>
<td>1.58±0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HPSA- Mental Health Care</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CMHC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FQHC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% with GT 4yr college education &gt; 16%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% below poverty level GT 11.1%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Density of Social Workers in the County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.0±0.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.89±0.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.23±0.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.00±0.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.03±0.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Study sample comprised of individuals with type 2 diabetes mellitus aged 18-64 years and with at least one coexisting dominant, concordant or discordant chronic physical condition and who were alive, not dually eligible for Medicare and continuously enrolled in fee-for-service Medicaid for at least 24 months (N=5,837); includes Medicaid data from three states: Illinois, Texas, New York
Asterisks (*) represent significant differences in study population characteristics and coexisting chronic physical conditions categories i.e. Concordant Only, Discordant Only, Both Concordant and Discordant and Dominant, derived from chi-square statistics and univariate ordinary least square regressions (indicated by †) ***P<.001; **.001 ≤ P < .01; *.01 ≤ P < .05.
† Both Concordant and Discordant
‡ 16% Cut off was chosen based on 2000 Census Education attainment results
§ 11.1% Cut off was chosen based on 1999 Census Poverty levels
AA: African American; Q: Quartile; HPSA: Health Professional Shortage Area; CMHC: Community Mental Health Clinic; FQHC: Federally qualified health clinic; GT: Greater Than;
Table 2: Percentages of Depression Treatment by Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions
Among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression
Multi-state Medicaid Claims Database – 2000 - 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Antidepressants only</th>
<th></th>
<th>Psychotherapy only</th>
<th></th>
<th>Both Antidepressants &amp; Psychotherapy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Concordant</td>
<td>Discordant</td>
<td>Both¥</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Concordant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predisposing Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-44 years</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mental Health Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Eligibility-Cash Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Antidepressants only | | | | Psychotherapy only | | | | Both Antidepressants & Psychotherapy | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                      | Dominant | Concordant | Discordant | Both ¥ | Dominant | Concordant | Discordant | Both ¥ | Dominant | Concordant | Discordant | Both ¥ | Dominant | Concordant | Discordant | Both ¥ | Sig |
| Medicaid Eligibility-Medical Need | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes                  | 17.5     | 29.4     | 30.5     | 27.4     | 38.9     | 21.0     | 18.6     | 21.5     | 10.3     | 18.7     | 12.7     | 18.6     | **   |
| No                   | 20.6     | 27.6     | 33.5     | 28.1     | 26.0     | 16.6     | 12.6     | 16.5     | 12.8     | 10.7     | 10.8     | 10.5     | ***  |
| Medicaid Eligibility- Waiver | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes                  | 22.0     | 45.7     | 52.8     | 36.9     | 24.4     | 8.6      | 2.8      | 11.3     | 12.2     | 6.7      | 4.2      | 7.8      | **   |
| No                   | 20.1     | 27.0     | 31.4     | 28.0     | 18.0     | 14.3     | 17.5     | 12.5     | 12.0     | 11.7     | 12.0     | 11.7     | ***  |

Personal Health Practices

| Number of Oral Antidiabetic Drugs (OADs) Classes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 24.1 | 28.6 | 34.4 | 28.8 | 19.7 | 13.8 | 13.7 | 15.3 | 20.7 | 12.2 | 9.3 | 10.6 | *** |
| 2 | 29.9 | 29.8 | 33.9 | 32.6 | 20.7 | 13.3 | 12.2 | 13.1 | 7.3 | 9.8 | 10.4 | 12.7 |
| 3+ | 31.7 | 28.7 | 39.1 | 34.7 | 17.1 | 16.8 | 7.2 | 15.0 | 9.8 | 15.0 | 18.8 | 11.7 |
| None | 13.8 | 25.7 | 30.1 | 23.4 | 35.1 | 22.6 | 15.4 | 21.0 | 10.9 | 11.8 | 11.4 | 11.2 | *** |
| Insulin Use | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 24.0 | 33.0 | 33.5 | 28.6 | 19.9 | 14.0 | 12.0 | 14.9 | 15.6 | 14.0 | 12.0 | 12.9 |
| No | 17.9 | 24.9 | 33.1 | 27.6 | 32.6 | 19.0 | 13.7 | 18.5 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 10.8 | 10.4 | *** |
| Polypharmacy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 23.8 | 29.6 | 32.7 | 32.7 | 24.3 | 15.3 | 14.6 | 13.9 | 13.6 | 11.7 | 11.7 | 12.8 | *** |
| No | 17.7 | 27.3 | 33.4 | 24.4 | 30.2 | 17.8 | 12.7 | 19.5 | 11.7 | 11.8 | 10.7 | 10.3 | *** |
| Inpatient Hospitalization | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 18.4 | 22.9 | 23.9 | 24.8 | 29.4 | 22.2 | 21.9 | 19.9 | 13.7 | 14.2 | 12.4 | 11.6 | *** |
| No | 24.7 | 30.8 | 36.7 | 32.4 | 23.8 | 14.2 | 10.1 | 13.2 | 9.2 | 10.4 | 10.5 | 11.1 | *** |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Antidepressants only</th>
<th>Psychotherapy only</th>
<th>Both Antidepressants &amp; Psychotherapy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concordant Only</td>
<td>Discordant Only</td>
<td>Both Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient Visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Q</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Q</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Q</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Q</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HPSA- Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQHC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression
Multi-state Medicaid Claims Database – 2000 - 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antidepressants only</th>
<th>Psychotherapy only</th>
<th>Both Antidepressants &amp; Psychotherapy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Concordant Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>1st Q</th>
<th>24.4</th>
<th>30.2</th>
<th>37.1</th>
<th>22.9</th>
<th>15.3</th>
<th>16.0</th>
<th>11.7</th>
<th>15.0</th>
<th>15.3</th>
<th>15.8</th>
<th>10.8</th>
<th>14.7 **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Q</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.1 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Q</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>9.7  **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Q</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.0 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% with GT 4yr college education > 16%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>19.1</th>
<th>26.9</th>
<th>31.4</th>
<th>28.5</th>
<th>30.6</th>
<th>17.9</th>
<th>14.3</th>
<th>18.3</th>
<th>11.6</th>
<th>10.9</th>
<th>11.4</th>
<th>11.1 ***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>12.9 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% below poverty level GT 11.1%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>19.8</th>
<th>26.8</th>
<th>32.4</th>
<th>27.5</th>
<th>28.4</th>
<th>17.5</th>
<th>13.9</th>
<th>17.3</th>
<th>11.6</th>
<th>11.7</th>
<th>11.3</th>
<th>11.7 ***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.3  *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Study sample comprised of individuals with type 2 diabetes mellitus aged 18-64 years and with at least one co-existing dominant, concordant or discordant chronic physical condition and who were alive, not dually eligible for Medicare and continuously enrolled in fee-for-service Medicaid for at least 24 months (N=5,837); includes Medicaid data from three states: Illinois, Texas, New York

Asterisks(*) represent significant differences in depression treatment categories i.e. antidepressants only, psychotherapy only, both antidepressants and psychotherapy and no treatment by coexisting chronic physical conditions categories i.e. Dominant, Concordant Only, Discordant Only and Both Concordant and Discordant for each of the categorical independent variable subgroups

***P < .001; **.001 ≤ P < .01; *.01 ≤ P < .05.

† Both Concordant and Discordant
H 16% Cut off was chosen based on 2000 Census Education attainment results
HH 11.1% Cut off was chosen based on 1999 Census Poverty levels

Q: Quartile; HPSA: Health Professional Shortage Area; CMHC: Community Mental Health Clinic; FQHC: Federally qualified health clinic; GT: Greater Than;
Table 3: Odds Ratios and Adjusted Odds Ratio and 95% Confidence Intervals of Types of Co-existing Chronic Physical Conditions from Multinomial Logistic Regression on Depression Treatment Categories Among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Antidepressants Only</th>
<th>Psychotherapy Only</th>
<th>Both Antidepressants &amp; Psychotherapy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR 95% CI Sig</td>
<td>OR 95% CI Sig</td>
<td>OR 95% CI Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1: Adjusted for Types of Co-existing Chronic Physical Conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>0.65 0.51 , 0.83 ***</td>
<td>2.23 1.72 , 2.91 ***</td>
<td>1.21 0.89 , 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordant Only</td>
<td>0.83 0.68 , 1.00</td>
<td>1.26 0.98 , 1.62</td>
<td>1.05 0.80 , 1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discordant Only</td>
<td>Reference Reference</td>
<td>Reference Reference</td>
<td>Reference Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both†</td>
<td>0.82 0.69 , 0.98 *</td>
<td>1.24 0.98 , 1.57</td>
<td>1.01 0.78 , 1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2: Adjusted for Model I + Predisposing (gender, age, race/ethnicity), Need Factors (other mental health conditions, number of conditions), Enabling Factors (Medicaid Eligibility Categories-Poverty, Medical Need, Waiver) Personal health practices (number of ER and outpatient visits, inpatient hospitalization, number of OAD classes, insulin use and polypharmacy)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>0.77 0.60 , 1.00 *</td>
<td>1.61 1.21 , 2.15 **</td>
<td>1.14 0.82 , 1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordant Only</td>
<td>0.81 0.67 , 1.00 *</td>
<td>1.31 1.01 , 1.70 *</td>
<td>1.03 0.78 , 1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discordant Only</td>
<td>Reference Reference</td>
<td>Reference Reference</td>
<td>Reference Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both†</td>
<td>0.88 0.73 , 1.07</td>
<td>1.12 0.87 , 1.44</td>
<td>0.87 0.66 , 1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 3: Adjusted for Model 1+Model 2+ External environment characteristics (whether county of residence had a CMHC, FQHC, was HPSA for mental health, density of social workers rural/urban status of county, median income in the county, whether percent below poverty level and percent with college education greater than national average)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>0.77 0.59 , 0.99 *</td>
<td>1.60 1.20 , 2.13 **</td>
<td>1.11 0.79 , 1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordant Only</td>
<td>0.80 0.65 , 0.98 *</td>
<td>1.32 1.01 , 1.72 *</td>
<td>1.01 0.76 , 1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discordant Only</td>
<td>Reference Reference</td>
<td>Reference Reference</td>
<td>Reference Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both†</td>
<td>0.87 0.72 , 1.05</td>
<td>1.14 0.88 , 1.46</td>
<td>0.86 0.65 , 1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Study sample comprised of individuals with type 2 diabetes mellitus aged 18-64 years and with at least one co-existing concordant, discordant or dominant chronic physical condition and who were alive, not dually eligible for Medicare and continuously enrolled in fee-for-service Medicaid for at least 24 months (N=5,837); includes Medicaid data from three states: Illinois, Texas, New York

Asterisks (*) indicate statistical significance are based on multinomial logistic regression with discordant conditions as reference group for independent variable and no antidepressant treatment i.e. none as reference group for dependent variable.

