Geographic Variation in Rosiglitazone Use Surrounding FDA Warnings in the Department of Veterans Affairs

Vishal Ahuja, PhD; Min-Woong Sohn, PhD; John R. Birge, PhD; Chad Syverson, PhD; Elly Budiman-Mak, MD, MS, MPH; Nicholas Emanuele, MD; Jennifer M. Cooper, MPH; and Elbert S. Huang, MD, MPH

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND: Geographic variation in the use of prescription drugs, particularly those deemed harmful by the FDA, may lead to variation in patient exposure to adverse drug events. One such drug is the glucose-lowering drug rosiglitazone, for which the FDA issued a safety alert on May 21, 2007, following the publication of a meta-analysis that suggested a 43% increase in the risk of myocardial infarction with the use of rosiglitazone. This alert was followed by a black box warning on August 14, 2007, that was updated 3 months later. While large declines have been documented in rosiglitazone use in clinical practice, little is known about how the use of rosiglitazone and other glucose-lowering drugs varied within the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), surrounding the FDA alerts. Understanding this variation within integrated health care systems is essential to formulating policies that enhance patient protection and quality of care.

OBJECTIVE: To document variation in the use of rosiglitazone and other glucose-lowering drugs across 21 Veterans Integrated Service Networks (VISNs).

METHODS: We conducted a retrospective analysis of drug use patterns for all major diabetes drugs in a national cohort of 550,550 veterans with diabetes from 2003 to 2008. This included the time periods when rosiglitazone was added to (November 2003) and removed from (October 2007) the VA national formulary (VANF). We employed multivariable logistic regression models to statistically estimate the association between a patient's location and the patient's odds of using rosiglitazone.

RESULTS: Aggregate rosiglitazone use increased monotonically from 7.7%, in the quarter it was added to the VANF (November 4, 2003), to a peak of 15.3% in the quarter when the FDA issued the safety alert. Rosiglitazone use decreased sharply afterwards, reaching 3.4% by the end of the study period (September 30, 2008). The use of pioglitazone, another glucose-lowering drug in the same class as rosiglitazone, was low when the FDA issued the safety alert (0.4%) but increased sharply afterwards, reaching 3.6% by the end of the study period. Insulin use increased monotonically; metformin use remained relatively flat; and sulfonylurea use exhibited a general declining trend throughout the study period. Statistically significant geographic variation was observed in rosiglitazone use throughout the study period. The prevalence range, defined as the range of minimum to maximum use across VISNs was 3.7%-12.4% in the first quarter (January 1 to March 31, 2003); 1.0%-5.5% in the last quarter of study period (July 1 to September 30, 2008); and reached a peak of 9.6%-25.5% in the quarter when the FDA safety alert was issued (April 1 to March 31, 2007). In 5 VISNs, peak rosiglitazone use occurred before the FDA issued the safety alert. The odds ratio of using rosiglitazone in a given VISN varied from 0.55 (95% CI=0.52-0.59; VISN 10) to 1.58 (95% CI=1.50-1.66; VISN 15), with VISN 1 being the reference region. The variation was higher in the periods after the FDA issued the safety alert. Much less variation was observed in the use of pioglitazone, metformin, sulfonylurea, and insulin.

CONCLUSIONS: Our results show statistically significant variation in the way VISNs within the VA responded to the FDA alerts, suggesting a need for mechanisms that disseminate information and guidelines for drug use in a consistent and reliable manner. Further study of regions that adopted ideal practices earlier may provide lessons for regional leadership and practice culture within integrated health care systems.

J Manag Care Spec Pharm. 2015;21(12):1214-34

Copyright© 2015, Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy. All rights reserved.

What is already known about this subject

- Following the safety alert by the FDA in May 2007 regarding potentially increased risk of myocardial infarction in patients receiving rosiglitazone, substantial declines in rosiglitazone use were observed in clinical practice by as much as 75% overall and as much as 87% within the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA).
- There was substantial regional variation in the use of rosiglitazone following the FDA warnings for the drug outside of the VA.

What this study adds

- This is the first study to document geographic variation in rosiglitazone use within the VA before and after the FDA safety alert.
- Statistically significant regional variation was found in rosiglitazone use throughout the study period, including the time periods when rosiglitazone was added into, and removed from, the VA national formulary. Much less variation was observed in the use of other glucose-lowering drugs.
- Rosiglitazone use decreased sharply following the FDA safety alert (78% in 15 months). During the same period, insulin and pioglitazone use increased, while metformin and sulfonylurea use decreased.

Clinicians face a constant challenge of deciding whether to prescribe newly available medications and when to stop medications based on newly discovered adverse drug effects, particularly when the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) issues warnings.^{1,2} This challenge is heightened for drugs with FDA “boxed” warnings, its strongest labeling requirements for high-risk medicines.¹ Previous research has shown that clinician response to FDA warnings

may be inadequate, which has the potential to jeopardize patient health.^{1,3} Additionally, there may be geographic variation in clinician response to the FDA warnings, implying that patients' locations may determine their extent of exposure to the potential risk of adverse drug events. Understanding this variation is critical to policymakers and health system administrators responsible for communicating guidelines for drug use to their clinicians, particularly in integrated health care systems, where the nature and extent of the observed variation may influence their actions.

One of the landmark examples of a boxed FDA warning is that for the glucose-lowering drug rosiglitazone. On May 21, 2007, the FDA issued a safety alert on rosiglitazone,⁴ following the publication of a meta-analysis that suggested a 43% increase in the risk of myocardial infarction with rosiglitazone.⁵ On August 14, 2007, the FDA issued a boxed warning for the drug that was updated 3 months later.^{6,7} As a result of these warnings, large declines in rosiglitazone prescriptions were observed in clinical practice in the United States.^{3,8-15}

A large body of research, led by The Dartmouth Atlas of Health Care, has documented significant geographic variation in the cost, quantity, and quality of health care in the United States.¹⁶ Within the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), the largest integrated health care system in the United States, studies have documented significant geographic variation in various aspects of patient care and outcomes.¹⁷⁻¹⁹ However, there is relatively limited literature documenting geographic variation in drug use in an integrated health care system such as the VA. One study by Shah et al. (2010) documented significant geographic variation in rosiglitazone prescriptions in a non-VA setting.³

To better understand the geographic variation in rosiglitazone use, we conducted a retrospective analysis of a national cohort of veterans over a 6-year period. The VA is divided into 21 regions, called the Veterans Integrated Service Networks (VISNs). VISNs provide integrated care to veterans based on geographic location and differ by regional leadership and policies, thus providing a useful setting to investigate geographic variation.

The VA can influence the prescribing behavior of its clinicians by adding or removing drugs from its national formulary (VANF); the formulary composition is the same across all VISNs. To prescribe a nonformulary drug, a physician must first make a request, which is reviewed by a pharmacist. If the request is approved, the drug is provided to the patient as part of normal VA care and does not affect patient benefits.²⁰ Rosiglitazone was added to the VANF on November 4, 2003. The VA communicated the FDA alert for rosiglitazone internally on May 21, 2007, the same day it was issued. After an internal investigation, the VA removed rosiglitazone from

the VANF on October 4, 2007, and recommended, through its newsletter, that clinicians discuss the risks and benefits of continued rosiglitazone use with their patients.

We evaluated the use of rosiglitazone and other major glucose-lowering drugs within the VA and documented the geographic differences throughout our study period. We statistically estimated the effect that a patient's VISN had on the odds of using rosiglitazone. To our knowledge, this is the first study that identifies geographic variation in rosiglitazone use in the VA and covers 3 key events: rosiglitazone's addition to the VANF, the FDA safety alert for rosiglitazone, and rosiglitazone's removal from the VANF.

Methods

Data

We constructed a longitudinal dataset over a 6-year period that included the 3 key events already mentioned. Our study cohort consisted of patients from across the 21 VISNs, who were aged 40 years or older on October 1, 2002, and had diabetes. Patients were included if they met 1 of the following 2 criteria: (1) at least one diabetes medication filled between October 1, 2002, and September 30, 2003, and (2) two or more *International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision, Clinical Modification* (ICD-9-CM) diagnostic codes (250.xx) present for inpatient care and outpatient visits between October 1, 2001, and September 30, 2003. This criteria is known to have 93% sensitivity and 98% specificity for identifying diabetes.²¹ Since glucose monitoring is an essential part of diabetes management, our cohort included only those patients for whom hemoglobin A1c (A1c) values were available at baseline. Further, we excluded patients with missing values of enrollment priority, date of death, and patient identifiers, resulting in 550,550 unique patients (Figure 1). We aggregated health care data of all included patients on a quarterly basis, which resulted in 9,829,507 unique patient-quarter observations. A quarter was defined according to a calendar year (e.g., 2003 Q1 = January 1, 2003-March 31, 2003). 2003 Q3 served as the baseline period with 2003 Q4-2008 Q3 serving as the observation period.

Variables

The main outcome variable of interest was a binary indicator of whether a veteran was using rosiglitazone. The key predictor variable was the patient's VISN, determined by where the veteran's primary care provider was located. The current VISN structure was established in March 1995 with a goal to decentralize decision making and provide greater consistency in the quality of care systemwide.²² Appendix A (available in online article) lists all the VISNs, including the larger geographic region in which each VISN is located; we adopted the definition of region from Egede et al. (2011).²³

FIGURE 1 Flowchart of Patient Sample Selection

A1c=hemoglobin A1c; ICD-9-CM=International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision, Clinical Modification.

Covariates and potential risk factors included patient demographics at baseline: age, gender, race, marital status, and enrollment priority. Additionally, we included Charlson Comorbidity Index scores at baseline, as defined by Deyo et al. (1992),²⁴ and the patient's duration of diabetes. Other covariates included the patients' use of other glucose-lowering drugs, their lab results, and whether they experienced any diabetes-related clinical events, including cardiovascular complications, microvascular complications, and hypoglycemia, in the same time period.

The glucose-lowering medications were classified as either injectable (insulin) or oral (metformin, sulfonylurea, pioglitazone, and rosiglitazone). Pioglitazone, belonging to the same thiazolidinedione class of medications as rosiglitazone, was never on the VANF. Metformin, sulfonylurea, and insulin were on the VANF through the entire study period. A patient was considered to be using a drug if the patient possessed at least a 30-day supply of the drug in a given quarter, irrespective of the dosage. The 30-day supply threshold also served as a proxy for medication adherence. Drug use was measured as the percentage of total patients in that VISN and/or time period. All numbers represent the usage at the end of each quarter.