***P<0.001; **0.001 ≤ P < 0.01; *0.01 ≤ P <0.05.
† Both Concordant and Discordant
ER: Emergency Room; OAD: Oral Antidiabetic Drugs; HPSA: Health Professional Shortage Area; CMHC: Community Mental Health Clinic; FQHC: Federally qualified health clinic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concordant conditions</th>
<th>ICD-9-CM Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coronary Artery Disease</strong></td>
<td>410,4100,4101,4102,4103,4104,4105,4106,4107,4108,4109,411,4110,4111,4118,41181,41189,412,413,4130,4131,4139,414,4140,41400,4141,41402,41403,41404,41405,4141,41410,41411,41419,4148,4149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congestive Heart Failure</strong></td>
<td>40201,40211,40291,40401,40411,40491,428,4280,4281,4289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arrhythmia</strong></td>
<td>423,4230,4231,4232,4238,4239,42731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stroke</strong></td>
<td>431,43301,43311,43321,43331,43381,43391,43401,43411,43491,435,4350,4351,4352,4353,4358,4359,438,4380,4381,43811,43812,4382,4383,4384,4385,43850,43851,43852,43853,4388,43881,43882,43889,4389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peripheral Vascular Disease</strong></td>
<td>2507,4402,44020,44021,44022,44023,44024,44029,4408,4409,4422,4423,443,4430,4431,4438,44381,44389,4439,4442,44481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peripheral Vascular Disease-gangrene</strong></td>
<td>7854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renal</strong></td>
<td>40311,40391,40412,40413,40492,40493,585,586,587,2741,27410,27411,27419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chronic Renal Failure</strong></td>
<td>40310,40390,40410,40411,40490,40491,581,5810,5811,5812,5813,5818,5819,582,5820,5821,5822,5824,5828,58281,58289,5829,583,5830,5831,5832,5834,5836,5837,5838,58381,58389,5839,5900,59000,59001,5936,5939,7531,75313,75314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diabetic Nephropathy</strong></td>
<td>2504,25040,25041,25042,25043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acute Renal Failure and Disease</strong></td>
<td>40300,40301,40400,40401,40402,40403,40501,4553,584,5845,5846,5847,5848,5849,5850,5804,5808,58081,58089,5809,5901,59010,59011,5902,5903,5908,59080,59081,59381,866,8660,86600,86601,86602,86603,8661,86610,86611,86612,86613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retinopathy</strong></td>
<td>3620,36201,25050,25051,25052,25053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(excludes advanced retinopathy, blindness)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ulcer</strong></td>
<td>700,68110,68111,6827,7071,73076,73077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Diabetes Related Complications</strong></td>
<td>25002,25003,25010,25011,25012,25013,25020,25021,25022,25023,25024,25031,25032,25033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncontrolled Diabetes</strong></td>
<td>030,25031,25032,25033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Term Diabetes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discordant Conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gastro Intestinal Tract Related Disorders:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERD/Esophagitis</td>
<td>5301,5302,5303,53081,531,532,533,534,555,556,56211,56213,574,575,576,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peptic ulcers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflammatory Bowel Disease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverticulitis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gall Bladder disease and stone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viral hepatitis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease</td>
<td>490,491,492,493,495,496,500,501,502,503,504,505,5064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gout</td>
<td>274,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hip problem</td>
<td>71905,71915,71925,71935,71945,71955,71965,71975,71985,71995,71998,7265,73314,73315,73342,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low back pain</td>
<td>720,7213,72142,72210,72252,72273,72283,72293,72402,7242,7243,7244,7245,7246,7247,7248,7249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix A : ICD-9-CM Codes for Identifying Types of Coexisting chronic physical Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>ICD-9-CM Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Osteoarthritis</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arthritis</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheumatoid arthritis</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connective tissue rheumatological disease</td>
<td>7100,7101,7104,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blindness Single Eye</td>
<td>3696,3697,3698,3699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dominant Conditions

| End Stage Renal Disease                         | E8791,V51,V56,V560,V5631,V5632,V568 |
| End Stage Liver Disease                        | 5722,5723,5724,5728,4560,4561,4562,45620,45621,571 |
| Blindness Both Eyes/ Advanced Retinopathy      | 36202,3690,3691,3692,3693,3694 |
| Pre-dementia Cognitive Impairment              | 294,2941,29283,2949,33183,78093,438,3330,3334,3315 |
| Dementia and Related Conditions                | 2900,29010,29011,29012,29013,2902,29021,2903,29040,29041,29042,29043,2912,29410,29411,2948,3310,3311,3312,3317,33182,3319,3319,3320,046,1,0463,0941,29282,3109 |
| Multiple Sclerosis                             | 340                             |
| Hemiplegia Hemiparesis and Paraplegia          | 342,3441                        |
| Parkinson’s Disease                            | 332                             |
| Muscular dystrophy                              | 359                             |
| Spinal cord injury                              | 80600,80601,80602,80603,80604,80605,80606,80607,80608,80609,8061,9520, 34400,34401,34402,34403,34404,34409 |
| Epilepsy                                        | 345                             |
| Gastroparesis                                   | 5363                            |
| AIDS                                           | 042                             |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>AOR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>AOR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>[0.51, 0.83]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>[0.60, 1.00]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>[0.59, 0.99]</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordant Only</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>[0.68, 1.00]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>[0.67, 1.00]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>[0.65, 0.98]</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discordant Only</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>[0.69, 0.98]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>[0.73, 1.07]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>[0.72, 1.05]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-44 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>[0.87, 1.23]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>[0.88, 1.25]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>[0.87, 1.22]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>[0.89, 1.26]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>[1.01, 1.34]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>[0.99, 1.32]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>[1.37, 1.95]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>[1.21, 1.78]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>[1.13, 1.57]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>[1.10, 1.53]</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mental Health Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>[0.54, 0.73]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>[0.55, 0.75]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Eligibility-Poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>[0.47, 0.83]</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>[0.46, 0.81]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Eligibility-Medical Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>[0.68, 1.17]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>[0.66, 1.14]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Eligibility-Waiver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>[0.87, 1.70]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>[0.81, 1.60]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Antidiabetic Drugs (OADs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 OAD</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>[0.65, 1.06]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>[0.64, 1.05]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OAD</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>[0.70, 1.15]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>[0.69, 1.14]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 OAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No OAD</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>[0.57, 0.94]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>[0.57, 0.94]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>AOR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>AOR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insulin Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>[1.05, 1.39]</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>[1.05, 1.39]</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Polypharmacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>[1.07, 1.44]</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>[1.08, 1.46]</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inpatient Hospitalization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>[0.77, 1.03]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>[0.77, 1.04]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outpatient Visits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quartile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quartile</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>[0.73, 1.05]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>[0.73, 1.05]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quartile</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>[0.72, 1.05]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>[0.72, 1.06]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quartile</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>[0.57, 0.89]</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>[0.57, 0.90]</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of T2DM Related Office Visits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>[1.00, 1.01]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>[1.00, 1.01]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of ER Visits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>[0.95, 1.02]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>[0.96, 1.02]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>[0.71, 1.02]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>[0.77, 1.26]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>[0.53, 0.83]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>[0.39, 0.69]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HPSA-Mental Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CMHC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FQHC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued
Appendix B: Odds Ratios and Adjusted Odds Ratio and 95% Confidence Intervals of All Independent Variables from Multinomial Logistic Regression on Depression Treatment Categories Results presented for Antidepressants Only Among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression Multi-state Medicaid Claims Database – 2000 – 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>AOR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density Social Workers</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>[0.83, 0.99]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 st Quartile</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>[0.81, 1.71]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quartile</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>[0.82, 1.41]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quartile</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>[0.89, 1.53]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quartile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with GT 4yr college education &gt; 16%†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>[0.61, 1.03]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% below poverty level GT 11.1%‡‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>[0.70, 1.27]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>[0.71, 1.19]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asterisks (*) indicate statistical significance are based on multinomial logistic regression with discordant conditions as reference group for independent variable and no antidepressant treatment i.e. none as reference group for dependent variable.

***P<0.001; **0.001 ≤ P < 0.01; *0.01 ≤ P <0.05.

† 16% Cut off was chosen based on 2000 Census Education attainment results
‡‡ 11.1% Cut off was chosen based on 1999 Census Poverty levels
HPSA: Health Professional Shortage Area; CMHC: Community Mental Health Clinic; FQHC: Federally qualified health clinic;
## Appendix C: Odds Ratios and Adjusted Odds Ratio and 95% Confidence Intervals of All Independent Variables from Multinomial Logistic Regression on Depression Treatment Categories
### Results presented for Psychotherapy Only
#### Among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>OR  (95% CI)</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>AOR  (95% CI)</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>AOR  (95% CI)</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>2.23 [1.72, 2.91]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.61 [1.21, 2.15]</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1.60 [1.20, 2.13]</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordant Only</td>
<td>1.26 [0.98, 1.62]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.31 [1.01, 1.70]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.32 [1.01, 1.72]</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discordant Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>1.24 [0.98, 1.57]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.12 [0.87, 1.44]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.14 [0.88, 1.46]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-44 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>1.09 [0.89, 1.33]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.06 [0.86, 1.30]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>1.25 [1.02, 1.52]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.20 [0.98, 1.47]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.63 [0.54, 0.74]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.65 [0.56, 0.76]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.90 [0.74, 1.10]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.13 [0.91, 1.39]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0.86 [0.71, 1.04]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90 [0.74, 1.09]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mental Health Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.99 [1.70, 2.34]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.93 [1.64, 2.28]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Eligibility-Poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.16 [0.85, 1.59]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.17 [0.85, 1.60]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Eligibility-Medical Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.64 [1.25, 2.15]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.64 [1.24, 2.17]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Eligibility-Waiver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.67 [0.43, 1.05]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.69 [0.44, 1.07]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Antidiabetic Drugs (OADs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 OAD</td>
<td>0.85 [0.62, 1.17]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87 [0.63, 1.20]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OAD</td>
<td>0.81 [0.59, 1.13]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82 [0.59, 1.14]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 OAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No OAD</td>
<td>1.32 [0.97, 1.80]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.34 [0.98, 1.83]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
## Appendix C: Odds Ratios and Adjusted Odds Ratio and 95% Confidence Intervals of All Independent Variables from Multinomial Logistic Regression on Depression Treatment Categories

Results presented for Psychotherapy Only

Among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>AOR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>AOR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insulin Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>[0.61, 0.86]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>[0.62, 0.88]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Polypharmacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>[0.70, 1.01]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>[0.70, 1.00]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inpatient Hospitalization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>[1.07, 1.50]</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>[1.05, 1.48]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outpatient Visits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quartile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quartile</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>[0.97, 1.57]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>[0.95, 1.54]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quartile</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>[1.23, 1.99]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>[1.22, 1.98]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quartile</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>[1.50, 2.48]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>[1.48, 2.47]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of T2DM Related Office Visits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>[0.99, 1.01]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>[0.99, 1.01]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of ER Visits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>[0.94, 1.00]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>[0.94, 1.00]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>[0.43, 0.65]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>[0.35, 0.64]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>[0.58, 0.94]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>[0.88, 1.76]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HPSA-Mental Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>[0.76, 1.32]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>[0.76, 1.71]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CMHC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>[0.94, 1.46]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FQHC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>[0.91, 1.57]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued*
Appendix C: Odds Ratios and Adjusted Odds Ratio and 95% Confidence Intervals of All Independent Variables from Multinomial Logistic Regression on Depression Treatment Categories

Results presented for Psychotherapy Only

Among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>AOR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>AOR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density Social Workers</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>[1.01, 1.28]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quartile</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>[0.75, 1.74]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quartile</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>[0.81, 1.53]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quartile</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>[0.86, 1.61]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quartile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with GT 4yr college education &gt; 16%*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>[1.30, 2.51]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% below poverty level GT 11.1%**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>[0.68, 1.42]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>[0.97, 1.96]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asterisks (*) indicate statistical significance are based on multinomial logistic regression with discordant conditions as reference group for independent variable and no antidepressant treatment i.e. none as reference group for dependent variable.