Laboratory results were continuous, time-varying variables and included glucose levels (A1c); triglycerides and cholesterol (high-density lipoprotein, low-density lipoprotein, total); blood pressure (systolic and diastolic); and body mass index. We implemented the "last observation carried forward" method to populate the missing laboratory values and created clinically relevant categorical variables (see Appendix B for ranges and categories, available in online article).²⁵ When multiple values were observed for a given measure in a quarter, we averaged those values.

At the organizational level, we included the facility where the patient's primary care provider was located (719 total) and the facility's parent station (128 total). Facility-level covariates included the number of operating beds and indicators for the following: affiliation with a teaching hospital, urban location, and whether it was a community-based outpatient clinic.

Statistical Analysis

We summarized the baseline characteristics of our cohort, at the VISN and the aggregate VA level, as means $\pm$ standard deviation (SD) and/or percentage of patients. We compared patients' demographic and clinical characteristics as well as overall facility characteristics between the 21 VISNs using analysis of variance. We compared drug use across time periods using a generalized linear model, where we included the first 3 quarters of the calendar year 2003 (2003 Q1-2003 Q3) to show how rosiglitazone's addition to the VANF affected the usage patterns of all glucose-lowering drugs.

We used the following measures to capture variation in the use of drugs: (a) *variation factor*: ratio of maximum to minimum use across all the VISNs and (b) *range*: difference between maximum and minimum use across all the VISNs. We employed a fixed-effects multivariate logistic regression model to statistically estimate the association between patients' location (VISN) and their likelihood of using rosiglitazone, expressed as odds ratio (OR). We conducted this regression analysis for 3 separate time periods: the entire study period (20 quarters), prewarning periods (14 quarters), and postwarning periods (the last 6 quarters). All statistical tests used a two-tailed $\alpha=0.05$ level of

TABLE 1 Baseline Characteristics of Patients and Region by VISN

VISN ^a	All	VISN 1	VISN 2	VISN 3	VISN 4	VISN 5	VISN 6	VISN 7	VISN 8	VISN 9	VISN 10
Region	—	Northeast	Northeast	Northeast	Mid-Atlantic	Mid-Atlantic	Mid-Atlantic	South	South	Mid-Atlantic	Mid-Atlantic
Patient population	550,550	22,240	15,283	23,176	33,429	13,904	27,008	34,355	50,821	26,454	20,644
Patient characteristics											
Male	98.2	98.3	98.2	98.9	98.5	97.9	97.9	98.0	98.4	98.5	98.3
Married	64.9	61.2	63.1	57.9	66.6	56.0	65.9	68.2	69.7	68.1	62.9
Race/ethnicity											
Non-Hispanic white	71.2	86.1	82.7	68.1	80.6	54.1	59.9	59.3	69.9	76.4	77.5
Non-Hispanic black	12.9	4.4	6.5	20.2	9.6	32.2	23.5	27.4	7.6	12.5	12.6
Age, years, mean ± SD	66.9 ± 10.5	68.5 ± 10.2	68 ± 10.6	69.4 ± 10.4	68.6 ± 10.1	66.4 ± 10.8	64.9 ± 10.6	65.0 ± 10.6	68.6 ± 10.2	65.7 ± 10.4	67.5 ± 10.6
< 65	40.1	32.9	35.4	30.0	32.4	41.5	48.0	47.3	32.9	44.9	37.7
65-74	32.3	34.2	32.2	33.5	34.4	31.8	30.4	31.0	34.9	31.6	31.7
≥ 75	27.6	32.9	32.4	36.6	33.2	26.7	21.6	21.7	32.2	23.5	30.5
Diabetes duration, years											
< 3	41.2	38.5	38.0	35.4	43.0	39.8	41.1	39.4	43.3	39.6	46.6
≥ 3	58.8	61.5	62.0	64.6	57.0	60.2	58.9	60.6	56.7	60.4	53.4
Risk factors											
BMI, kg/m ² , mean ± SD	30.9 ± 5.9	31.0 ± 5.7	31.5 ± 5.9	29.9 ± 5.4	31.0 ± 5.8	30.6 ± 5.9	30.8 ± 5.8	30.6 ± 5.8	29.9 ± 5.4	30.7 ± 5.9	31.0 ± 6.0
≥ 25	61.5	52.2	65.9	60.8	63.3	60.2	58.7	65.9	59.0	65.0	70.8
Missing	29.1	40.9	26.1	27.6	27.8	28.9	32.2	22.7	29.8	24.2	18.7
A1c, %, mean ± SD	7.3 ± 1.4	7.1 ± 1.3	7.3 ± 1.3	7.2 ± 1.4	7.1 ± 1.3	7.6 ± 1.6	7.4 ± 1.5	7.3 ± 1.5	7.4 ± 1.4	7.2 ± 1.4	7.4 ± 1.4
≥ 7.0	52.0	48.2	52.6	50.7	47.2	60.0	55.2	51.3	54.4	50.9	56.3
LDL-C, mg/dL, mean ± SD	100.4 ± 31.9	95.8 ± 29.4	99.8 ± 30.3	103.2 ± 30.9	101.9 ± 30.7	105.4 ± 32.4	103.7 ± 32.7	94.1 ± 37.0	99.0 ± 31.0	101.9 ± 32.1	100.2 ± 32.3
≥ 100	32.8	25.3	28.1	45.2	27.0	45.2	38.0	34.8	35.9	35.8	39.3
Missing	30.2	35.9	38.3	10.6	44.0	15.2	25.0	17.7	20.1	26.4	14.1
SBP, mm Hg, mean ± SD	137.3 ± 18.1	135.3 ± 17.4	136.2 ± 17.0	134.2 ± 17.4	137.4 ± 18.3	138.3 ± 18.5	138.6 ± 18.7	138.0 ± 18.3	136.6 ± 17.7	138.2 ± 18.2	138.7 ± 18.7
≥ 140	31.8	25.3	30.0	27.8	33.0	35.7	32.5	34.6	29.8	35.6	37.7
Missing	24.5	34.0	25.1	25.5	21.1	18.7	28.6	20.7	26.8	20.0	15.9
Medication use^b											
Sulfonylureas	49.1	50.2	50.0	49.8	50.2	39.8	48.9	50.2	51.5	51.6	49.0
Metformin	37.0	35.3	30.7	29.9	39.0	22.4	42.1	37.4	35.1	41.8	39.3
Rosiglitazone	7.4	8.4	8.2	7.9	4.3	10.9	5.9	4.5	8.3	6.2	4.8
Pioglitazone	2.7	0.9	0.6	1.2	4.4	0.2	1.9	2.9	4.2	1.3	0.8
Insulin	23.5	21.5	21.5	17.9	21.1	22.4	26.1	25.6	22.6	24.0	23.0
Facility characteristics^c											
Parent station	69.1	72.1	20.6	61.8	86.2	83.1	95.8	80.5	69.6	65.3	56.8
VA medical center	78.3	66.9	75.3	89.4	80.4	90.1	95.8	86.7	72.5	87.3	62.5
Urban location	87.6	69.1	81.7	99.1	79.4	94.8	99.9	87.2	96.8	87.7	85.1
Teaching-affiliated	70.8	73.7	68.4	77.1	65.9	83.1	95.8	75.4	69.6	74.0	56.8
Outpatient beds, n											
< 300	70.5	88.2	93.0	54.8	67.3	65.4	65.2	68.9	54.5	77.7	64.8
≥ 300	29.5	11.8	7.0	45.2	32.7	34.6	34.8	31.1	45.5	22.3	35.2

continued on next page

significance. All standard errors were robust and corrected for clustering at the patient level. All statistical analyses were conducted using Stata version 12 (StataCorp, College Station, TX) and SAS version 9.3 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

Results

Baseline Characteristics

We observed statistically significant differences in patient demographic and clinical characteristics between the

VISNs (Table 1). The average age of the cohort was 66.9 years, ranging from 64.9 years (VISN 17) to 69.4 years (VISN 3). Approximately 13% of the overall cohort was non-Hispanic black, but that fraction ranged from 2.6% (VISN 23) to 32.2% (VISN 5). The average A1c ranged from 7.1% (VISN 4) to 7.6% (VISN 5). Sulfonylurea and metformin were the 2 most frequently prescribed glucose-lowering drugs, with 49.1% and 37% of the total cohort

TABLE 1 Baseline Characteristics of Patients and Region by VISN (continued)