***P<0.001; **0.001 ≤ P < 0.01; *0.01 ≤ P < 0.05.

* 16% Cut off was chosen based on 2000 Census Education attainment results

** 11.1% Cut off was chosen based on 1999 Census Poverty levels

HPSA: Health Professional Shortage Area; CMHC: Community Mental Health Clinic; FQHC: Federally qualified health clinic;
## Appendix D: Odds Ratios and Adjusted Odds Ratio and 95% Confidence Intervals of All Independent Variables from Multinomial Logistic Regression on Depression Treatment Categories Results presented for Both Antidepressants and Psychotherapy Among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>OR 95% CI</th>
<th>Sig AOR 95% CI</th>
<th>Sig AOR 95% CI</th>
<th>Sig AOR 95% CI</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>1.21 [0.89, 1.65]</td>
<td>1.14 [0.82, 1.60]</td>
<td>1.11 [0.79, 1.55]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordant Only</td>
<td>1.05 [0.80, 1.38]</td>
<td>1.03 [0.78, 1.38]</td>
<td>1.01 [0.76, 1.35]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discordant Only</td>
<td>1.01 [0.78, 1.30]</td>
<td>0.87 [0.66, 1.14]</td>
<td>0.86 [0.65, 1.13]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-44 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>1.07 [0.86, 1.34]</td>
<td>1.04 [0.83, 1.31]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>0.85 [0.67, 1.07]</td>
<td>0.82 [0.65, 1.04]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.02 [0.84, 1.24]</td>
<td>1.05 [0.86, 1.27]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1.45 [1.15, 1.83]</td>
<td>** 1.85 [1.44, 2.38]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1.21 [0.96, 1.52]</td>
<td>1.21 [0.96, 1.53]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0.96 [0.79, 1.17]</td>
<td>0.95 [0.78, 1.16]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mental Health Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.00 [0.71, 1.42]</td>
<td>0.98 [0.69, 1.39]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Eligibility-Poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.61 [1.18, 2.21]</td>
<td>** 1.63 [1.18, 2.24]</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Eligibility-Medical Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.32 [0.79, 2.21]</td>
<td>1.23 [0.73, 2.07]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Eligibility-Waiver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Antidiabetic Drugs (OADs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 OAD</td>
<td>0.67 [0.48, 0.93]</td>
<td>* 0.66 [0.47, 0.92]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OAD</td>
<td>0.65 [0.46, 0.91]</td>
<td>* 0.64 [0.45, 0.90]</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 OAD</td>
<td>0.61 [0.44, 0.85]</td>
<td>** 0.61 [0.44, 0.86]</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No OAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulin Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.22 [1.01, 1.48]</td>
<td>* 1.26 [1.04, 1.52]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polypharmacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.34 [1.09, 1.64]</td>
<td>** 1.35 [1.10, 1.66]</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Hospitalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.18 [0.97, 1.44]</td>
<td>1.16 [0.95, 1.42]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix D: Odds Ratios and Adjusted Odds Ratio and 95% Confidence Intervals of All Independent Variables from Multinomial Logistic Regression on Depression Treatment Categories
Results presented for Both Antidepressants and Psychotherapy
Among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>AOR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>AOR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outpatient Visits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quartile</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>[0.74, 1.24]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>[0.74, 1.24]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quartile</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>[0.72, 1.23]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>[0.71, 1.23]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quartile</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>[0.89, 1.59]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>[0.87, 1.57]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quartile</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>[0.99, 1.01]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>[0.99, 1.01]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of T2DM Related Office Visits</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>[0.97, 1.03]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>[0.97, 1.04]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>[0.25, 0.42]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>[0.25, 0.50]</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>[0.81, 1.37]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>[1.08, 2.25]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HPSA-Mental Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>[0.74, 1.33]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>[0.82, 1.90]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CMHC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>[1.12, 1.81]</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FQHC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>[1.02, 1.85]</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Density Social Workers</strong></td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>[0.93, 1.19]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Household Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quartile</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>[0.57, 1.44]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quartile</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>[0.62, 1.27]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quartile</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>[0.66, 1.35]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quartile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with GT 4yr college education &gt; 16%ⱡ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>[0.84, 1.63]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% below poverty level GT 11.1%ⱡⱡ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>[0.69, 1.57]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>[0.71, 1.47]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asterisks (*) indicate statistical significance are based on multinominal logistic regression with discordant conditions as reference group for independent variable and no antidepressant treatment i.e. none as reference group for dependent variable.

***P<0.001; **0.001 ≤ P < 0.01; *0.01 ≤ P <0.05.

ⱡ 16% Cut off was chosen based on 2000 Census Education attainment results
ⱡⱡ 11.1% Cut off was chosen based on 1999 Census Poverty levels
HPSA: Health Professional Shortage Area; CMHC: Community Mental Health Clinic; FQHC: Federally qualified health clinic;
Chapter 4: Treatment for Depression and Healthcare Expenditures among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-Diagnosed Depression

Introduction

Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (T2DM), Depression and Healthcare Expenditures

Individuals with coexisting type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) and depression use more healthcare services such as inpatient [1], outpatient [2, 3] and prescription drug use [2, 3], report higher total [1, 3, 4] as well as T2DM-related medical care expenditures, as compared to individuals with T2DM and no depression [5]. Research with Medical Expenditure Panel Survey, a nationally representative data of the United States’ population has shown that among individuals with diabetes, those with coexisting depression could have mean total annual healthcare expenditures 4.5 times higher ($247,000,000) compared to those without depression ($55,000,000) [3]. An analysis of West Virginia state Medicaid data (1997-2002) showed that among enrollees with T2DM, those with depression had 65% higher healthcare expenditures as compared to those without depression [6]. Therefore, presence of depression is associated with substantially high healthcare expenditures among individuals with T2DM. However, in general, recovery from depression following depression treatment has been shown to be associated with lower subsequent healthcare utilization and expenditures [7].

Treatment for Depression and Healthcare Expenditures among Individuals with T2DM

Randomized clinical trials that have studied whether among individuals with both depression and T2DM, depression treatment delivered in primary care based collaborative care settings (where both depression and T2DM is managed with the help of coordinated healthcare teams comprising of primary care physicians, nurses and other specialists) results in reduction of healthcare expenditures as compared to usual care. The Improving Mood-Promoting Access to
Collaborative (IMPACT) randomized controlled trial included 418 individuals aged 60 years or older, of them 204 received the collaborative care intervention and 214 were randomized to usual care; this study found that at the end of 24 months the intervention group had $896 lower expenditures as compared to the usual care group [8]. The Pathways study [9, 10] was also a randomized controlled trial which was carried out in 9 primary care settings across Washington and Idaho; the participants were members of a mixed model health plan. The intervention provided was a 12 month stepped-care depression management program delivered via primary care physicians, registered nurses who received training in problem solving therapy for depression and psychiatrists. Depression treatment for intervention group (mean age 58 years) in step 1 started with antidepressant drugs or psychotherapy, in case of no response to treatment in step 1, treatment modality was adjusted in step 2, e.g. those treated with antidepressants in step 1, were given psychotherapy in step 2, in case of no response to treatment in step 2, treatment in step 3 involved referral to specialist; the control group (mean age 57 years) was given usual care. Total healthcare expenditures reported at the end of 2-year and 5-year periods were found to be lower in the intervention group as compared to control group: 2 year mean (SD) in intervention vs control group were $21,148 ($27,548) vs $22,258 ($35,607) [9] and 5 year mean(SD) in intervention vs control group were 49,254 (50,773) vs 49,254 (50,773) [10].

Studies examining the association between depression treatment with healthcare expenditures among individuals with coexisting T2DM and depression are very limited. So, evidence from studies examining the association between depression treatment and healthcare expenditures among individuals with other chronic conditions is discussed. Using administrative claims data, one study showed that among individuals with dyslipidemia, T2DM and coronary artery disease, either in combination or alone, antidepressant medication adherence improved
adherence to coexisting disease medications and thus reduced one-year healthcare expenditures [11]. On the contrary, one study carried out with real world data from Medicare Current Beneficiary Survey (MCBS), found that among beneficiaries with coexisting depression and chronic diseases such as arthritis, diabetes, respiratory diseases including asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, heart disease, hypertension, osteoporosis, and stroke, those receiving depression treatment had higher inpatient, medical provider and prescription drug expenditures [12]; however, this study was restricted to the elderly population.

While randomized controlled trials have demonstrated that depression treatment delivered in collaborative care settings reduced expenditures among individuals with T2DM and coexisting depression, studies conducted using real world observational data have reported inconsistent findings. However these studies were not specific to T2DM population and included special populations such as elderly. Therefore, it remains to be established whether depression treatment with antidepressants and psychotherapy, alone or in combination, are associated with reductions in healthcare expenditures, among individuals with T2DM. Based on evidence from depression care delivered in collaborative care settings, one may infer that combined antidepressants and psychotherapy may reduce healthcare expenditures.

*The Relationship between Depression Treatment and Healthcare Expenditures by Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions*

Virtually, there are no existing studies using real world data that are specific to populations with coexisting T2DM and depression which have examined the association between depression treatment and healthcare expenditures; therefore there is no knowledge on whether this association varies by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions. Findings from unpublished studies conducted by the authors of this study, have revealed that among individuals
with T2DM, the risk of having newly-diagnosed depression and treatment received by those with newly-diagnosed depression varied by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions. Therefore, it is highly plausible that healthcare expenditures following depression treatment may also be associated with coexisting chronic physical conditions. With majority of adults (88.6%) with T2DM in the US having at least one chronic condition and 15% having reported four or more chronic conditions [13], presence of other coexisting chronic physical conditions among individuals with T2DM is a norm rather than an exception. Therefore, in absence of any related literature it is important to examine whether the relationship between depression treatment and expenditures vary by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions.

**Need for the study**

As explained above there is a significant gap in the literature on whether depression treatment can reduce healthcare expenditures among individuals with T2DM. To the best of the authors’ knowledge, no study has examined whether the association between depression treatment and healthcare expenditures among individuals with T2DM vary by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions.

It is particularly important to study this association in non-elderly population given that, in recent years, the prevalence of multiple coexisting chronic conditions, which has traditionally been thought of as a problem in the elderly population, has been increasing among non-elderly adults [14, 15]. In the US, among adults participating in the national health interview survey and in the age group 45-64 years, the prevalence of multiple coexisting chronic conditions has been increasing and has grown from 24.5% in 2004 to 28.1% in 2010 [16]. As risk of depression increases with increasing number of coexisting chronic physical conditions [17], there is a need to evaluate the impact of type of depression treatment on healthcare expenditures and whether
this relationship vary by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions among non-elderly adults aged 18-64 years.

In the US, state Medicaid plans are a major provider of health insurance among non-elderly adults. As of 2010, 27% of US adults, 20-64 years of age were covered by Medicaid, outlaying 68% of the federal spending [18]. Adults with diabetes are disproportionately covered by Medicaid and four out of five Medicaid beneficiaries with diabetes suffer from a coexisting chronic physical condition. It has been reported that among adults enrolled in Medicaid, those with diabetes spend more than 2.5 times compared to those without diabetes [19]. Twenty percent of Medicaid enrollees suffer from depression [20, 21]. According to Agency of Healthcare Research and Quality 2011 statistical brief, mood disorders which includes depression ranks top most among the ten conditions for 30 day readmission in Medicaid resulting in 41,600 readmissions and costing $286 million [22]. Depression is also a major driver for poor health outcomes and future healthcare expenditures in T2DM [23]. Given such compelling statistics, it is apparent that Medicaid data provides a rich opportunity to conduct research of both depression and T2DM, and can lead to important findings that might influence clinical practice and policy. Therefore, among the high risk population of Medicaid enrollees with T2DM, it is necessary to delineate the relationship between depression treatment and healthcare expenditures and understand how types of coexisting chronic physical conditions impact this association.
RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES

Aim 3.1: Among non-elderly Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression, examine the association depression treatment categories and total and T2DM-related healthcare care expenditures.

*Hypothesis 3.1: As compared to those with no depression treatment, those with depression treatment with only antidepressants, only psychotherapy or both, will have negative associations with total and T2DM-related healthcare expenditures as compared no depression treatment.*

Aim 3.2: Among non-elderly Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression, examine whether the association between depression treatment and total and T2DM-related medical care expenditures vary by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions.