VISN ^a	VISN 11	VISN 12	VISN 15	VISN 16	VISN 17	VISN 18	VISN 19	VISN 20	VISN 21	VISN 22	VISN 23
Region	Midwest	Midwest	Midwest	South	South	West	Midwest	West	West	West	Midwest
Patient population	25,384	24,571	28,383	52,527	27,706	25,284	11,109	13,206	20,086	25,188	29,792
Patient characteristics											
Male	98.2	98.4	98.3	98.1	97.9	97.8	97.7	97.2	97.8	97.9	98.4
Married	63.2	63.1	67.3	67.8	69.0	67.5	64.5	61.8	57.0	52.1	69.4
Race/ethnicity											
Non-Hispanic white	76.7	72.4	76.5	67.5	62.7	70.6	78.3	79.4	63.4	58.6	84.3
Non-Hispanic black	11.9	14.1	9.8	19.3	12.8	4.4	4.1	3.1	11.1	13.6	2.6
Age, years, mean ± SD	67.0±10.5	68.1±10.3	67.1±10.5	65.6±10.4	64.9±10.6	66.5±10.4	66.5±10.6	65.5±10.5	65.9±10.6	65.3±10.5	68.7±10.2
<65	39.2	34.4	39.0	45.8	49.0	42.1	42.7	46.3	45.6	47.2	31.8
65-74	32.0	34.3	32.7	31.1	29.2	31.9	31.2	30.2	30.0	30.6	35.1
≥75	28.8	31.3	28.3	23.2	21.8	26.0	26.2	23.5	24.4	22.2	33.0
Diabetes duration, years											
<3	43.6	45.3	43.6	41.6	40.5	39.5	38.0	34.9	39.4	40.7	43.4
≥3	56.4	54.7	56.4	58.4	59.5	60.5	62.0	65.1	60.6	59.3	56.6
Risk factors											
BMI, kg/m ² , mean ± SD	31.6±6.2	31.2±5.8	31.2±6.1	31.0±5.9	31.2±6.0	30.6±5.9	30.8±6.0	32.0±6.3	31.0±6.1	31.0±6.1	31.5±5.9
≥25	59.6	49.5	63.7	64.4	73.0	59.4	60.1	52.6	63.7	60.4	56.5
Missing	33.0	44.1	27.0	26.0	16.5	30.6	29.9	41.5	26.5	29.7	36.9
A1c, %, mean ± SD	7.3±1.4	7.2±1.3	7.3±1.3	7.4±1.4	7.2±1.4	7.3±1.3	7.4±1.4	7.4±1.3	7.3±1.4	7.2±1.4	7.1±1.3
≥7.0	53.1	50.6	53.9	53.5	46.7	53.2	53.6	56.1	53.3	49.7	47.4
LDL-C, mg/dL, mean ± SD	100.7±31.5	94.4±29.1	112.4±29.7	102.0±31.7	101.6±31.3	98.9±30.4	97.1±31.2	103.1±32.9	102.1±31.7	103.8±32.5	95.6±29.3
≥100	31.1	24.0	26.9	32.0	29.3	37.3	32.1	35.4	37.4	31.4	24.3
Missing	33.4	36.7	57.9	34.8	39.8	17.5	25.0	29.8	22.9	38.3	38.6
SBP, mm Hg, mean ± SD	137.5±18.5	133.6±16.6	137.9±18.4	138.5±18.3	139.7±18.4	138.3±17.7	135.8±17.6	138.3±18.5	136.8±17.5	135.9±17.6	135.5±17.9
≥140	30.6	18.9	34.9	34.9	41.3	31.7	28.5	27.6	31.3	29.6	29.5
Missing	27.2	42.2	20.2	22.0	13.8	27.5	25.4	36.8	23.6	24.0	23.6
Medication use^b											
Sulfonylureas	49.5	49.4	52.7	49.0	46.9	49.2	46.6	48.3	38.9	48.6	50.7
Metformin	41.7	37.5	33.0	33.8	36.8	34.7	40.2	43.9	38.9	42.1	40.9
Rosiglitazone	10.2	4.2	5.6	9.4	5.9	5.9	13.7	9.2	13.6	11.0	4.8
Pioglitazone	4.1	2.3	2.4	3.7	10.0	0.7	0.2	0.8	1.2	0.1	4.1
Insulin	27.3	23.0	24.4	24.1	23.4	24.6	25.4	26.9	21.1	22.8	24.2
Facility characteristics^c											
Parent station	69.7	72.8	32.9	73.6	54.6	85.1	72.4	88.3	62.2	82.6	52.0
VA medical center	77.8	72.8	91.3	75.1	63.9	73.3	72.4	78.7	64.1	82.6	82.7
Urban location	85.8	80.9	83.6	83.7	86.7	88.8	70.5	82.9	94.1	99.2	88.6
Teaching-affiliated	58.4	59.2	81.1	73.7	54.6	85.1	43.9	53.0	54.2	91.2	65.2
Outpatient beds, n											
<300	80.1	54.0	76.1	73.7	31.2	99.6	99.8	89.3	83.5	70.3	73.3
≥300	19.9	46.0	23.9	26.3	68.8	0.4	0.2	10.7	16.5	29.7	26.7

Notes: SI conversion factors: to convert LDL to mmol/L, multiply values by 0.0259.

P<0.001 for all the variables based on one-way analysis of variance.

All reported values are percentage of patients, unless otherwise specified.

^aDetails on VISNs can be found at http://www.va.gov/directory/guide/division_f1sh.asp?dnum=1.

^bA patient could use a single medication or in conjunction with other diabetes medications; the categories are not exclusive.

^cThe percentages represent the number of patients whose primary care facility has these characteristics.

A1c=hemoglobin A1c; BMI=body mass index; kg/m²=kilogram per square meter; LDL-C=low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; mg/dL=milligram per deciliter; mmHg=millimeter of mercury; mmol/L=millimole per liter; SBP=systolic blood pressure; SD=standard deviation; SI=International System of Units; VA=U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs; VISN=Veterans Integrated Service Network.

using the drugs, respectively. Thirty percent of our cohort belonged to the VISNs in the South region. On average, the annual mortality rate of our cohort was 5.2%, consistent with previous literature.²⁶

Patterns of Medication Usage: Temporal Trend

Figure 2 shows the usage patterns for various diabetes drugs at the aggregate national level. Unless otherwise noted, P<0.0001.

FIGURE 2 Aggregate Use of Various Glucose-Lowering Medications as a Percentage of Total Population

Note: Data were aggregated at the quarterly level and included only patients who survived up to that quarter. The 3 vertical lines represent the quarter in which (1) left (2003 Q4): rosiglitazone was made available in the VANF; (2) middle (2007 Q2): FDA issued a safety alert related to rosiglitazone; and (3) right (2007 Q4): rosiglitazone was removed from the VANF.

FDA=U.S. Food and Drug Administration; Q=quarter; VANF=Veterans Affairs national formulary.

Aggregate rosiglitazone use increased from 7.7% ($n=42,477$) in 2003 Q4, when it was added to the VANF, to a peak of 15.3% ($n=70,598$) in 2007 Q2, when the FDA issued the safety alert. Rosiglitazone use decreased afterwards, reaching 10.3% ($n=45,934$), when it was removed from the VANF (2007 Q4). The rate of decrease in rosiglitazone use accelerated subsequently, reaching 3.4% ($n=14,321$) by the end (2008 Q3), a 78% reduction in 15 months following the FDA safety alert.

The use of pioglitazone, which was never on the VANF, remained low throughout the observation period. After an initial increase (from 2.3% to 2.9% in the first 3 quarters), pioglitazone use started to decrease, reaching 0.4% in 2007 Q2. However, in the time periods following rosiglitazone's removal from the VANF, pioglitazone use increased rapidly, reaching 3.6% by the end of the study period.

The use of other 3 drugs (metformin, sulfonylurea, and insulin) increased for the first 3 quarters until rosiglitazone was added to the VANF (2007 Q2). However, the trend was different in the following periods. Metformin use remained relatively stable, increasing by 1.2% during the time when

rosiglitazone was on the VANF (37.4% in 2003 Q4 to 37.8% in 2007 Q2) but decreasing 2.5% afterwards. Comparatively, sulfonylurea use exhibited an overall declining trend, going from a high of 49.7% in 2003 Q4 to 44.9% in 2007 Q2 and 41.7% in 2008 Q3, an overall decline of 16.1%. Insulin use, on the other hand, increased monotonically throughout, ranging from 24.1% in 2003 Q4, to 29.5% in 2007 Q2, and 32.8% in 2008 Q3. This implies an overall increase of 36.2% in insulin use and a particularly steep increase of 11.5% in the 15 months following rosiglitazone's removal from the VANF.

Patterns of Medication Usage: Geographic Variation

There were differences in rosiglitazone use between the VISNs throughout the study period (Table 2 and Appendix C, available in online article). At the time of its addition to the VANF (2003 Q4), rosiglitazone use ranged from 4.4% (VISN 4, Mid-Atlantic) to 14.5% (VISN 19, Midwest), a variation factor of 3.3. In 2007 Q2, when the FDA issued the safety alert, VISN 23 (Midwest) and VISN 17 (South) had the lowest (9.6%) and highest (25.5%) levels of use, respectively (variation

TABLE 2 Geographic Variation in the Use of Various Glucose-Lowering Drugs

		2003 Q4 (%)	2004 Q4 (%)	2005 Q4 (%)	2007 Q2 (%)	2007 Q4 (%)	2008 Q3 (%)
Rosiglitazone	Maximum	14.5	17.5	21.6	25.5	17.8	5.5
	25th percentile	9.5	12.7	16.3	16.8	11.8	4.1
	Median	8.0	10.5	12.3	13.3	9.2	3.4
	75th percentile	6.0	9.2	11.1	11.8	8.0	2.6
	Minimum	4.4	6.9	8.8	9.6	6.6	1.0
Pioglitazone	Maximum	11.6	14.0	2.9	1.1	2.8	6.8
	25th percentile	3.9	1.2	0.9	0.5	1.0	4.2
	Median	1.6	0.9	0.4	0.3	0.9	3.2
	75th percentile	0.8	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.7	3.0
	Minimum	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.8
Metformin	Maximum	44.3	44.3	44.9	44.8	44.3	43.1
	25th percentile	41.1	40.8	40.9	40.2	39.4	38.5
	Median	37.5	36.8	37.3	38.3	38.0	37.8
	75th percentile	35.1	34.8	34.4	36.1	36.2	35.5
	Minimum	24.4	27.5	28.5	29.7	29.8	29.6
Sulfonylurea	Maximum	54.8	53.2	51.6	47.5	46.1	44.3
	25th percentile	50.6	49.6	48.6	46.2	45.1	43.4
	Median	50.1	48.8	47.6	44.5	43.2	41.1
	75th percentile	48.1	48.2	46.8	43.6	42.4	40.7
	Minimum	39.4	37.0	39.6	41.1	40.1	38.3
Insulin	Maximum	28.1	30.4	32.8	36.4	37.6	39.5
	25th percentile	25.2	27.1	29.1	31.4	32.6	34.8
	Median	24.1	25.9	27.1	29.6	30.9	33.3
	75th percentile	22.5	24.3	25.5	27.5	28.4	30.6
	Minimum	18.5	19.3	20.6	21.5	22.4	23.7

Note: Key time periods: (a) 2003 Q4: rosiglitazone was made available in the VAMF; (b) 2007 Q2: the FDA issued a safety alert related to rosiglitazone; (c) 2007 Q4: rosiglitazone was removed from the VAMF; and (d) 2008 Q3: end of study period.

FDA=U.S. Food and Drug Administration; Q=quarter; VAMF=Veterans Affairs national formulary.

factor=2.7). The variation factor increased rapidly afterwards, reaching 5.4 by the end of the study period. In contrast, the range of rosiglitazone use remained steady until 2005 Q2, when it was 9.6%, increased afterwards to a peak of 16%, but decreased to 4.5% in the end.

There were geographic differences in the timing of peak use in each VISN. For example, in VISN 11 (Midwest), rosiglitazone use reached a peak use of 17.5% in 2004 Q4. In contrast, in VISN 17 (South), rosiglitazone use remained low until 2005 Q2 but then increased sharply, from 9.1% to a peak of 25.5% in 2007 Q2. The lowest level of peak use occurred in VISN 23 (Midwest), at 9.6%, which was also one of the VISNs where rosiglitazone use was consistently low. There were 5 VISNs in which peak rosiglitazone use occurred before the FDA issued the safety alert: VISN 5 (2003 Q2, $P=0.022$, Mid-Atlantic); VISN 7 (2006 Q4, $P=0.007$, South); VISN 11 (2004 Q4, $P\leq 0.0001$, Midwest); VISN 16 (2007 Q1, $P=0.007$, South); and VISN 19 (2005 Q4, $P=0.023$, Midwest).