*Hypothesis 3.2.1: As compared to no depression treatment, treatment within both antidepressants and psychotherapy will reduce total and T2DM related healthcare expenditures across all conditions.*

*Hypothesis 3.2.2: Depression treatment with only antidepressants will not be associated with T2DM related healthcare expenditures among those with concordant conditions only.*
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The basic framework used in this study was a hybrid of the expanded behavioral model on use of health services, widely known as the Andersen behavioral model (ABM) [24]. The ABM posits that utilization of health services varies as a function of 1) each individual’s unique predisposition for using services (predisposing factors); 2) the means available to each individual for obtaining services (enabling factors); 3) each individual’s level of need; 4) personal health practices; and 5) the external environment (figure 1). The behavioral health model is very flexible and was easily adapted to analyze the relationship between depression treatment and types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and the association between depression treatment and healthcare expenditures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predisposing factors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender, age, race/ethnicity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enabling factors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Eligibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Factors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of coexisting physical conditions, Other Mental Health Conditions, Number of chronic conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Environment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g. County level social determinants of health County Median Income, State, % with college education and % below poverty level and Community level healthcare infrastructure e.g. presence of CMHC, FQHC in a county</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Health Practices:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g. Health care Seeking Behavior: Medication use, use of inpatient and emergency room services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aim 3 – Dependent Variables:
Total Healthcare Expenditure
T2DM-Related Healthcare Expenditure
METHODS

Study Design

A retrospective longitudinal study repeated measures cohort design was used. The study cohort included individuals with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression. “Index date” was defined as the first date of depression diagnosis and baseline and follow-up periods were respectively defined as 12 months prior and subsequent to this index date. Inpatient, outpatient and prescription drug expenditures were identified at the end of each month of follow-up. Therefore, each individual included in the study cohort had 12 observations. Appropriate statistical models were used to account for such repeated measures design. Independent measures design, which often use aggregate expenditures at the end of follow-up period, do not capture the variation in healthcare expenditures at different time points of follow-up. The repeated measures analysis helped in capturing healthcare expenditures both during and after the acute phase of depression treatment.

Data Source

Medicaid analytic extract (MAX) files:

The MAX files are prepared and produced by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Person-level data such as eligibility, demographics, managed care enrollment, a utilization summary and Medicaid payments for enrollees are provided in the enrollment (“personal summary”) file. Information on International Classification of Diseases 9th revision (ICD-9-CM codes) of conditions diagnosed, healthcare service utilizations and charges paid by Medicaid for the services can be extracted from inpatient, other therapy files. The pharmacy file provides information on variables such as national drug code (NDC) of medications used and
amount paid by Medicaid for the medication claims. This study used Medicaid data from 2000-2008 data from three states: New York (NY), Texas (TX), Illinois (IL).

*Area Health Resource File (AHRF):*

The AHRF is national county-level health resource information provided by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2011) that provides information on more than 6,000 variables county level variables such as characteristics of health facilities, number and type of health professionals in a county, rural-urban status, resource scarcity, health status, economic activity, health training programs, and socioeconomic and environmental characteristics [25]. The Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) county codes which are available both in the AHRF file and the personal summary file of the MAX data, were used to link the two files.

*Identification of T2DM and Newly-diagnosed Depression Cohort*


*Medicaid Beneficiaries with T2DM:*

Medicaid enrollees with at least one inpatient visit or two or more physician outpatient visits which were at least 30 days apart, with a primary or secondary diagnosis of ICD-9-CM codes: 250.x0 or 250.x2 during a calendar year, were identified as having T2DM. Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM who had a diagnosis of depression or antidepressant medication use during the calendar year were excluded.

*Medicaid Beneficiaries with Newly-diagnosed Depression:*

The eligible study population was followed into the subsequent calendar year to identify newly-diagnosed depression. Enrollees with at least one outpatient physician visit or an inpatient admission with a primary or secondary diagnosis of depression in the following calendar year
were classified as having a newly-diagnosed depression [26]. Depression was identified using ICD9 CM codes: 296.2 (major depressive disorder, single episode), 296.3 (major depressive disorder, recurrent episode), 311 (depression not elsewhere classified), 309.1 (prolonged depressive reaction), 300.4 (neurotic depression) and 298.0 (depressive type psychosis). These ICD-9-CM codes are extensively used by health plans to identify depression [27] and have also been used in previous literature that have studied depression in Medicaid enrollees [28-30]. Those with no newly-diagnosed depression were excluded from the study cohort. The first observed date of outpatient visit or inpatient discharge with diagnosis of depression was the “index date”; 365 days prior to the index date was required to be free of any depression diagnosis or antidepressant medication. One may note that other studies have 120 day depression free period to define newly-diagnosed depression [31]. However, the 365 day look-back period was used with the intent to minimize misclassification of an episodic manifestation of chronic depression (where depression symptoms last for two or more years) as newly-diagnosed depression.

Additional exclusion criteria were (1) not having a diagnosis of at least one chronic physical condition (identified by ICD-9-CM codes included in the appendix) in the baseline period (2) no continuous fee-for-service Medicaid eligibility and (3) enrollment in Medicare at any point during the observation period; (4) died during the study period and (5) did not use inpatient or outpatient Medicaid services during the study period.

**Dependent Variables**

**Total Healthcare Expenditures:**

Total healthcare expenditure per person included in the study cohort was defined as the total dollar amount that Medicaid paid for inpatient, outpatient and pharmacy claims. Total
healthcare expenditures were identified at the end of each month of follow-up during the 12 month follow-up period. The total healthcare expenditures were adjusted by the medical component of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and expressed in the 2008 constant dollars. After assessing the skewness and kurtosis properties and linearity through qq-plots, the total health expenditures were log transformed and used as dependent variable.

*T2DM-Related Healthcare Expenditures:*

T2DM-related healthcare expenditure per person included in the study cohort were defined as the total dollar amount that Medicaid paid for inpatient and outpatient claims with a diagnosis of T2DM. The T2DM-related healthcare expenditures were also identified on a monthly basis during the 12 month follow-up period. Similar to total healthcare expenditures, the T2DM-related expenditures were also adjusted by the medical component of the CPI and expressed in the 2008 constant dollars and were log transformed.

**Independent Variables**

*Key Independent Variables:*

*Depression treatment during the acute phase:* The first four months following the newly-diagnosed depression is known as the acute phase of depression treatment. The acute phase is used to set treatment goals, assess risk of suicide, decide on using psychotherapy and/or appropriate antidepressant, enhance adherence and monitor response [32]. The initial treatment choice may influence the effectiveness of depression treatment and therefore may also be associated with healthcare expenditures over time.

Depression treatment in the acute phase could be provided with only antidepressants or only psychotherapy or both. *Antidepressant Use:* The national drug codes available in the prescription drug use file of MAX data were used to identify antidepressant drug classes:
selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors, selective norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors, tricyclic antidepressants, monoamine oxidase inhibitors and other (mirtazapine and bupropion).

**Psychotherapy Use:** The use of psychotherapy was identified with Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) codes. The following psychotherapy types were used: (i) psychotherapy diagnostic interview (90801, 90802) (ii) individual psychotherapy [individual psychotherapy 20-30 min (90804, 90816, 90805, 90817), 45-50 min (90806, 90818, 90807, 90819), 75-80 min (90808, 90821, 90809, 90822); interactive individual psychotherapy 20-30 min (90810, 90823, 90811, 90824), 45-50 min (90812, 90826, 90813, 90827), 75-80 min (90814, 90828, 90815, 90829)) (iii) other psychotherapy [family psychotherapy (90846, 90847, 90849), group psychotherapy (90853), interactive group psychotherapy(90857)][33].

Depression treatment in the acute phase was categorized as treatment with: (1) Only Antidepressants: These individuals received at least one prescription for antidepressant, but no psychotherapy visit during the acute phase of depression treatment were considered as being treated with only antidepressants; (2) Only Psychotherapy: Those who received at least one psychotherapy office visit, but no prescription for antidepressant drugs during the acute phase were considered as being treated with only psychotherapy. (3) Both Antidepressants and Psychotherapy: Those who received a minimum of one prescription for antidepressants and one psychotherapy visit during the first120 days following newly-diagnosed depression were considered as being treated with both antidepressants and psychotherapy (4) No treatment: These individuals received no prescriptions for antidepressants and no psychotherapy office visit during the acute phase.

*Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions (Need Factor used in ABM):*
As other physical conditions coexisting with T2DM often impact the medical care, self-management, and healthcare outcomes of an individual with T2DM, Piette and Kerr developed a framework that classified coexisting conditions among individuals with T2DM into categories based on similarities and differences from T2DM pathophysiology and management. The categories of conditions that might coexist with T2DM were defined as: dominant (conditions whose severity eclipses all other conditions’ management plans such as metastatic cancer), concordant (conditions that overlap with T2DM in their pathophysiology and management plans such as cardiovascular diseases) or discordant (conditions with unrelated pathophysiology or management plans such as musculoskeletal disorders) [34].

Following this framework, one may assume that presence of such coexisting conditions among individuals with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression may also affect the management of depression and therefore response to depression treatment. Therefore, based on this theoretical framework, forty-four different types of coexisting chronic physical conditions a list of which along with the ICD-9-CM codes used to identify the conditions is presented in Appendix A, were used to define types of coexisting chronic physical conditions. A hierarchical classification was followed [23]; dominant conditions were given priority because such conditions often take precedence over the management of other health conditions. Only among those without dominant conditions, concordant and discordant conditions were identified. The types of coexisting chronic physical conditions were classified as: 1) Dominant conditions 2) Concordant only, 3) Discordant only and 4) Both concordant and discordant.

Other independent variables:

Based on the Andersen’s Behavioral Model, the other independent variables included in the study were:
**Predisposing Factors:** The included variables were: demographics (gender, age, race/ethnicity [Whites, African Americans, Hispanics or other races]).

**Enabling Factors:** Using Medicaid eligibility status the enabling factors included were: eligibility due to poverty (yes/no), medical needs (yes/no) and waiver (yes/no).

**Need Factors:** The variables included were clinical characteristics such as presence of other mental health conditions and number of conditions during baseline. The other mental health conditions included bipolar disorder, schizophrenia, post-traumatic stress disorder, and alcohol and drug abuse.

**Personal Health Practices:** As an individual’s propensity to seek treatment may influence healthcare utilizations and thereby expenditure, therefore the study controlled for healthcare seeking behavior by controlling for baseline healthcare utilization characteristics such as number of emergency room visits in 180 days prior to new-onset depression, inpatient hospitalization, number of oral antidiabetic medication classes and insulin use as identified by NDC codes, presence of polypharmacy identified by use of 6 or more drug classes in the 90 days prior to new-onset depression, number of outpatient visits measured in quartiles and total baseline healthcare expenditures.

**External Environment:** External environment variables included state of residence, community level access healthcare infrastructure and community level social determinants of health variables. Community level access healthcare infrastructure variables included presence of community mental health clinic (CMHC) and federally qualified health clinic (FQHC) in a county, whether county of residence was designated as Health Professional Shortage area (HPSA) and density of social workers in a county. The social determinants of health variables included were urban/rural status of a county, median income in the county and whether percent
below poverty level and percent with college education in the county were greater than national average based on US census estimates [35, 36].

Other variables: After response to depression treatment is achieved in the acute phase, treatment for depression may be continued for another 4 to 9 months of continuation phase treatment [37]. Therefore, it may be plausible that some individuals received depression treatment with antidepressants and/or psychotherapy during entire length of follow-up and some did not. To control for such variation, the statistical models additionally controlled for antidepressant treatment at each month of follow-up: This was defined as a dichotomous (yes/no) variable, which indicated whether an individual received antidepressant prescription during each month of the follow-up; psychotherapy treatment at each month of follow-up: A categorical (yes/no) variable that indicated whether an individual received outpatient psychotherapy during each month of the follow-up. year of observation: As data from multiple years forming seven different panels (2000-2002, 2001-2003, 2002-2004, 2003-2005, 2004-2006, 2005-2007, 2006-2008) were used, a variable indicating the particular cohort the observation came from was also included.

Statistical Analyses

Bivariate Analyses:

Unadjusted analyses using descriptive statistics, including frequency, percentage, mean, and standard errors were conducted. Chi-square analyses were used to examine unadjusted differences in baseline characteristics and types of coexisting chronic physical conditions. Chi-square analyses were used to examine unadjusted differences in types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and depression treatment.

Analyses with repeated measures:
As healthcare expenditures were aggregated for each month of follow-up, 12 observations were available for each individual. Due to repeated measures of healthcare expenditures, the observations were not independent. Because standard regression techniques assume that individual observations are independent, they cannot be applied to data with repeated measures. More appropriate models are those that account, for such dependence. Therefore, the multivariable analyses consisted of linear mixed effects models. These models account for correlated error terms of observations from same person.

Linear mixed model analyses were conducted to assess the association between depression treatment categories during the acute phase and total and T2DM-related healthcare expenditures. The statistical model included the key independent variable i.e. depression treatment categories during the acute phase, types of coexisting chronic physical conditions, and predisposing, enabling, need, personal health practices (health seeking behavior), external environment characteristics and other variables (antidepressant treatment at each month of follow-up, psychotherapy treatment at each month of follow-up, year of observation). Additionally, separate linear mixed model regressions for each type of coexisting chronic physical conditions were conducted to examine whether the association between depression treatment and total and T2DM-related healthcare expenditures vary by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions.

*Observed Selection Bias: Adjusting for inverse probability weighting technique (IPTW)*

Depression treatment is a choice variable and observed differences in individual as characteristics of the study population can influence this choice. To account for such observed differences the inverse probability weighting technique (IPTW) was used. The IPTW gives weight to each individual based on the inverse of their propensity to use a particular type of
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depression treatment. Thus individuals who have lower propensity are up-weighted and those with higher propensity are down weighted. This helps to balance the probability of treatment across the treatment groups. In order to account for the differences in group sizes of the treatment groups, the weights were further stabilized by dividing them with sample size of each group.

For easier interpretation of log transformed expenditure variables, percentage changes in total and T2DM-related expenditures for depression treatment categories were calculated by subtracting one (depression treatment being categorical) from exponentiated beta coefficients and multiplying this number by 100. All analyses were conducted using Statistical Analysis Software (SAS 9.3).

**Secondary Analysis**

It has been observed the individuals with depression often do not get adequately treated owing to various clinician and patient related factors such as short duration of treatment and non-compliance to medication use [38]. However, adequate depression treatment has been found to be associated with lesser increase in healthcare expenditures from pre-depression to post-depression time periods as compared those not adequately treated, especially in presence of other coexisting chronic conditions [39]. Therefore, this study additionally examined whether adequate depression treatment in the acute phase was associated with healthcare expenditures in this study population. Results of this analysis are presented in Appendix B.
RESULTS

Description of the Study Population

The study population consisted of 5,295 non-elderly fee-for-service Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression. Description of the study population is presented in Table 1. In the study population, 36.3% were aged 45-54 years and 38.5% were older adults aged between 55 and 64 years, 67.3% were females; 26.8% were Whites and 30.1% were African Americans and 43% belonged to other races; majority of the counties of residence were metro areas (89.1%), however, 83.2% of counties were designated as shortage area for mental health professionals and 51.1% of counties did not have a CMHC.

Description of the Study Population by Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical conditions

Table 1 also presents a description of the study population by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions. In the study population, 14.2% had dominant conditions, 27.3% had concordant conditions only, 15.8% had discordant conditions only and 42.8% had both concordant and discordant conditions. All individual baseline characteristics and majority of the county level characteristics differed significantly among the types of coexisting chronic physical conditions groups. For example, a greater proportion of individuals with dominant conditions were older i.e.55-64 years (17.4% vs 9.1% in 18-44 years age-group), males (18.3% vs 12.3% females), had presence of other mental health conditions (18.6% vs 11.6% with absence of other mental health conditions), inpatient hospitalizations (20.5% vs 8.1% in those without) and higher number of outpatient visits (22.7% in 4th vs 6.1% in 1st quartile). For the external environment characteristics, presence of a CMHC in the county and percentage of the county population below the national poverty level of 11.1% were the two variables that did not significantly differ among the types of coexisting chronic physical condition subgroups.
**Unadjusted Association between Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions and Depression Treatment Categories**

During the acute phase, 27.3% had treatment with only antidepressants, 18.1% had treatment with only psychotherapy, 11.4% had treatment with both antidepressants and psychotherapy and 43.2% of the study population had no depression treatment. Unadjusted chi-square analyses revealed that depression treatment during the acute phase varied significantly (P-value <0.001) among the types of coexisting chronic physical conditions subgroups. A significantly lower percentage of individuals with dominant conditions (19.1%) and concordant conditions only (27.3%) had treatment with only antidepressants as compared to those with discordant conditions only (32.7%); a significantly higher percentage of individuals in dominant conditions (28.2%) and concordant conditions only (17.2%) received treatment with only psychotherapy as compared to individuals with discordant conditions only (14.0%); treatment with both antidepressants and psychotherapy was received by 12.6% with dominant conditions, 11.2% with concordant conditions only, 10.7% with discordant conditions only and 11.4% with both concordant and discordant conditions. The percentages with no depression treatment were 40.1% for those with dominant conditions, 44.3% for individuals with concordant conditions only, 42.6% for individuals with discordant conditions only and 43.8% for individuals with both concordant and discordant conditions. Results are not presented in tabular form.

**Mean Monthly Healthcare Expenditures for Depression Treatment Categories**

**Total Healthcare Expenditures:** The mean total healthcare expenditures for 12 months after diagnosis of depression were $30,590 for those treated with only antidepressants, $35,099 for those treated with only with psychotherapy, $33,032 for those treated with both antidepressants and psychotherapy and $34,041 for those receiving no depression treatment. The
mean monthly expenditures across all depression treatment categories decreased over time. For example, in the antidepressant only group, the mean expenditure reduced from $4,729 at the end of Month 1 to $2,497 at the end of Month 12; for the only psychotherapy group the reduction from Month 1 to Month 12 was $6,172 to $2,621; for those with both antidepressant and psychotherapy treat the mean expenditures reduced from $5,473 (Month 1) to $2,327 (Month 12) and among those with no treatment the total healthcare expenditures reduced from $5291 (Month 1) to $2,689 (Month 12).

T2DM-related Healthcare Expenditures: The mean total healthcare expenditures for 12 months after diagnosis of depression were $13,642 for those treated with only antidepressants, $15,654 for those treated with only psychotherapy, $15,726 for those treated with both antidepressants and psychotherapy and $14,801 for those receiving no depression treatment. Similar to the reductions observed in total healthcare expenditures over each month, the reduction in T2DM-related healthcare expenditures from Month 1 to Month 12 was $2,848 to $895 for only antidepressants, $3,419 to $1,013 for only psychotherapy, $3176 to $768 for those treated with both antidepressants and psychotherapy and $3,305 to $1,065 for those received no depression treatment. Whether the mean monthly expenditures

The total and T2DM-related healthcare expenditures aggregated at ends of Months 1-4, Months 5-8 and Months 7-12 are presented in Figure 1.

Mean Monthly Healthcare Expenditures for Depression Treatment Categories: by Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions

Total Healthcare Expenditures: Total healthcare expenditures reduced with in each subgroup of types of coexisting chronic physical conditions.
**T2DM-related Healthcare Expenditures:** Similarly, the T2DM-related healthcare expenditures also reduced in each subgroup of types of coexisting chronic physical conditions.

Total and T2DM-related healthcare expenditures aggregated at ends of Months 1-4, Months 5-8 and Months 9-12 by each subgroup of types of coexisting chronic physical conditions are presented in Figure 2.

**Adjusted Association between Depression Treatment Categories during the Acute Phase and Healthcare Expenditures**

**Total Healthcare Expenditures:** Linear mixed model regression analyses were conducted to examine the association between depression treatment categories and log transformed total and T2DM-related healthcare expenditures. In Model 1, which did not include the interaction term between depression treatment categories and types of coexisting chronic physical condition, it was found that, as compared to no treatment, all other types of treatment was associated with reduction in total healthcare expenditures. As compared to no depression treatment, depression treatment with only antidepressants was associated with 17% (beta: -0.18; SE: 0.04) reduction in total healthcare expenditures, treatment with only psychotherapy was associated with 22% (beta: -0.25; SE: 0.05) reduction in total healthcare expenditures and treatment with both antidepressants and psychotherapy was associated with 28% (beta: -0.33; SE: 0.06) reductions in total healthcare expenditures.

**T2DM-related Healthcare Expenditures:** Treatment with only antidepressants was not significantly associated with reduced log transformed T2DM-related expenditures as compared to no depression treatment. However, treatment with psychotherapy and both antidepressants and
psychotherapy was associated with 28% and 18% reduction in T2DM-related expenditures as compared to no depression treatment.

The results are presented in Table 3.

**Adjusted Association between Depression Treatment Categories during the Acute Phase and Healthcare Expenditures by Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions**

**Total Healthcare Expenditures:** Treatment with only antidepressants was associated with 21% (beta: -0.24; SE: 0.18) reductions in total healthcare expenditures among those with concordant conditions only and by 18% (beta: -0.20; SE: 0.09) among those with discordant conditions only. Depression treatment with only psychotherapy was associated with 48% (beta: -0.65; SE: 0.12) reductions in total healthcare expenditures among those with dominant conditions and 21% (beta: -0.23; SE: 0.07) reductions in total healthcare expenditures among those with both concordant and discordant conditions. Treatment with both antidepressants and psychotherapy was associated with reductions in total healthcare expenditures among all types of coexisting chronic physical condition groups.

**T2DM-related Healthcare Expenditures:** Associations with reduced T2DM-related healthcare expenditures were not observed with treatment by only antidepressants. Treatment with only psychotherapy was associated with 41% (beta:-0.53; SE: 0.14) reduction in T2DM-related healthcare expenditures among those with dominant conditions and 34% (beta:-0.41; SE: 0.10) reduction in T2DM-related healthcare expenditures among individuals with both concordant and discordant conditions. Treatment with both antidepressants and psychotherapy was associated with 27% (beta:-0.32; SE: 0.13) reduction in T2DM-related healthcare expenditures among those with concordant conditions only.

Table 4 presents the beta-coefficients and standard errors
DISCUSSION

This study examined the association between depression treatment categories and total and T2DM-related healthcare expenditures and further assessed whether this association varied by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions among non-elderly Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression. Multiple unique significant findings were observed.

**Depression Treatment Categories during the Acute Phase and Healthcare Expenditures**

- In this study population, 43%, or 4 in 10 i.e individuals with T2DM and newly diagnosed depression did not receive any treatment for depression.
- However, it was observed that as compared to not receiving treatment for depression, any modality of depression treatment reduced both total healthcare expenditures.
- With regards to T2DM-related expenditures, the modality of depression treatment was important; treating depression with only antidepressants did not reduce T2DM-related healthcare expenditures.

**Total Healthcare Expenditures:** The study findings indicate that treating depression is associated with a reductions in total healthcare expenditure. There are some plausible explanations for such an observed association between depression treatment and reduced healthcare expenditures. Randomized Clinical trials which have examined the association of depression treatment with pharmacotherapy i.e. antidepressants and/or psychotherapy have found that depression treatment with antidepressants reduced depressive symptoms among individuals with T2DM and depression [40-47] and depression treatment with psychotherapy such as cognitive behavioral therapy was also effective in reducing depression symptoms [48-50]. Therefore, treating depression may reduce healthcare expenditures by providing relief from
depressive symptoms by reducing mental-health related expenditures. Additionally, individuals with depression have been shown to have high utilizations of healthcare services [51, 52] and also there is evidence that coexisting depression worsens of other medical conditions by its adverse effect of medication adherence [53] and self-care regimens [54]. Treatment of depression may result in subsequent relief from symptoms and therefore, may result in reduced healthcare service utilizations, improved adherence of other chronic disease medications and better self-care, thereby, reducing healthcare expenditures.

T2DM-related Healthcare Expenditures: An interesting finding was that, depression treatment with only antidepressants did not reduce T2DM-related healthcare expenditures. This finding can be explained by the fact that among individuals with T2DM and depression, clinical trials of depression treatment with only antidepressants did not provide conclusive evidence of better T2DM related outcomes such as glycemic control [55]. Furthermore, among adults with T2DM, depression treatment with antidepressants can increase cardiovascular morbidity and mortality [56, 57]. Therefore, among individuals with T2DM, treatment with antidepressants may not be a suitable option for reducing T2DM-related expenditures.