Some variation was observed in pioglitazone use, particularly during the periods when rosiglitazone was not in the VAMF; however, the results should be tempered by the fact that, in absolute terms, pioglitazone use remained relatively low, except for VISN 17, a region where we observed the following interesting features. First, pioglitazone use in VISN 17 was very high until 2005 Q4; for example, in 2005 Q2, pioglitazone use was almost 8 times the maximum use across the rest of the VISNs. Second, the timing of the decline in pioglitazone use coincided with that of the rise in rosiglitazone use. Finally, total thiazolidinedione use was the highest in VISN 17 before the FDA issued the safety alert. Metformin, sulfonylurea, and insulin use exhibited relatively less variation. Table 2 lists the use of various drugs, expressed in terms of quartiles: maximum, first (25th percentile), second (median), third (75th percentile), minimum. Appendix D (available in online article) visually depicts the pattern of drug use by each VISN.

Estimating the Region Effect

We found statistically significant geographic variation in rosiglitazone use after controlling for all observable covariates (Table 3 and Appendix E, available in online article). With VISN 1 serving as the reference region, the odds ratio (OR) varied from 0.55 (95% confidence interval [CI]=0.52-0.59; VISN 10, Mid-Atlantic) to 1.58 (95% CI=1.50-1.66; VISN 15, Midwest). The postwarning periods exhibited a higher variation (OR range: 0.50-1.67) compared with prewarning periods (OR range: 0.57-1.55). Overall, patients located in the South region (VISNs 7, 8, 16, and 17) were most likely to use rosiglitazone. Further, ORs for VISNs in the South region decreased the most, on average, from pre- to postwarning period. In absolute terms, the OR decreased from pre- to postwarning periods for all but 5 VISNs: 2 (Northeast), 4 (Mid-Atlantic), 15 (Midwest), 18 (West), and 23 (Midwest). A complete list of variables and the ORs (with 95% CIs) can be found in Appendix F (available in online article).

For sensitivity analysis, we changed the threshold level of days supply employed for classifying whether a patient is a user of the drug from 30 days to 45 days and 60 days. The regression results for the entire observation period (Appendix G, available in online article) reveal that ORs did not change in any meaningful way, regardless of which threshold level was used. In addition, we conducted an analysis where we used a 30-day equivalent as an alternate measure of drug use. This means that instead of drug use being a binary variable, it was a categorical variable with 4 values, -0, 1, 2, and 3, depending on whether the days supply for a drug was 0 days, 1-29 days, 30-59 days, or greater than 60 days, respectively, in a given quarter.²⁷ In general, we observed similar results in terms of the absolute values as well as ordering of VISNs based on ORs (Appendix H, available in online article).

TABLE 3 Odds Ratios (95% CIs) Representing the Odds of a Veteran with Type 2 Diabetes Receiving a Rosiglitazone Prescription

VISN	All Time Periods 2003 Q4-2008 Q3		Prewarning Period 2003 Q4-2007 Q1		Postwarning Period 2007 Q2-2008 Q3	
1 (reference)	1.00		1.00		1.00	
2	0.92 ^a	(0.86-0.98)	0.89 ^b	(0.83-0.95)	0.98	(0.90-1.05)
3	0.87 ^b	(0.83-0.92)	0.96	(0.91-1.02)	0.63 ^b	(0.59-0.67)
4	0.84 ^b	(0.80-0.89)	0.83 ^b	(0.78-0.87)	0.88 ^b	(0.83-0.93)
5	0.82 ^b	(0.77-0.88)	0.87 ^b	(0.82-0.93)	0.68 ^b	(0.63-0.74)
6	0.68 ^b	(0.65-0.72)	0.70 ^b	(0.66-0.74)	0.65 ^b	(0.61-0.69)
7	0.93 ^a	(0.88-0.97)	1.01	(0.96-1.06)	0.72 ^b	(0.68-0.77)
8	1.43 ^b	(1.36-1.49)	1.49 ^b	(1.42-1.56)	1.28 ^b	(1.21-1.35)
9	0.82 ^b	(0.78-0.86)	0.82 ^b	(0.78-0.87)	0.82 ^b	(0.77-0.88)
10	0.55 ^b	(0.52-0.59)	0.57 ^b	(0.53-0.61)	0.50 ^b	(0.46-0.54)
11	0.80 ^b	(0.76-0.84)	0.91 ^b	(0.86-0.96)	0.52 ^b	(0.48-0.56)
12	0.80 ^b	(0.75-0.84)	0.82 ^b	(0.77-0.86)	0.73 ^b	(0.68-0.78)
15	1.58 ^b	(1.50-1.66)	1.55 ^b	(1.46-1.63)	1.67 ^b	(1.57-1.78)
16	1.29 ^b	(1.23-1.34)	1.32 ^b	(1.26-1.38)	1.19 ^b	(1.13-1.25)
17	1.35 ^b	(1.29-1.42)	1.43 ^b	(1.36-1.51)	1.25 ^b	(1.18-1.33)
18	0.68 ^b	(0.65-0.72)	0.68 ^b	(0.64-0.72)	0.69 ^b	(0.65-0.74)
19	1.16 ^b	(1.09-1.24)	1.28 ^b	(1.20-1.37)	0.83 ^b	(0.77-0.90)
20	0.60 ^b	(0.56-0.64)	0.61 ^b	(0.57-0.65)	0.58 ^b	(0.54-0.63)
21	1.51 ^b	(1.43-1.59)	1.55 ^b	(1.47-1.63)	1.39 ^b	(1.31-1.48)
22	1.18 ^b	(1.13-1.25)	1.21 ^b	(1.15-1.28)	1.10 ^a	(1.03-1.17)
23	0.58 ^b	(0.55-0.61)	0.57 ^b	(0.54-0.61)	0.60 ^b	(0.56-0.65)
Observations, n	7,626,779		5,245,146		2,381,633	
Pseudo R ²	0.105		0.0919		0.134	

Notes: The F-test for the joint significance of all the coefficients resulted in $P < 0.0001$.

All standard errors are robust and standard errors are clustered at the individual patient level.

The multivariate regression includes controls for demographics and clinical characteristics of a patient, the characteristics of the patient's primary care facility, and time dummies.

Similar results were found when individual-level random effect was included; the correlation between coefficients obtained from the 2 sets of regression was 0.98.

^a $P < 0.01$.

^b $P < 0.001$.

CI = confidence interval; VISN = Veterans Integrated Service Network.

Discussion

Aggregate rosiglitazone use in the VA declined by 78% in the 15 months following the FDA safety alert for the drug, indicating a swift response by the VA clinicians and highlighting the potential strength of the mechanisms through which the VA communicates FDA warnings to its clinicians. This response is similar to previously published studies in a non-VA setting, most notably to that of Shah et al., who reported a 75% decline in monthly rosiglitazone prescriptions dispensed in 30 months following the FDA alert.³ The increase in pioglitazone and insulin use following the FDA alert suggests that the VA clinicians used them as alternatives to rosiglitazone.

We found considerable geographic variation in rosiglitazone use throughout the study period. The two-fold increase in the variation factor from 2007 Q2 to 2008 Q3 is higher than what an earlier study of non-VA data reported and more than

what was observed for metformin, sulfonylureas, and insulin.³ Further, this variation persisted after controlling for patient- and facility-level covariates that may be associated with rosiglitazone prescriptions. Our regression analysis revealed that the patient's VISN significantly, and differentially, affected the odds of using rosiglitazone. While the geographic variation, in terms of the variation factor and odds ratio, increased after the FDA warnings, our conclusions should be tempered by the fact that the range, as well as the actual rosiglitazone use, decreased substantially after the FDA warnings.

In the United States, where large geographic differences in incidence of diabetes, glycemic control, and medication adherence exist, geographic variation in drug use may not be surprising.^{23,28-30} This variation has been attributed to clinicians' practice styles and how they translate FDA warnings into practice.^{3,11} Within the VA, we expected less variation in drug use given that the VA has a closed pharmacy and a national

formulary used across all VISNs, a relatively homogeneous population with well-established eligibility criteria for veterans and a physician workforce that is salaried with financial incentives that are unaffected by practice patterns. Moreover, many administrative policies are uniform across all VISNs, and adherence to clinical guidelines and VA policy are frequently used as facility performance indicators.

We believe that some of the variation may be explained by local practice patterns that spill over to the VA, since (a) many VA clinicians practice outside of the VA (e.g., those affiliated with teaching hospitals) and may behave similar to non-VA clinicians,^{17,31} and (b) veterans who receive the initial prescription from the non-VA clinicians may get it subsequently refilled from a VA clinician.³¹ For rosiglitazone, which exhibited a persistently high variation, more than that of other drugs, there may be other contributing factors. First, some physicians may have continued to prescribe rosiglitazone to their patients for whom they thought the benefits outweighed the added potential risk. Moreover, since the decision to discontinue rosiglitazone may come from either the patient or the physician,³² patients may have decided to discontinue rosiglitazone at different times. It must be noted that the boxed warning did not explicitly prohibit the use of rosiglitazone. Second, the increased role of the pharmacist has been linked to better prescribing behavior of doctors.^{33,34} In this instance, pharmacists may have been better integrated to clinical practice in some VISNs than in others, which may have led to some variation. Finally, many patients, particularly those with stable diabetes and/or those living in rural areas, may visit their clinicians infrequently (e.g., twice a year) and have their medications mailed to them for use between visits, leading to the variation in when they stopped using rosiglitazone. We note that the fraction of people living in rural areas ranged from 0.1% (VISN 1) to 30.9% (VISN 6).