However, depression treatments modalities which included which psychotherapy was a component of treatment was associated with reductions in T2DM-related healthcare expenditures. This finding is comparable to the limited evidence from previous research. For example, Lustman et al., showed that treatment of depression among 51 individuals with T2DM and depression, 10 weeks of cognitive behavioral therapy was not significantly associated with reduced glycated hemoglobin (A1C) levels in the intervention group at 6 month after follow-up (intervention vs control: 9.5% vs 10.9% ; P = 0.03). No study in real-world setting has examined the effects of treating depression with both antidepressants and psychotherapy. However,
evidence from randomized controlled trials of collaborative care which includes often depression
treatment with antidepressants as well as psychotherapy (either initiated together or in a stepped
care approach based on response to initial treatment) have shown significant reductions in A1C
levels in intervention as compared to control group [58]. Such evidence, supports this study
findings that treatment of depression with psychotherapy can reduce T2DM-related expenditures.

*Depression Treatment Categories during the Acute Phase and Healthcare Expenditures: By Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions*

- Across all types of co-existing conditions treatment for depression with combination therapy (i.e. antidepressants and psychotherapy) was associated with reduced total healthcare expenditures.
- The relationships between other depression treatment categories and total healthcare expenditures varied by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions.
- For some conditions treatment for depression with only antidepressants reduced total healthcare expenditures. These were: concordant conditions only and discordant conditions only
- For other conditions, treatment for depression with only psychotherapy reduced total healthcare expenditures: these conditions were: dominant conditions and both concordant and discordant conditions.
- The associations between depression treatment categories and T2DM-related expenditures varied by types of co-existing chronic conditions. For some conditions psychotherapy reduced T2DM-related expenditures: these were dominant conditions and both concordant and discordant conditions; for
concordant only condition combined antidepressants and psychotherapy reduced T2DM-related expenditures.

Taken together these findings highlight the importance of combined antidepressants and psychotherapy as the best alternative to reducing total healthcare expenditures among individuals with T2DM and newly diagnosed depression. Several studies, including multiple randomized clinical trials [59-61] and meta-analyses [62, 63] have shown that, among individuals with depression, combined treatment with both pharmacotherapy and psychotherapy significantly reduces depression symptoms and dropout rates. Treatment with both antidepressants and psychotherapy has also been found to have long term benefits in terms of preventing relapse [67] and increasing depression treatment adherence [68-70]. Therefore, by improving depression related outcomes, treatment with both antidepressants and psychotherapy may help to reduce total healthcare expenditures.

However, if physicians or patients prefer treatment either with antidepressants or psychotherapy alone, then the choice of treatment need to be prioritized based on type of coexisting chronic physical condition. Depression treatment with only psychotherapy reduced total healthcare expenditures among those with high burden of coexisting conditions such as those with dominant conditions and also individuals with both concordant and discordant conditions; additionally, it also needs to be noted that, treatment with only psychotherapy also reduced T2DM-related healthcare expenditures among these individuals. Individuals with dominant and those with both concordant and discordant conditions may have higher disease burden and treating depression in such patients can be challenging. A previous study has shown that principles of certain types of psychotherapy, such as cognitive behavioral therapy may help in managing aspects of chronic physical conditions such as pain [64, 65]. Pain management is an
integral part of dominant conditions such as cancer and multiple sclerosis. Presence of both concordant and discordant conditions, for example, coexisting neuropathy and rheumatoid arthritis, may also result in exacerbated pain. Psychotherapy such as cognitive behavioral therapy has also been proven to be beneficial for management of pain [66, 67]. Treatment with psychotherapy, in such cases, may result in more holistic treatment and better outcomes as seen by reduced healthcare expenditures as compared to treatment with only antidepressants.

**Implications**

The study findings have significant health policy implications. In this study expenditures over a one year period were examined among Medicaid beneficiaries with newly-diagnosed depression. Therefore, this could be viewed as expenditures following a new episode of depression in a high risk group of Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM and coexisting conditions. In general, the study results indicated that depression treatment is associated with reduced healthcare expenditures, however the association varies by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions. Such results have important implications in the context of new payment models such as the “bundled payment” where providers or facilities are paid a single payment for all services in relation to treating a condition or provide a treatment. The results of this study indicated the some types of depression treatment is no better than not treating depression at all, in terms of association with reduced healthcare expenditure. For example, depression treatment with only antidepressants in presence of dominant conditions is not associated with reduced healthcare expenditures. Therefore, among individuals with T2DM and coexisting dominant conditions, physicians may not want to initiate treatment for newly-diagnosed depression with antidepressants, under the bundled payment systems.

The findings also have implications for improving quality of care initiatives such as Medicare Shared Savings Program (MSSP). The MSSP [68] use expenditure patterns of
Medicare beneficiaries in the past three years to set expenditures “benchmarks”, using risk adjustment models. These benchmarks are used to establish savings and share the cost-reduction with the CMS. [69] Although, the MSSP is specific to Medicare, many state Medicaid agencies are using the MSSP as one of the models for building their accountable care organization (ACO) programs. The study results have implications with regards to such “benchmarking” approaches.

Response to depression treatment in terms of economic benefits varied by types of coexisting conditions present. Therefore, total healthcare expenditures among Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression and coexisting conditions may vary both by types of coexisting conditions and types of depression treatment received. Therefore, while setting benchmarks for individuals with T2DM, newly-diagnosed depression and other coexisting chronic physical conditions, one will need to risk adjust for type of coexisting conditions and types of depression treatment categories.

The study findings further suggests that economic benefits of depression treatment may be more achievable in integrated care settings where physical and mental healthcare are delivered in tandem and treatment of depression is adjusted as per individual response. The 2010 Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act aims to promote such integrated care through patient centered medical homes (PCMH). For managing treatment of mental health conditions such as depression, the PCMH model promotes coordinated care among primary care physicians, a mental healthcare specialist and a care manager [70]. As care is integrated, primary care physicians can monitor the overall health and can easily consult and refer with mental healthcare specialists and thus provide more holistic care to individuals with both depression and multiple coexisting chronic physical conditions [70]. As of 2013, 43 of 50 states of US had adopted policies to promote PCMH [71]. Therefore, in coming years, studies need to be conducted to
assess depression treatment patterns and associated long term expenditures among individuals with coexisting depression and multiple chronic physical conditions.

**Strengths and Limitations**

There are several strengths of this study. Medicaid claims data from multiple years of three states were used in this study. There are several advantages to using such administrative data. A large cohort of patients could be efficiently followed for a long period of time across a variety of providers. The study included adults with T2DM, newly-diagnosed depression and coexisting chronic physical conditions, such populations with multiple conditions are often ignored in clinical trials of depression treatment. The economic consequences of depression treatment were observed in real world settings instead of the controlled environment of clinical trials. The use of a repeated measures design allowed for studying the association between depression treatments and healthcare expenditure over time, instead of aggregating expenditures at the end of follow-up. To the best of the authors’ knowledge such a design has yet not been adopted by any other study in this area. Since the association between depression treatments and healthcare expenditures adjusted for inverse probability treatment weights, selection bias due to differences in observed characteristics in the depression treatment groups could be controlled in the analyses.

However, the study has some limitations. As administrative claims data can only identify diseases through diagnosis codes, a limitation using such kind of data for studies with depression, is the potential for underestimating newly-diagnosed depression owing to undiagnosed depression and under-coding of depression. Identifying depression is one of the more difficult problems in administrative data research and perfection may not be attainable. However, the use of diagnoses codes that are recommended by HEDIS and extensively used by health plans in order to identify depression claims and the ability to identify physician/
psychologist diagnoses of depression offer a particularly attractive alternative to the substantial expenditure and complications associated with prospective surveys supplemented with medical record data. Additionally, T2DM and other coexisting chronic physical conditions were also identified using diagnosis codes in medical claims. Incomplete or erroneous records submitted by healthcare providers, limited clinical detail in the ICD-9-CM codes and inaccurate demographic information might limit the accuracy of administrative data. Perceived general and mental health status variables were not available due to nature of the dataset and thus could not be controlled for in the analyses. These variables may impact choice of depression treatment and expenditures. Duration of T2DM and coexisting chronic conditions may influence healthcare utilization and consequently expenditures, however as these variables were not available and were not adjusted for in regression analyses. The study included fee-for-service Medicaid beneficiaries enrolled in three states, thus results might not be generalizable to Medicaid population. Additionally, though differences in observed characteristics among depression treatment groups were controlled by using IPTW, there may be unobserved differences between the depression treatment groups which were not examined in this study.
CONCLUSION

Among non-elderly adults with T2DM and newly diagnosed depression, compared to no depression treatment, treating depression can produce cost-savings to Medicaid. Treating depression with combined antidepressants and psychotherapy may be the best alternative to achieve consistent reduction in expenditures across all types of coexisting chronic physical conditions. For specific modalities of depression treatment (i.e. antidepressant only or psychotherapy only), cost-reductions will depend on the types of coexisting chronic physical conditions.
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Table 1: Description of the Study Population by Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions Among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression
Multi-state Medicaid Claims Database – 2000 - 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All</th>
<th>Dominant</th>
<th>Concordant Only</th>
<th>Discordant Only</th>
<th>Both Concordant &amp; Discordant</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>5,295</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Predisposing Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-44</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>2,039</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3,565</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>1,566</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Need Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Mental Health Conditions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3,418</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>1,506</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Enabling Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicaid eligibility - Poverty</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicaid eligibility - Medical Need</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4,657</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medicaid eligibility - Waiver</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4,995</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Personal Health Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Antidiabetic Drugs (OADs)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 1: Description of the Study Population by Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions Among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression
Multi-state Medicaid Claims Database – 2000 - 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Dominant</th>
<th>Concordant Only</th>
<th>Discordant Only</th>
<th>Both Concordant &amp; Discordant</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulin Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,827 34.5</td>
<td>277 15.2</td>
<td>512 28.0</td>
<td>148 8.1</td>
<td>890 48.7</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3,468 65.5</td>
<td>476 13.7</td>
<td>932 26.9</td>
<td>686 19.8</td>
<td>1,374 39.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polypharmacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,915 36.2</td>
<td>293 15.3</td>
<td>345 18.0</td>
<td>295 15.4</td>
<td>982 51.3</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3,380 63.8</td>
<td>460 13.6</td>
<td>1,099 32.5</td>
<td>539 15.9</td>
<td>1,282 37.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Hospitalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,604 49.2</td>
<td>534 20.5</td>
<td>532 20.4</td>
<td>232 8.9</td>
<td>1,306 50.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2,691 50.8</td>
<td>219 8.1</td>
<td>912 33.9</td>
<td>602 22.4</td>
<td>958 35.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient Visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quartile</td>
<td>1,392 26.3</td>
<td>85 6.1</td>
<td>588 42.2</td>
<td>294 21.1</td>
<td>425 30.5</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quartile</td>
<td>1,221 23.1</td>
<td>139 11.4</td>
<td>352 28.8</td>
<td>215 17.6</td>
<td>515 42.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quartile</td>
<td>1,352 25.5</td>
<td>227 16.8</td>
<td>282 20.9</td>
<td>180 13.3</td>
<td>663 49.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quartile</td>
<td>1,330 25.1</td>
<td>302 22.7</td>
<td>222 16.7</td>
<td>145 10.9</td>
<td>661 49.7</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ± SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of T2DM-related office visits</td>
<td>6.93±0.13</td>
<td>7.98±0.29</td>
<td>6.51±0.29</td>
<td>5.44±0.21</td>
<td>7.40±0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ER Visits</td>
<td>1.18±0.03</td>
<td>1.65±0.11</td>
<td>0.66±0.04</td>
<td>0.78±0.05</td>
<td>1.51±0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Illinois</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>HPSA- Mental Health Care</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,405 83.2</td>
<td>651 14.8</td>
<td>1,209 27.4</td>
<td>1,866 42.4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>890 16.8</td>
<td>102 11.5</td>
<td>235 26.4</td>
<td>398 44.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,719 89.1</td>
<td>698 14.8</td>
<td>1,291 27.4</td>
<td>2,000 42.4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>576 10.9</td>
<td>55 9.5</td>
<td>153 26.6</td>
<td>264 45.8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,590 48.9</td>
<td>376 14.5</td>
<td>702 27.1</td>
<td>1,119 43.2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2,705 51.1</td>
<td>377 13.9</td>
<td>742 27.4</td>
<td>1,145 42.3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 1: Description of the Study Population by Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions Among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Dominant</th>
<th>Concordant Only</th>
<th>Discordant Only</th>
<th>Both Concordant &amp; Discordant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FQHC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,365</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>1,199 27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>245 26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quartile</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>365 27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quartile</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>378 26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quartile</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>345 27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quartile</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>356 26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with GT 4yr college education &gt; 16%†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,399</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>1,197 27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>247 27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% below poverty level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT 11.1%‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,692</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>1,284 27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>160 26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ± SE</td>
<td>3.01±0.02</td>
<td>3.27±0.06</td>
<td>3.02±0.04</td>
<td>3.02±0.06</td>
<td>2.91±0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Study sample comprised of adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus aged 18-64 years and with at least one coexisting dominant, concordant, discordant chronic physical condition and who were alive, not dually eligible for Medicare and continuously enrolled in fee-for-service Medicaid for at least 24 months (N=5,295); includes Medicaid data from three states: Illinois, Texas, New York