Our analysis reveals other interesting patterns. In 5 VISNs, peak rosiglitazone use occurred before the FDA issued the safety alert, suggesting that some clinicians may have learned about the harmful effects of rosiglitazone earlier than others. For example, VISN 11, where rosiglitazone use started to decline the earliest, is also the location of the VA Diabetes Quality Enhancement Research Initiative, whose mission is to conduct translational research to improve diabetes care.³⁵ Presumably, geographic proximity to information sources allows clinicians to have quicker access to relevant information.^{3,36} Finally, VISN 10, where the likelihood of rosiglitazone use was the lowest, is home to Cleveland Clinic, the affiliation of the authors of the 2007 study that linked rosiglitazone to an increased myocardial infarction risk.⁵

Limitations

Our study has several limitations. First, our data were restricted to the VA and did not include prescriptions or services that patients may have obtained from outside of the VA. The cost of medications is lower in the VA than in the private sector. Therefore, it is quite likely that most veterans obtained their diabetes medications from the VA; consequently, we estimate the effect of omitting non-VA data to be relatively small. Further, the overwhelming majority of our cohort was male (98.2%) and non-Hispanic white (71.2%). While this may not be fully representative of the true composition of diabetes patients, we believe that the policy implications from our results are still valid. Second, we aggregated our data into quarters, which prevented us from analyzing trends at a more granular level. Third, our findings may have been impacted by the rules we used to identify whether a patient is using a medication. As previously discussed, our sensitivity analyses on different rules show this effect to be minimal. Fourth, patients whose primary care facilities were located in rural locations may have lacked access to appropriate and evidence-based medical care, contributing to the observed geographic variation. However, our results do not change in any meaningful way when we limit the data to patients whose primary care facilities were in urban locations (Appendix I, available in online article). Fifth, we did not compare active versus passive dissemination of FDA advisories, which may evoke a different clinician response; we leave this for future study. Finally, we did not explore or analyze causes of variation, for example, why pioglitazone (rosiglitazone) was high (low) in VISN 17. We also leave this as future work.

Conclusions

In examining the largest health care system in the United States, our study strengthens the argument that local practice patterns of care affect how clinicians learn and translate the FDA warnings into practice, given the significant geographic variation observed. From a policy perspective, our study highlights the need for mechanisms to disseminate information and guidelines for drug use in a consistent and reliable manner and ensure a systemwide clinical adherence to FDA warnings noted to be of utmost importance for patient safety.³⁷ Finally, our study reveals opportunities for learning from high-performing divisions of the system to increase the overall efficiency. This has the potential to reduce the geographic variation in clinician response and ultimately improve the timeliness and quality of patient care.

Authors

VISHAL AHUJA, PhD, is Assistant Professor of Operations Management, Cox School of Business, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas, and Research Associate, Center of Innovation for Complex Chronic Healthcare, Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital, Hines, Illinois. MIN-WOONG SOHN, PhD, is Associate Professor of Public Health Sciences, University of Virginia School of Medicine, Charlottesville, and Research Associate, Center of Innovation for Complex Chronic Healthcare, Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital, Hines, Illinois. JOHN R. BIRGE, PhD, is Jerry W. and Carol Lee Levin Professor of Operations Management, and CHAD SYVERSON, PhD, is J. Baum Harris Professor of Economics, Booth School of Business, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois. ELLY BUDIMAN-MAK, MD, MS, MPH, is Professor Emeritus, Department of Medicine/ Rheumatology, Stritch School of Medicine, Loyola University, Maywood, Illinois, and Research Consultant, Center of Innovation for Complex Chronic Healthcare, Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital, Hines, Illinois. NICHOLAS EMANUELE, MD, is Professor of Medicine, Division of Endocrinology and Metabolism, Loyola University Medical Center, Maywood, Illinois, and Chief, Section of Endocrinology, Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital, Hines, Illinois. JENNIFER M. COOPER, MPH, is Research Project Manager, Department of Medicine, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, and Research Associate, Center of Innovation for Complex Chronic Healthcare, Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital, Hines, Illinois. ELBERT S. HUANG, MD, MPH, is Associate Professor, Department of Medicine, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, and Research Associate, Center of Innovation for Complex Chronic Healthcare, Edward Hines, Jr. VA Hospital, Hines, Illinois.

AUTHOR CORRESPONDENCE: Vishal Ahuja, PhD, Cox School of Business, Southern Methodist University, P.O. Box 750333, Dallas, TX 75275-0333. Tel.: 214.768.3145; Fax: 214.768.4099; E-mail: vahuja@smu.edu.

All authors were involved in drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content. Ahuja and Huang supervised the study and had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. Ahuja drafted the manuscript and conducted statistical analysis. Ahuja, Huang, Sohn, and Syverson were involved in study concept and design. Ahuja, Huang, Sohn, Budiman-Mak, and Emanuele were involved in acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Brian Bartle for assistance with data collection and Francesca Cunningham and Donald Lynx for their helpful perspectives.

REFERENCES

- Wagner AK, Chan KA, Dashevsky I, et al. FDA drug prescribing warnings: is the black box half empty or half full? *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf*. 2006;15(6):369-86.
- Dusetzina SB, Higashi AS, Dorsey ER, et al. Impact of FDA drug risk communications on health care utilization and health behaviors: a systematic review. *Med Care*. 2012;50(6):466-78.
- Shah ND, Montori VM, Krumholz HM, Tu K, Alexander GC, Jackevicius CA. Responding to an FDA warning—geographic variation in the use of rosiglitazone. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;363(22):2081-84.
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration. FDA issues safety alert on Avandia. May 21, 2007. Available at: <http://www.fda.gov/NewsEvents/Newsroom/PressAnnouncements/2007/ucm108917.htm>. Accessed October 19, 2015.
- Nissen SE, Wolski K. Effect of rosiglitazone on the risk of myocardial infarction and death from cardiovascular causes. *N Engl J Med*. 2007;356(24):2457-71.
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Postmarket drug safety information for patients and providers. Information for healthcare professionals rosiglitazone maleate (marketed as Avandia, Avandamet, and Avandaryl). Page updated August 22, 2013. Available at: <http://www.fda.gov/Drugs/DrugSafety/PostmarketDrugSafetyInformationforPatientsandProviders/ucm143406.htm>. Accessed October 19, 2015.
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration. FDA adds boxed warning for heart-related risks to anti-diabetes drug Avandia. November 14, 2007. Available at: <http://www.fda.gov/NewsEvents/Newsroom/PressAnnouncements/2007/ucm109026.htm>. Accessed October 19, 2015.
- Starner CI, Schafer JA, Heaton AH, Gleason PP. Rosiglitazone and pioglitazone utilization from January 2007 through May 2008 associated with five risk-warning events. *J Manag Care Pharm*. 2008;14(6):523-31. Available at: http://www.amcp.org/data/jmcp/JMCPMaga_523-531.pdf.
- Stewart KA, Natzke BM, Williams T, Granger E, Casscells SW, Croghan TW. Temporal trends in anti-diabetes drug use in tri-care following safety warnings in 2007 about rosiglitazone. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf*. 2009;18(11):1048-52.
- Cohen A, Rabbani A, Shah N, Alexander GC. Changes in glitazone use among office-based physicians in the U.S., 2003-2009. *Diabetes Care*. 2010;33(4):823-25.
- Hurren KM, Taylor TN, Jaber LA. Antidiabetic prescribing trends and predictors of thiazolidinedione discontinuation following the 2007 rosiglitazone safety alert. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract*. 2011;93(1):49-55.
- Shi L, Zhao Y, Szymanski K, Yau L, Fonseca V. Impact of thiazolidinedione safety warnings on medication use patterns and glycemic control among veterans with diabetes mellitus. *J Diabetes Complications*. 2011;25(3):143-50.
- Jain R, Mullins CD, Lee H, Wong W. Use of rosiglitazone and pioglitazone immediately after the cardiovascular risk warnings. *Res Soc Adm Pharm*. 2012;8(1):47-59.

DISCLOSURES

This research was supported by funding from the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Health Services Research and Development (HSR&D) Service (LIP 42-089), the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ, RO1HS018542), the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (P30DK092949), and the National Institute on Aging (T32AG000243; P30AG012857). This article presents the findings and conclusions of the authors; it does not necessarily represent the Department of Veterans Affairs or HSR&D Service, the AHRQ, or the NIH. This study received approval from the Department of Veterans Affairs (Hines) and the University of Chicago institutional review boards.

The U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Health Services Research and Development Service, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, and the National Institute on Aging had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; or design to submit the manuscript for publication. The authors report no conflicts of interest.

Parts of this study were presented at the 36th Annual North American Meeting of Society for Medical Decision Making; Miami, Florida; October 18-22, 2014.

14. Ross JS, Jackevicius C, Krumholz HM, et al. State Medicaid programs did not make use of prior authorization to promote safer prescribing after rosiglitazone warning. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2012;31(1):188-98.
15. Aspinall S, Zhao X, Good C, Stone R, Smith K, Cunningham F. FDA warning and removal of rosiglitazone from VA national formulary. *Am J Manag Care*. 2013;19(9):748-58.
16. Wennberg JE, Cooper MM. *The Dartmouth Atlas of Health Care*. Chicago, IL: American Hospital Publishing; 1996.
17. Ashton CM, Petersen NJ, Soucek J, et al. Geographic variations in utilization rates in Veterans Affairs hospitals and clinics. *N Engl J Med*. 1999;340(1):32-39.
18. Subramanian U, Weinberger M, Eckert GJ, L'Italien GJ, Lapuerta P, Tierney W. Geographic variation in health care utilization and outcomes in veterans with acute myocardial infarction. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2002;17(8):604-11.
19. Joo MJ, Lee TA, Weiss KB. Geographic variation of spirometry use in newly diagnosed COPD. *Chest*. 2008;134(1):38-45.
20. U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. Pharmacy benefits management services. VA national formulary. Available at: <http://www.pbm.va.gov/nationalformulary.asp>. Accessed October 19, 2015.
21. Miller DR, Safford MM, Pogach LM. Who has diabetes? Best estimates of diabetes prevalence in the Department of Veterans Affairs based on computerized patient data. *Diabetes Care*. 2004;27(Suppl 2):B10-21.
22. Kizer KW. *Vision for Change: A Plan to Restructure the Veterans Health Administration*. Washington, DC: Department of Veterans Affairs; 1995.
23. Egede LE, Gebregziabher M, Hunt KJ, et al. Regional, geographic, and racial/ethnic variation in glycemic control in a national sample of veterans with diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. 2011;34(4):938-43.
24. Deyo RA, Cherkin DC, Ciol MA. Adapting a clinical comorbidity index for use with ICD-9-CM administrative databases. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 1992;45(6):613-19.
25. Rosenstock J, Rood J, Cobitz A, Huang C, Garber A. Improvement in glycaemic control with rosiglitazone/metformin fixed-dose combination therapy in patients with type 2 diabetes with very poor glycaemic control. *Diabetes Obes Metab*. 2006;8(6):643-49.
26. Young BA, Maynard C, Boyko EJ. Racial differences in diabetic nephropathy, cardiovascular disease, and mortality in a national population of veterans. *Diabetes Care*. 2003;26(8):2392-99.
27. Stroupe KT, Smith BM, Lee TA, et al. Effect of increased copayments on pharmacy use in the Department of Veterans Affairs. *Med Care*. 2007;45(11):1090-97.
28. Egede LE, Gebregziabher M, Hunt KJ, et al. Regional, geographic, and ethnic differences in medication adherence among adults with type 2 diabetes. *Ann Pharmacother*. 2011;45(2):169-78.
29. Voeks JH, McClure LA, Go RC, et al. Regional differences in diabetes as a possible contributor to the geographic disparity in stroke mortality: the Reasons for Geographic And Racial Differences in Stroke Study. *Stroke*. 2008;39(6):1675-80.
30. Couto JE, Panchal JM, Lal LS, et al. Geographic variation in medication adherence in commercial and Medicare Part D populations. *J Manag Care & Spec Pharm*. 2014;20(8):834-42. Available at: <http://www.amcp.org/JMCP/2014/August/18388/1033.html>.
31. Gellad WF, Good CB, Lowe JC, Donohue JM. Variation in prescription use and spending for lipid-lowering and diabetes medications in the Veterans Affairs Healthcare System. *Am J Manag Care*. 2010;16(10):741-50.
32. Orrico KB, Lin JK, Wei A, Yue H. Clinical consequences of disseminating the rosiglitazone FDA safety warning. *Am J Manag Care*. 2010;16(5):e111-16.
33. Lipton HL, Bero LA, Bird JA, McPhee SJ. The impact of clinical pharmacists' consultations on physicians' geriatric drug prescribing: a randomized controlled trial. *Med Care*. 1992;30(7):646-58.
34. Grol R, Grimshaw J. From best evidence to best practice: effective implementation of change in patients' care. *Lancet*. 2003;362(9391):1225-30.
35. Krein SL, Hayward RA, Pogach L, BootsMiller BJ. Department of Veterans Affairs' quality enhancement research initiative for diabetes mellitus. *Med Care*. 2000;38(6 Suppl 1):138-148.
36. Nair HS, Manchanda P, Bhatia T. Asymmetric social interactions in physician prescription behavior: The role of opinion leaders. *J Mark Res*. 2010;47(5):883-95.
37. Brown MT, Bussell JK. Medication adherence: WHO cares? *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2011;86(4):304-14.

APPENDIX A List of Veterans Integrated Service Networks (VISNs)

VISN	Geographical Region	Description
1	Northeast	VA New England Healthcare System
2	Northeast	VA Health Care Upstate New York
3	Northeast	VA NY/NJ Veterans Healthcare Network
4	Mid-Atlantic	VA Stars & Stripes Healthcare Network
5	Mid-Atlantic	VA Capitol Health Care Network
6	Mid-Atlantic	VA Mid-Atlantic Health Care Network
7	South	The Southeast Network
8	South	VA Sunshine Healthcare Network
9	Mid-Atlantic	VA Mid South Healthcare Network
10	Mid-Atlantic	VA Healthcare System of Ohio
11	Midwest	Veterans In Partnership
12	Midwest	VA Great Lakes Health Care System
15	Midwest	VA Heartland Network
16	South	South Central VA Health Care Network
17	South	VA Heart of Texas Health Care Network
18	West	VA Southwest Health Care Network
19	Midwest	Rocky Mountain Network
20	West	Northwest Network
21	West	Sierra Pacific Network
22	West	Desert Pacific Healthcare Network
23	Midwest	VA Midwest Health Care Network

VA = Veterans Affairs.

APPENDIX B Range and Categories for Various Measures of Laboratory Data

Measure	Range	Categories
BMI, kg/m ²	10-70	BMI < 18.5
		18.5 ≤ BMI < 25
		25 ≤ BMI < 30
		30 ≤ BMI < 35
		35 ≤ BMI < 40
A1c, %	3-20	BMI ≥ 40
		A1c < 6
		6 ≤ A1c < 7
		7 ≤ A1c < 8
		8 ≤ A1c < 9
LDL, mg/dL	20-300	A1c ≥ 9
		LDL < 70
		70 ≤ LDL < 100
		100 ≤ LDL < 160
		130 ≤ LDL < 160
HDL, mg/dL	20-200	160 ≤ LDL < 190
		LDL ≥ 190
		HDL < 40
TCH, mg/dL	50-500	40 ≤ HDL < 60
		HDL ≥ 60
		TCH < 200
TGL, mg/dL	20-800	200 ≤ TCH < 240
		TCH ≥ 240
		TGL < 150
		150 ≤ TGL < 200
SBP, mm Hg	30-300	200 ≤ TGL < 500
		TGL ≥ 500
		SBP < 120
		120 ≤ SBP < 140
DBP, mm Hg	20-250	140 ≤ SBP < 160
		SBP ≥ 160
		DBP < 80
		80 ≤ DBP < 90
		90 ≤ DBP < 100
		DBP ≥ 100

A1c = hemoglobin A1c; BMI = body mass index; DBP = diastolic blood pressure; HDL = high-density lipoprotein; kg/m² = kilogram per square meter; LDL = low-density lipoprotein; mg/dL = milligram per deciliter; mm Hg = millimeter per mercury; SBP = systolic blood pressure; TCH = total cholesterol; TGL = triglycerides.

APPENDIX C Rosiglitazone Use as a Percentage of Total Population Within Each VISN

Note: Data is aggregated at the quarterly level and includes only patients who survived up to that quarter. The 3 vertical lines represent the quarter in which (1) left (2003 Q4): rosiglitazone was made available in the VANF; (2) middle (2007 Q2): the FDA issued a safety alert related to rosiglitazone; and (3) right (2007 Q4): rosiglitazone was removed from the VANF.

FDA=U.S. Food and Drug Administration; Q=quarterly; VANF=Veterans Affairs national formulary; VISN=Veterans Integrated Service Network.

APPENDIX D Pioglitazone, Metformin, Sulfonyleurea, and Insulin Use as a Percentage of Total Population Within Each VISN

Note: Data is aggregated at the quarterly level and includes only patients who survived up to that quarter. The 3 vertical lines represent the quarter in which (1) left (2003 Q4): rosiglitazone was made available in the VANF; (2) middle (2007 Q2): the FDA issued a safety alert related to rosiglitazone; and (3) right (2007 Q4): rosiglitazone was removed from the VANF.

FDA=U.S. Food and Drug Administration; Q=quarterly; VANF=Veterans Affairs national formulary; VISN=Veterans Integrated Service Network.

APPENDIX E Odds Ratios and 95% CIs of a Veteran with Type 2 Diabetes Receiving a Prescription of Rosiglitazone

Note: The VISN on the x-axis are arranged according to increasing value of OR (from left to right) in each of (a) all time periods, (b) prewarning periods, and (c) postwarning periods. VISN 10 served as the reference region (OR=1.0). CI= confidence interval; OR=odds ratio; VISN= Veterans Integrated Service Network.

Geographic Variation in Rosiglitazone Use Surrounding FDA Warnings in the Department of Veterans Affairs

APPENDIX F Odds Ratios (95% CIs) Representing the Odds of a Veteran with Type 2 Diabetes Receiving a Rosiglitazone Prescription (All Variables)

Variable	All Time Periods 2003 Q4–2008 Q3		Prewarning Periods 2003 Q4–2007 Q1		Postwarning Periods 2007 Q2–2008 Q3	
VISN						
2	0.92 ^a	(0.86-0.98)	0.89 ^b	(0.83-0.95)	0.98	(0.90-1.05)
3	0.87 ^b	(0.83-0.92)	0.96	(0.91-1.02)	0.63 ^b	(0.59-0.67)
4	0.84 ^b	(0.80-0.89)	0.83 ^b	(0.78-0.87)	0.88 ^b	(0.83-0.93)
5	0.82 ^b	(0.77-0.88)	0.87 ^b	(0.82-0.93)	0.68 ^b	(0.63-0.74)
6	0.68 ^b	(0.65-0.72)	0.70 ^b	(0.66-0.74)	0.65 ^b	(0.61-0.69)
7	0.93 ^a	(0.88-0.97)	1.01	(0.96-1.06)	0.72 ^b	(0.68-0.77)
8	1.43 ^b	(1.36-1.49)	1.49 ^b	(1.42-1.56)	1.28 ^b	(1.21-1.35)
9	0.82 ^b	(0.78-0.86)	0.82 ^b	(0.78-0.87)	0.82 ^b	(0.77-0.88)
10	0.55 ^b	(0.52-0.59)	0.57 ^b	(0.53-0.61)	0.50 ^b	(0.46-0.54)
11	0.80 ^b	(0.76-0.84)	0.91 ^b	(0.86-0.96)	0.52 ^b	(0.48-0.56)
12	0.80 ^b	(0.75-0.84)	0.82 ^b	(0.77-0.86)	0.73 ^b	(0.68-0.78)
15	1.58 ^b	(1.50-1.66)	1.55 ^b	(1.46-1.63)	1.67 ^b	(1.57-1.78)
16	1.29 ^b	(1.23-1.34)	1.32 ^b	(1.26-1.38)	1.19 ^b	(1.13-1.25)
17	1.35 ^b	(1.29-1.42)	1.43 ^b	(1.36-1.51)	1.25 ^b	(1.18-1.33)
18	0.68 ^b	(0.65-0.72)	0.68 ^b	(0.64-0.72)	0.69 ^b	(0.65-0.74)
19	1.16 ^b	(1.09-1.24)	1.28 ^b	(1.20-1.37)	0.83 ^b	(0.77-0.90)
20	0.60 ^b	(0.56-0.64)	0.61 ^b	(0.57-0.65)	0.58 ^b	(0.54-0.63)
21	1.51 ^b	(1.43-1.59)	1.55 ^b	(1.47-1.63)	1.39 ^b	(1.31-1.48)
22	1.18 ^b	(1.13-1.25)	1.21 ^b	(1.15-1.28)	1.10 ^a	(1.03-1.17)
23	0.58 ^b	(0.55-0.61)	0.57 ^b	(0.54-0.61)	0.60 ^b	(0.56-0.65)
Year, quarter						
2004 Q1	1.11 ^b	(1.10-1.12)	1.11 ^b	(1.10-1.12)		
2004 Q2	1.27 ^b	(1.25-1.28)	1.27 ^b	(1.25-1.28)		
2004 Q3	1.41 ^b	(1.39-1.43)	1.41 ^b	(1.39-1.42)		
2004 Q4	1.60 ^b	(1.58-1.62)	1.60 ^b	(1.58-1.62)		
2005 Q1	1.76 ^b	(1.74-1.79)	1.76 ^b	(1.73-1.78)		
2005 Q2	1.81 ^b	(1.79-1.84)	1.81 ^b	(1.78-1.83)		
2005 Q3	1.96 ^b	(1.93-1.99)	1.94 ^b	(1.92-1.97)		
2005 Q4	2.08 ^b	(2.05-2.12)	2.06 ^b	(2.03-2.09)		
2006 Q1	2.16 ^b	(2.13-2.20)	2.14 ^b	(2.11-2.18)		
2006 Q2	2.17 ^b	(2.13-2.20)	2.15 ^b	(2.12-2.18)		
2006 Q3	2.21 ^b	(2.17-2.24)	2.19 ^b	(2.15-2.22)		
2006 Q4	2.31 ^b	(2.28-2.35)	2.29 ^b	(2.25-2.33)		
2007 Q1	2.40 ^b	(2.36-2.43)	2.37 ^b	(2.33-2.41)		
2007 Q2	2.36 ^b	(2.32-2.40)				
2007 Q3	1.89 ^b	(1.86-1.92)			0.80 ^b	(0.79-0.80)
2007 Q4	1.47 ^b	(1.44-1.50)			0.62 ^b	(0.61-0.62)
2008 Q1	0.98 ^c	(0.96-1.00)			0.40 ^b	(0.40-0.41)
2008 Q2	0.61 ^b	(0.60-0.62)			0.24 ^b	(0.24-0.25)
2008 Q3	0.43 ^b	(0.42-0.44)			0.17 ^b	(0.17-0.17)
Male	1.37 ^b	(1.29-1.44)	1.34 ^b	(1.26-1.42)	1.44 ^b	(1.34-1.54)
Married	1.14 ^b	(1.12-1.16)	1.15 ^b	(1.13-1.17)	1.10 ^b	(1.08-1.12)
Age, years						
55-64	1.08 ^b	(1.06-1.11)	1.09 ^b	(1.07-1.12)	1.05 ^b	(1.02-1.08)
65-74	1.03 ^c	(1.00-1.05)	1.05 ^b	(1.02-1.07)	0.97 ^c	(0.94-1.00)
75+	0.84 ^b	(0.82-0.86)	0.86 ^b	(0.84-0.89)	0.77 ^b	(0.74-0.80)
Race/ethnicity						
Non-Hispanic black	0.94 ^b	(0.91-0.96)	0.94 ^b	(0.92-0.97)	0.91 ^b	(0.88-0.94)
Hispanic	1.17 ^b	(1.13-1.22)	1.20 ^b	(1.15-1.25)	1.10 ^b	(1.05-1.15)
Others	1.09 ^b	(1.07-1.12)	1.08 ^b	(1.06-1.11)	1.11 ^b	(1.08-1.15)