Asterisks(*) represent significant differences in study population characteristics and coexisting chronic physical conditions categories i.e. Dominant, Concordant Only, Discordant Only and Both Concordant and Discordant, derived from chi-square statistics

***P ≤ .001; **.001 ≤ P < .01; *.01 ≤ P < .05.
†16% Cut off was chosen based on 2000 Census Education attainment results
‡11.1% Cut off was chosen based on 1999 Census Poverty in 18-64 year results

HPSA: health professional shortage area; CMHC: Community Mental Health Clinic; FQHC: Federally qualified health clinic; GT: Greater Than
Table 2: IPTW Adjusted Association Between Depression Treatment and Healthcare Expenditures, Among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression Multi-state Medicaid Claims Database – 2000 – 2008 (Reference Group : No Depression Treatment)

| Depression Treatment | ALL Expenditures | | | T2DM-Related Expenditures | |
|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                      | Beta             | SE               | Sig              | Beta             | SE               | Sig              |
| Only antidepressants | -0.18            | 0.04             | ***              | -0.10            | 0.05             | ***              |
| Only psychotherapy   | -0.25            | 0.05             | ***              | -0.33            | 0.06             | ***              |
| Antidepressants and  | -0.33            | 0.06             | ***              | -0.20            | 0.07             | **               |
| Psychotherapy        |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |

Model adjusted for Random effects: Random Intercept; Fixed Effects: Time in months, Depression Treatment, Predisposing (gender, age, race/ethnicity), Need Factors (other mental health conditions, Types of Co-existing Chronic Physical Conditions), Enabling Factors (Medicaid Eligibility -Poverty, Medical Need, Waiver), Personal health practices (number of ER and outpatient visits, inpatient hospitalization, number of OAD classes, insulin use and polypharmacy, total baseline healthcare expenditures), External environment characteristics: (whether county of residence had a CMHC, FQHC, was HPSA for mental health, density of social workers rural/urban status of county, whether percent below poverty level and percent with college education greater than national average), Other variables: Antidepressant treatment during each month of follow-up, Psychotherapy treatment during each month of follow-up and
All Healthcare expenditures included Inpatient, Outpatient and Prescription Drug Related Expenditures; T2DM Related Expenditures included Inpatient and Outpatient Expenditures due to T2DM-related diagnosis. The expenditures were log transformed
Asterisks indicate statistical significance and are based on mixed effects models; none i.e. no antidepressant treatment i.e. none as reference group for dependent variable. ***P < .001; **.001 ≤ P < .01; *.01 ≤ P < .05.
T2DM: Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus; depression: Major Depressive Disorder; IPTW: Inverse Probability Treatment Weights; SE: Standard Error
Table 3: IPTW Adjusted Association Between Depression Treatment and Healthcare Expenditures Stratified by Types of Coexisting Conditions among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression, Multi-state Medicaid Claims Database – 2000 – 2008, (Reference Group : No Depression Treatment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depression Treatment Categories</th>
<th>ALL Expenditures</th>
<th>T2DM Related Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Concordant Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only antidepressants</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only psychotherapy</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidepressants and Psychotherapy</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only antidepressants</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only psychotherapy</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidepressants and Psychotherapy</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only antidepressants</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only psychotherapy</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidepressants and Psychotherapy</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only antidepressants</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only psychotherapy</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidepressants and Psychotherapy</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Model adjusted for Random effects: Random Intercept; Fixed Effects: Adjusted for: Time in months. Depression Treatment, Predisposing (gender, age, race/ethnicity), Need Factors (other mental health conditions, Types of Co-existing Chronic Physical Conditions), Enabling Factors (Medicaid Eligibility -Poverty, Medical Need, Waiver), Personal health practices (number of ER and outpatient visits, inpatient hospitalization, number of OAD classes, insulin use and polypharmacy), External environment characteristics: (whether county of residence had a CMHC, FQHC, was HPSA for mental health, density of social workers rural/urban status of county, median income in the county, whether percent below poverty level and percent with college education greater than national average). Other variables: Antidepressant treatment at each month of follow-up, Psychotherapy treatment at each month of follow-up and Year of observation All Healthcare Expenditures included Inpatient, Outpatient and Prescription Drug Related Expenditures; T2DM Related Expenditures included Inpatient and Outpatient Expenditures due to T2DM-related diagnosis. The expenditures were log transformed

Asterisks indicate statistical significance and are based on mixed effects models; ***P < .001; **.001 ≤ P < .01; *.01 ≤ P < .05.

T2DM: Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus; depression: Major Depressive Disorder; IPTW: Inverse Probability Treatment Weights; SE: Standard Error
Figure 1: Mean IPTW adjusted Total and T2DM-Related Healthcare Expenditures during Follow-up for Medicaid Beneficiaries with T2DM and Newly-Diagnosed Depression
Figure 2: Mean IPTW adjusted Total and T2DM-Related Healthcare Expenditures during Follow-up for Medicaid Beneficiaries with T2DM and Newly-Diagnosed Depression: By Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions

Figure 2a: Dominant Conditions:

**Total Health Care Costs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Months 1-4</th>
<th>Months 5-8</th>
<th>Months 9-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD Only</td>
<td>$17,916</td>
<td>$12,233</td>
<td>$12,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych Only</td>
<td>$17,982</td>
<td>$14,667</td>
<td>$14,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>$17,767</td>
<td>$13,922</td>
<td>$10,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>$18,991</td>
<td>$15,934</td>
<td>$15,449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Months 1-4</th>
<th>Months 5-8</th>
<th>Months 9-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD Only</td>
<td>$8,856</td>
<td>$5,027</td>
<td>$4,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych Only</td>
<td>$6,866</td>
<td>$4,278</td>
<td>$4,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>$8,529</td>
<td>$5,355</td>
<td>$3,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>$7,542</td>
<td>$4,375</td>
<td>$4,621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**T2DM Related Health Care Cost:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Months 1-4</th>
<th>Months 5-8</th>
<th>Months 9-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD Only</td>
<td>$9,592</td>
<td>$7,787</td>
<td>$7,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych Only</td>
<td>$15,139</td>
<td>$8,564</td>
<td>$8,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>$17,824</td>
<td>$10,282</td>
<td>$9,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>$12,359</td>
<td>$7,182</td>
<td>$8,324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Months 1-4</th>
<th>Months 5-8</th>
<th>Months 9-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD Only</td>
<td>$4,587</td>
<td>$3,322</td>
<td>$2,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych Only</td>
<td>$6,862</td>
<td>$2,362</td>
<td>$2,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>$5,858</td>
<td>$4,854</td>
<td>$3,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>$5,302</td>
<td>$2,177</td>
<td>$2,663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2b: Concordant Conditions Only
Figure 2c: Discordant Conditions Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Months 1-4</th>
<th>Months 2-8</th>
<th>Months 9-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD Only</td>
<td>$6,777</td>
<td>$5,869</td>
<td>$6,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych Only</td>
<td>$9,306</td>
<td>$5,968</td>
<td>$7,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>$11,568</td>
<td>$4,772</td>
<td>$6,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>$8,593</td>
<td>$8,476</td>
<td>$6,928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2d: Both Concordant and Discordant Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Months 1-4</th>
<th>Months 5-8</th>
<th>Months 9-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD Only</td>
<td>$14,138</td>
<td>$10,179</td>
<td>$9,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych Only</td>
<td>$14,770</td>
<td>$12,692</td>
<td>$10,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>$12,718</td>
<td>$9,969</td>
<td>$10,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>$13,695</td>
<td>$11,211</td>
<td>$11,653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2e: T2DM Related Health Care Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Months 1-4</th>
<th>Months 2-8</th>
<th>Months 9-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD Only</td>
<td>$1,996</td>
<td>$1,683</td>
<td>$2,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych Only</td>
<td>$2,746</td>
<td>$1,619</td>
<td>$2,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>$3,676</td>
<td>$1,158</td>
<td>$1,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>$3,226</td>
<td>$3,431</td>
<td>$1,996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Concordant conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>ICD-9-CM Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coronary Artery Disease</td>
<td>410,4100,4101,4102,4103,4104,4105,4106,4107,4108,4109,411,4110,4111,4118,4119,412,4123,413,4130,4131,4139,414,4140,41400,4141,41402,41403,41404,41405,4141,41410,41411,41419,4148,4149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestive Heart Failure</td>
<td>40201,40211,40291,40401,40411,40491,428,4280,4281,4289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrhythmia</td>
<td>423,4232,4231,4232,4238,4239,42731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>431,43301,43311,43321,43331,43381,43391,43401,43411,43491,435,4350,4351,4352,4353,4358,4359,438,4380,4381,43811,43812,4382,4383,4385,43850,43852,43853,4388,43881,43882,43889,4389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral Vascular Disease</td>
<td>2507,4402,44020,44021,44022,44023,44024,44029,4408,4409,4422,4423,443,4430,4431,4438,44381,44389,44422,44481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal</td>
<td>40311,40391,40412,40413,40492,40493,585,586,587,2741,27410,27411,27419,581,5810,5811,5812,5813,5818,5819,582,5820,5821,5822,5824,5828,58281,58289,5829,583,5830,5831,5832,5834,5836,5837,5838,5839,5839,5900,59000,59001,5936,5939,75312,75313,75314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetic Nephropathy</td>
<td>2504,25040,25041,25042,25043,3620,36201,25050,25051,25052,25053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute Renal Failure and Disease</td>
<td>40300,40301,40400,40401,40490,40491,580,5800,5804,5808,58081,5809,5809,5901,59010,59011,5902,5903,5908,59080,59081,59381,866,8660,86600,86601,86602,86603,8661,86610,86611,86612,86613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retinopathy (excludes advanced retinopathy, blindness)</td>
<td>700,68110,68111,6827,7071,73076,73077,25002,25003,25010,25011,25012,25013,25020,25021,25022,25023,25024,25025,25026,25027,25028,25029,25030,25031,25032,25033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discordant Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>ICD-9-CM Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gastro Intestinal Tract Related Disorders:</td>
<td>5301,5302,5303,53081,531,532,533,534,535,536,56211,56213,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERD/Esophagitis</td>
<td>575,576,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peptic ulcers</td>
<td>490,491,492,493,495,496,500,501,502,503,504,505,5064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflammatory Bowel Disease</td>
<td>274,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverticulitis</td>
<td>71905,71915,71925,71935,71945,71955,71965,71975,71985,71995,71997,7205,73314,73315,73342,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gall Bladder disease and stone</td>
<td>720,7213,72142,72210,72252,72273,72283,72293,72402,7242,7243,7244,7245,7246,7247,7248,7249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix A : ICD-9-CM Codes for Identifying Types of Coexisting chronic physical Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>ICD-9-CM Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Osteoarthritis</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arthritis</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheumatoid arthritis</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connective tissue rheumatological disease</td>
<td>7100,7101,7104,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blindness Single Eye</td>
<td>3696,3697,3698,3699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominant Conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Stage Renal Disease</td>
<td>E8791,V51,V56,V560,V5631,V5632,V568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Stage Liver Disease</td>
<td>5722,5723,5724,5728,4560,4561,4562,45620,45621,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blindness Both Eyes/ Advanced Retinopathy</td>
<td>36202,3690,3691,3692,3693,3694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>140,141,142,143,144,145,146,147,148,149,150,151,152,153,154,155,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,174,175,176,177,178,179,180,181,182,183,184,186,187,188,189,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.191,192,193,194,195,196,197,198,199,200,201,202,203,204,205,206,207,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-dementia Cognitive Impairment</td>
<td>294,2941,29283,2949,33183,78093,438,3330,3334,3315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dementia and Related Conditions</td>
<td>2900,29010,29011,29012,29013,2902,29021,2903,29040,29041,29042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.29043,2912,29410,29411,2948,3310,3311,3312,3317,33182,33189,3319,3320,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,0463,0941,29282,3109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Sclerosis</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemiplegia Hemiparesis and Paraplegia</td>
<td>342,3441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinson’s Disease</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscular dystrophy</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinal cord injury</td>
<td>80600,80601,80602,80603,80604,80605,80606,80607,80608,80609,80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61,9520,34400,34401,34402,34403,34404,34409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastroparesis</td>
<td>5363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Secondary Analysis

Adequate depression Treatment during the acute phase: Among those who received depression treatment either with antidepressant or psychotherapy, adequate depression treatment was classified as: (1) Received Adequate Treatment with Antidepressants or Psychotherapy: Based on HEDIS definition adequate antidepressant treatment was defined as receiving 84 or more days of prescription for any antidepressant drug during the first 120 days following the index date of depression diagnosis [1, 2]. Those who received 8 or more sessions of psychotherapy office visits (the minimum length of evidence based psychotherapy treatment for depression and anxiety disorders) [3, 4] during the 120 days of acute phase treatment were considered as having Adequate treatment with psychotherapy. Those who received adequate treatment either with antidepressants or psychotherapy were considered as having received adequate treatment during the acute phase (2) Not Adequate depression Treatment: Individuals who did not receive adequate treatment either with antidepressants or psychotherapy were considered as not being adequately treated.

Unadjusted Association between Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions and Adequate Depression Treatment: Over-all, 56.78% (N=3,007) of the study population received depression treatment with antidepressants and/or psychotherapy. Of these individuals 32.46% received adequate depression treatment; 32.2% of those with dominant conditions (N=451), 34.1% of those with concordant conditions (N=804), 31.7% of those discordant conditions (N=479) and 31.8% of those with both discordant and concordant conditions (N=1,273) received adequate depression treatment. Results of chi-square analysis showed that the association between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and adequate depression treatment was not statistically significant. These results are not presented in tabular form

Adjusted Association between Types of Adequate Depression Treatment and Expenditures: The linear mixed model regression analysis results showed that adequate depression treatment was not associated with total healthcare expenditures. As compared to bot adequate depression treatment, adequate depression treatment was not significantly associated with log transformed T2DM-related healthcare expenditures (beta coefficient: 0.27, standard error: 0.07; p-value <0.0001) Model 1, which did not control for interaction between adequate depression treatment and types of coexisting chronic physical conditions; however the significance disappeared after controlling for the interaction term suggesting that the association between adequate depression treatment and T2DM-related expenditures differed by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions.

Adjusted Association between Types of Adequate Depression Treatment And Expenditures: By Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions: When separate linear mixed model regressions where conducted among each subgroup of types of coexisting chronic physical conditions, no statistically significant association was observed between adequate depression treatment and log transformed total healthcare expenditures.
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Appendix C: IPTW Adjusted Linear Mixed Model Regression on Healthcare Expenditures, Among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in Months</th>
<th>Total Healthcare Expenditure</th>
<th></th>
<th>T2DM-Related Healthcare Expenditure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only antidepressants</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only psychotherapy</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Antidepressants and Psychotherapy</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Month Antidepressant Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Month Psychotherapy Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Coexisting Chronic Physical Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordant Only</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Concordant &amp; Discordant</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discordant Only</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-44 years</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mental Health Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
### Appendix C: IPTW Adjusted Linear Mixed Model Regression on Healthcare Expenditures, Among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression

**Multi-state Medicaid Claims Database – 2000 – 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Healthcare Expenditure</th>
<th>T2DM-Related Healthcare Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Eligibility-Poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Eligibility-Medical Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Eligibility-Waiver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Antidiabetic Drugs (OADs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 OAD</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OAD</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 OAD</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No OAD</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulin Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polypharmacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Hospitalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient Visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quartile</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quartile</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quartile</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quartile</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of T2DM Related Office Visits</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ER Visits</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPSA-Mental Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Appendix C: IPTW Adjusted Linear Mixed Model Regression on Healthcare Expenditures, Among Medicaid Beneficiaries with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus and Newly-diagnosed Depression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Healthcare Expenditure</th>
<th>T2DM-Related Healthcare Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQHC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density Social Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quartile</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quartile</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quartile</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quartile</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with GT 4yr college education &gt; 16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% below poverty level GT 11.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline total healthcare expenditure</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2002</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2003</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2004</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2005</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2006</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2007</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2008</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Asterisks indicate statistical significance and are based on mixed effects models; none i.e. no antidepressant treatment i.e. none as reference group for dependent variable. ***P < .001; **.001 ≤ P < .01; *.01 ≤ P < .05.

Both: Both Antidepressants and Psychotherapy; Neither: Neither antidepressants nor Psychotherapy; SE: Standard Error
CHAPTER 5
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Study Summary

The relationship between types of physical conditions and risk of depression is poorly understood. It is plausible that adults with T2DM and coexisting chronic physical conditions with similar disease management strategies may be at a lower risk for developing depression compared to those with coexisting chronic physical conditions that may require contradicting clinical and self-management strategies. As a majority of individuals with T2DM live with multiple other coexisting physical conditions, it is essential to examine whether individuals with particular types of coexisting physical conditions are at higher risk of developing depression as compared to other groups. In aim 1 of this dissertation, the association of risk of newly-diagnosed depression with types of coexisting physical conditions among adults with T2DM was examined.

Types of coexisting physical conditions were identified based on forty four different physical conditions commonly co-occurring among individuals with T2DM. These conditions were identified as dominant (life threatening severe conditions whose management takes priority over all other coexisting conditions) conditions, concordant (conditions with management or pathophysiology similar to that of T2DM) and discordant (conditions with management or pathophysiology different from that of T2DM). The types of coexisting physical conditions were classified following a hierarchy. Dominant conditions were first identified. Among those without dominant conditions concordant and discordant conditions were grouped. The final classification consisted of: 1) dominant 2) concordant only 3) discordant only and 4) both concordant and discordant conditions.

Depression treatment among adults with T2DM is challenging. Randomized clinical trials have proven that treating depressions helps in relieving depressive symptoms; however, the
effect of treating depression on T2DM outcomes is not clear [1-5]. In addition, antidepressants (one of the main modalities of depression treatment) have been shown to increase the risks of cardiovascular morbidity and mortality [6, 7]. As many adults with T2DM also have coexisting cardiovascular diseases, physicians may be cautious in prescribing antidepressant treatment for adults with T2DM and coexisting chronic physical conditions such as hypertension and heart disease. While there have been studies on depression treatment using collaborative care models, there real-world practices of managing depression among adults with T2DM is not known. Therefore, in aim 2 of this dissertation the association between types of coexisting chronic physical conditions and depression treatment among adults with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression was analyzed.

The economic benefits of treating depression among adults with T2DM have not been studied widely. While randomized controlled trials have demonstrated that depression treatment delivered in collaborative care settings reduced expenditures among individuals with T2DM and coexisting depression, studies not specific to T2DM population and conducted using real world observational data have reported inconsistent findings. Therefore, it remains to be established whether depression treatment with antidepressants and psychotherapy, alone or in combination, are associated with reductions in healthcare expenditures, among individuals with T2DM. Therefore, in aim 3 of this study, whether the relationship between depression treatment and total and type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) -related healthcare care expenditures vary by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions among non-elderly adult Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression was examined.
**Summary of Findings**

One in ten Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM developed depression. The risk of developing depression among those with T2DM varied by types of coexisting conditions; Medicaid beneficiaries with T2DM and dominant conditions and those with both concordant and discordant conditions were at higher risk of developing newly-diagnosed depression. Four in ten individuals in the study population did not receive any treatment for newly-diagnosed depression. Individuals with coexisting chronic physical conditions with dominant conditions were less likely to receive depression treatment with antidepressants. However, among nonelderly adults with T2DM and newly-diagnosed depression, compared to no depression treatment, treating depression produced cost-savings to Medicaid. The results indicated that treating depression with combined antidepressants and psychotherapy may be the best alternative to achieve consistent reduction in expenditures across all types of coexisting chronic physical conditions. For specific modalities of depression treatment cost-reductions would depend on the types of coexisting chronic physical conditions.

**Clinical and policy implications of the findings**

The study findings suggest that to reduce this increased risk of newly-diagnosed depression, those with dominant conditions and combinations of concordant and discordant conditions need to be under constant surveillance. However, in order for surveillance to be effective, in case such individuals get diagnosed with depression, appropriate treatment and follow-up must be provided. Future research may examine specific dominant conditions and combinations of concordant and discordant conditions that may result in high risk of newly diagnosed depression among adults with T2DM.

The low depression treatment rates observed in this study population may suggest that physicians are prioritizing treatment of other coexisting conditions in this study population.
Individuals with both physical (i.e. T2DM, coexisting chronic physical conditions) and mental health (i.e. depression) often have complex health care needs which may not be fully met in traditionally short (often channeled in to 15 minute time slots) primary care visits [8]. Integrating physical and mental healthcare with carefully selected teams having backgrounds in both physical and mental health care delivery may improve quality of depression treatment among such individuals. The novel healthcare delivery models such as Accountable Care Organizations (ACO) and Patient Centered Medical Home (PCMH) created under the 2010 Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, provide options for such integrated care models.

The study results indicated that depression treatment is associated with reduced healthcare expenditures; however the association varies by types of coexisting chronic physical conditions. Such findings have important implications with respect to new payment models for healthcare services such as “bundled payment” and “expenditure benchmarking”. Under bundled payment systems, where only a certain amount of prospective payment is made for episodes of care provided for a condition, while treating depression individuals with T2DM and other coexisting conditions, physicians may want to refrain from initiating depression treatment types which were no better associated with reduced healthcare expenditures as compared to not providing depression treatment all. While setting expenditure benchmarks for individuals with T2DM, newly-diagnosed depression and other coexisting chronic physical conditions, one will need to risk adjust for type of coexisting conditions and types of depression treatment categories.

Unique contribution of the study

(1) Filled a critical knowledge gap: This study provided evidence on the extent to which different types of depression treatments are economically beneficial, in the presence of T2DM and multiple coexisting chronic physical conditions (2) Use of Medicaid Claims data, feasibility
of identifying treatments, longitudinal design: The use of administrative claims data with dates of services made it possible to follow a cohort of patients with T2DM over time and to capture the healthcare experiences of Medicaid beneficiaries across a variety of providers. The study used a comprehensive list of independent variables by merging Medicaid claims data with the county-level data from the AHRF. (3) Use of framework to identify coexisting chronic physical conditions: A pragmatic practice-based theoretical framework was used to identify the numerous coexisting chronic physical conditions into manageable and clinically meaningful categories. (4) Real-world experience: This study was more in line with real world experiences of the patients, the effectiveness of depression treatments were examined among individuals with multiple coexisting chronic physical conditions, a population often not included in clinical trials [9].

Limitations

As administrative claims data can only identify diseases through diagnosis codes, there is the potential for underestimating depression prevalence or incidence because of under-coding of depression. Identifying depression is one of the more difficult problems in administrative data research and perfection may not be attainable. However, claims data contain physician/psychologist diagnoses of depression and offer a particularly attractive alternative to the substantial cost and complications associated with prospective surveys supplemented with medical record data. Additionally, this study included only filled prescriptions and it is not known whether the antidepressants were actually used. This study did not include alternative forms of treatment for depression. The study included fee-for-service Medicaid beneficiaries enrolled three states, thus results might not be generalizable to other populations.
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