APPENDIX F Odds Ratios (95% CIs) Representing the Odds of a Veteran with Type 2 Diabetes Receiving a Rosiglitazone Prescription (All Variables) (continued)

Variable	All Time Periods 2003 Q4–2008 Q3		Prewarning Periods 2003 Q4–2007 Q1		Postwarning Periods 2007 Q2–2008 Q3	
Diabetes duration						
1 year	0.92 ^b	(0.89-0.96)	0.91 ^b	(0.88-0.94)	0.95 ^c	(0.91-1.00)
2 years	1.05 ^c	(1.01-1.09)	1.04 ^c	(1.00-1.08)	1.06 ^a	(1.02-1.11)
3 years	1.06 ^a	(1.02-1.10)	1.05 ^c	(1.01-1.09)	1.07 ^a	(1.02-1.13)
4 years	1.10 ^b	(1.05-1.14)	1.09 ^b	(1.05-1.14)	1.11 ^b	(1.06-1.17)
5 years	1.16 ^b	(1.12-1.21)	1.16 ^b	(1.11-1.21)	1.17 ^b	(1.11-1.23)
6 years	1.24 ^b	(1.20-1.29)	1.25 ^b	(1.20-1.29)	1.23 ^b	(1.18-1.29)
Enrollment priority						
2	1.04 ^c	(1.01-1.07)	1.04 ^c	(1.01-1.08)	1.03	(0.99-1.07)
3	1.04 ^c	(1.01-1.07)	1.04 ^c	(1.01-1.07)	1.03	(0.99-1.07)
4	0.86 ^b	(0.79-0.92)	0.84 ^b	(0.78-0.91)	0.89 ^c	(0.81-0.99)
5	1.04 ^a	(1.01-1.06)	1.04 ^b	(1.02-1.07)	1.01	(0.98-1.04)
6	1.10 ^c	(1.02-1.18)	1.10 ^c	(1.02-1.19)	1.08	(0.99-1.19)
7	1.19 ^b	(1.13-1.26)	1.20 ^b	(1.14-1.27)	1.18 ^b	(1.10-1.25)
8	1.25 ^b	(1.22-1.29)	1.27 ^b	(1.24-1.31)	1.20 ^b	(1.16-1.24)
Charlson Score						
1	0.87 ^b	(0.86-0.89)	0.88 ^b	(0.86-0.90)	0.85 ^b	(0.83-0.87)
2	0.92 ^b	(0.90-0.95)	0.93 ^b	(0.90-0.95)	0.91 ^b	(0.88-0.94)
3	0.81 ^b	(0.78-0.83)	0.81 ^b	(0.78-0.84)	0.77 ^b	(0.74-0.80)
Body mass index (BMI)						
18.5 ≤ BMI < 25	1.35 ^b	(1.18-1.54)	1.34 ^b	(1.16-1.54)	1.38 ^a	(1.12-1.72)
25 ≤ BMI < 30	1.76 ^b	(1.54-2.01)	1.73 ^b	(1.50-2.00)	1.83 ^b	(1.48-2.27)
30 ≤ BMI < 35	2.29 ^b	(2.00-2.61)	2.26 ^b	(1.96-2.60)	2.37 ^b	(1.91-2.93)
35 ≤ BMI < 40	2.77 ^b	(2.42-3.18)	2.76 ^b	(2.39-3.18)	2.84 ^b	(2.29-3.51)
BMI ≥ 40	3.44 ^b	(3.00-3.94)	3.45 ^b	(2.99-3.98)	3.46 ^b	(2.79-4.28)
Hemoglobin A1c						
6 ≤ A1c < 7	1.57 ^b	(1.53-1.62)	1.55 ^b	(1.50-1.59)	1.66 ^b	(1.60-1.73)
7 ≤ A1c < 8	2.25 ^b	(2.18-2.31)	2.17 ^b	(2.11-2.23)	2.54 ^b	(2.44-2.64)
8 ≤ A1c < 9	2.46 ^b	(2.39-2.54)	2.38 ^b	(2.31-2.46)	2.79 ^b	(2.67-2.91)
A1c ≥ 9	2.23 ^b	(2.16-2.31)	2.17 ^b	(2.11-2.25)	2.48 ^b	(2.37-2.59)
Low-density lipoprotein (LDL)						
70 ≤ LDL < 100	1.19 ^b	(1.18-1.21)	1.19 ^b	(1.17-1.21)	1.20 ^b	(1.18-1.23)
130 ≤ LDL < 160	1.22 ^b	(1.20-1.24)	1.23 ^b	(1.21-1.25)	1.19 ^b	(1.16-1.22)
130 ≤ LDL < 160	1.05 ^b	(1.02-1.07)	1.06 ^b	(1.03-1.09)	1.02	(0.98-1.06)
160 ≤ LDL < 190	0.94 ^a	(0.91-0.98)	0.95 ^c	(0.91-0.99)	0.92 ^c	(0.87-0.98)
LDL ≥ 190	1.03	(0.98-1.09)	1.04	(0.99-1.11)	1.00	(0.92-1.09)
High-density lipoprotein (HDL)						
40 ≤ HDL < 60	1.26 ^b	(1.24-1.28)	1.25 ^b	(1.23-1.27)	1.30 ^b	(1.27-1.32)
HDL ≥ 60	1.19 ^b	(1.15-1.23)	1.18 ^b	(1.14-1.22)	1.21 ^b	(1.16-1.26)
Triglycerides (TGL)						
150 ≤ TGL < 200	1.20 ^b	(1.18-1.22)	1.21 ^b	(1.19-1.22)	1.19 ^b	(1.16-1.21)
200 ≤ TGL < 500	1.41 ^b	(1.39-1.43)	1.43 ^b	(1.41-1.45)	1.37 ^b	(1.35-1.40)
TGL ≥ 500	1.60 ^b	(1.55-1.66)	1.65 ^b	(1.59-1.71)	1.48 ^b	(1.40-1.56)
Total cholesterol (TCH)						
200 ≤ TCH < 240	1.21 ^b	(1.19-1.23)	1.23 ^b	(1.21-1.26)	1.13 ^b	(1.09-1.16)
TCH ≥ 240	1.70 ^b	(1.65-1.75)	1.73 ^b	(1.68-1.79)	1.55 ^b	(1.48-1.63)
Systolic blood pressure (SBP)						
120 ≤ SBP < 140	1.00	(0.99-1.01)	0.99	(0.98-1.01)	1.03 ^b	(1.02-1.05)
140 ≤ SBP < 160	0.97 ^b	(0.96-0.99)	0.96 ^b	(0.95-0.98)	1.00	(0.98-1.02)
SBP ≥ 160	0.95 ^b	(0.92-0.97)	0.95 ^b	(0.93-0.97)	0.93 ^b	(0.89-0.96)

Geographic Variation in Rosiglitazone Use Surrounding FDA Warnings in the Department of Veterans Affairs

APPENDIX F Odds Ratios (95% CIs) Representing the Odds of a Veteran with Type 2 Diabetes Receiving a Rosiglitazone Prescription (All Variables) (continued)

Variable	All Time Periods 2003 Q4–2008 Q3		Prewarning Periods 2003 Q4–2007 Q1		Postwarning Periods 2007 Q2–2008 Q3	
Diastolic blood pressure (DBP)						
80 ≤ DBP < 90	0.69 ^b	(0.69-0.70)	0.70 ^b	(0.69-0.71)	0.69 ^b	(0.67-0.70)
90 ≤ DBP < 100	0.54 ^b	(0.53-0.56)	0.55 ^b	(0.54-0.57)	0.51 ^b	(0.49-0.54)
DBP ≥ 100	0.40 ^b	(0.38-0.43)	0.41 ^b	(0.38-0.43)	0.39 ^b	(0.35-0.43)
Indicators						
AMI event	0.86 ^b	(0.82-0.91)	0.90 ^b	(0.85-0.95)	0.76 ^b	(0.68-0.84)
Hypoglycemic event	1.39 ^b	(1.33-1.45)	1.44 ^b	(1.38-1.51)	1.24 ^b	(1.15-1.34)
Stroke	1.00	(0.97-1.04)	1.01	(0.97-1.05)	0.98	(0.93-1.04)
CHF	0.71 ^b	(0.59-0.86)	0.75 ^a	(0.61-0.91)	0.54 ^a	(0.37-0.80)
LEA	0.97	(0.88-1.07)	1.02	(0.92-1.13)	0.83 ^c	(0.72-0.96)
Retinopathy	1.41 ^b	(1.34-1.48)	1.46 ^b	(1.38-1.54)	1.24 ^b	(1.14-1.35)
Nephropathy	1.46 ^b	(1.42-1.49)	1.48 ^b	(1.44-1.51)	1.44 ^b	(1.39-1.48)
Insulin use	0.89 ^b	(0.88-0.90)	0.94 ^b	(0.92-0.95)	0.77 ^b	(0.75-0.79)
Metformin use	1.25 ^b	(1.23-1.26)	1.23 ^b	(1.21-1.25)	1.28 ^b	(1.26-1.31)
Sulfonylurea use	2.27 ^b	(2.24-2.30)	2.19 ^b	(2.16-2.22)	2.53 ^b	(2.48-2.58)
Pioglitazone use	0.75 ^b	(0.73-0.78)	0.44 ^b	(0.42-0.45)	1.88 ^b	(1.81-1.95)
Other medication use	2.22 ^b	(2.14-2.31)	2.29 ^b	(2.20-2.39)	2.02 ^b	(1.93-2.12)
University affiliation	0.97	(0.94-1.00)	0.98	(0.95-1.01)	0.94 ^a	(0.90-0.98)
Dedicated diabetes unit	1.14 ^b	(1.10-1.18)	1.14 ^b	(1.10-1.19)	1.11 ^b	(1.06-1.16)
Urban location	1.21 ^b	(1.18-1.24)	1.22 ^b	(1.18-1.25)	1.20 ^b	(1.16-1.24)
Number of patients who died						
6-25	0.89 ^b	(0.87-0.92)	0.90 ^b	(0.87-0.92)	0.88 ^b	(0.85-0.91)
26-50	0.72 ^b	(0.69-0.74)	0.72 ^b	(0.69-0.74)	0.70 ^b	(0.67-0.74)
51-75	0.66 ^b	(0.64-0.68)	0.65 ^b	(0.63-0.68)	0.67 ^b	(0.64-0.70)
75+	0.57 ^b	(0.55-0.60)	0.59 ^b	(0.56-0.61)	0.50 ^b	(0.48-0.53)
Distance to parent station						
1-50 miles	0.80 ^b	(0.78-0.83)	0.80 ^b	(0.77-0.83)	0.82 ^b	(0.79-0.86)
51+ miles	0.94 ^b	(0.91-0.97)	0.95 ^a	(0.91-0.98)	0.91 ^b	(0.88-0.95)
Number of operating beds						
1-150	0.84 ^b	(0.80-0.88)	0.83 ^b	(0.79-0.87)	0.89 ^b	(0.84-0.95)
151-300	0.92 ^a	(0.88-0.97)	0.92 ^b	(0.87-0.96)	0.98	(0.92-1.04)
300+	0.84 ^b	(0.80-0.88)	0.82 ^b	(0.78-0.86)	0.92 ^a	(0.87-0.98)
Facility type						
CBOC	0.86 ^b	(0.82-0.90)	0.86 ^b	(0.82-0.91)	0.85 ^b	(0.80-0.90)
Other	1.34 ^b	(1.28-1.41)	1.44 ^b	(1.36-1.51)	1.05	(0.99-1.11)
Observations, n	7,626,779		5,245,146		2,381,633	
Pseudo R ²	0.105		0.0919		0.134	

Note: All reference categories were omitted. All standard errors are robust, and standard errors are clustered at the individual patient level.

^aP < 0.01.

^bP < 0.001.

^cP < 0.05.

AMI = acute myocardial infarction; CHF = coronary heart failure; CI = confidence interval; CBOC = community-based community center; LEA = lower extremity amputation; Q = quarter; VISN = Veterans Integrated Service Network.

APPENDIX G Odds Ratios (95% CIs) Representing the Odds of a Veteran with Type 2 Diabetes Receiving a Rosiglitazone Prescription as a Function of Level of Threshold (Days Supply)

VISN	All Time Periods Threshold = 30 Days Supply	All Time Periods Threshold = 45 Days Supply	All Time Periods Threshold = 60 Days Supply
1 (reference)	1.00	1.00	1.00
2	0.92 ^a (0.86-0.98)	0.91 ^a (0.85-0.97)	0.92 ^a (0.86-0.98)
3	0.87 ^b (0.83-0.92)	0.86 ^b (0.81-0.91)	0.86 ^b (0.81-0.91)
4	0.84 ^b (0.80-0.89)	0.84 ^b (0.80-0.88)	0.84 ^b (0.80-0.89)
5	0.82 ^b (0.77-0.88)	0.83 ^b (0.77-0.88)	0.83 ^b (0.78-0.89)
6	0.68 ^b (0.65-0.72)	0.70 ^b (0.66-0.74)	0.71 ^b (0.67-0.75)
7	0.93 ^a (0.88-0.97)	0.89 ^b (0.85-0.94)	0.88 ^b (0.84-0.93)
8	1.43 ^b (1.36-1.49)	1.44 ^b (1.37-1.51)	1.45 ^b (1.38-1.52)
9	0.82 ^b (0.78-0.86)	0.84 ^b (0.79-0.88)	0.85 ^b (0.81-0.90)
10	0.55 ^b (0.52-0.59)	0.56 ^b (0.53-0.60)	0.57 ^b (0.54-0.61)
11	0.80 ^b (0.76-0.84)	0.80 ^b (0.76-0.85)	0.81 ^b (0.77-0.85)
12	0.80 ^b (0.75-0.84)	0.77 ^b (0.72-0.81)	0.76 ^b (0.72-0.80)
15	1.58 ^b (1.50-1.66)	1.61 ^b (1.53-1.70)	1.63 ^b (1.55-1.72)
16	1.29 ^b (1.23-1.34)	1.24 ^b (1.19-1.30)	1.23 ^b (1.17-1.28)
17	1.35 ^b (1.29-1.42)	1.38 ^b (1.31-1.45)	1.38 ^b (1.32-1.45)
18	0.68 ^b (0.65-0.72)	0.67 ^b (0.63-0.71)	0.67 ^b (0.63-0.71)
19	1.16 ^b (1.09-1.24)	1.18 ^b (1.11-1.25)	1.20 ^b (1.12-1.27)
20	0.60 ^b (0.56-0.64)	0.61 ^b (0.57-0.65)	0.62 ^b (0.58-0.66)
21	1.51 ^b (1.43-1.59)	1.53 ^b (1.45-1.61)	1.55 ^b (1.47-1.64)
22	1.18 ^b (1.13-1.25)	1.20 ^b (1.14-1.26)	1.20 ^b (1.14-1.27)
23	0.58 ^b (0.55-0.61)	0.59 ^b (0.55-0.62)	0.59 ^b (0.56-0.63)
Observations, n	7,626,779	7,626,779	7,626,779
Pseudo R ²	0.105	0.104	0.103

Notes: All drugs were classified according to the chosen threshold of days supply.

The F-test for the joint significance of all the coefficients resulted in $P < 0.0001$.

All standard errors are robust and are clustered at the individual patient level.

The multivariate regression includes controls for demographics and clinical characteristics of a patient, the characteristics of the patient's primary care facility, and time dummies.

^a $P < 0.01$.

^b $P < 0.001$.

CI=confidence interval; VISN=Veterans Integrated Service Network.

APPENDIX H Odds Ratios (95% CIs) Representing the Odds of a Veteran with Type 2 Diabetes Receiving a Rosiglitazone Prescription Where the Outcome Variable Is a Categorical Variable That Takes 4 Values (0,1,2,3)

VISN	All Time Periods TDE=1	All Time Periods TDE=2	All Time Periods TDE=3
1 (reference)	1.00	1.00	1.00
2	0.87 ^a (0.81-0.94)	0.85 ^a (0.78-0.92)	0.92 ^b (0.86-0.99)
3	1.05 (0.98-1.12)	0.95 (0.89-1.02)	0.85 ^a (0.80-0.90)
4	0.90 ^a (0.84-0.95)	0.81 ^a (0.76-0.87)	0.84 ^a (0.80-0.89)
5	0.81 ^a (0.75-0.88)	0.75 ^a (0.69-0.81)	0.84 ^a (0.78-0.90)
6	0.62 ^a (0.58-0.66)	0.57 ^a (0.53-0.60)	0.71 ^a (0.67-0.75)
7	1.23 ^a (1.16-1.30)	1.05 (0.99-1.11)	0.88 ^a (0.84-0.93)
8	1.29 ^a (1.21-1.36)	1.25 ^a (1.18-1.33)	1.48 ^a (1.41-1.56)
9	0.73 ^a (0.68-0.78)	0.70 ^a (0.66-0.75)	0.85 ^a (0.80-0.90)
10	0.46 ^a (0.43-0.50)	0.47 ^a (0.44-0.51)	0.57 ^a (0.53-0.60)
11	0.82 ^a (0.76-0.87)	0.76 ^a (0.72-0.82)	0.81 ^a (0.77-0.86)
12	0.97 (0.91-1.04)	0.94 (0.88-1.01)	0.75 ^a (0.71-0.80)
15	1.32 ^a (1.24-1.41)	1.31 ^a (1.23-1.39)	1.67 ^a (1.58-1.77)
16	1.61 ^a (1.53-1.70)	1.41 ^a (1.33-1.48)	1.24 ^a (1.19-1.30)
17	1.32 ^a (1.25-1.40)	1.21 ^a (1.14-1.29)	1.39 ^a (1.32-1.46)
18	0.80 ^a (0.75-0.85)	0.72 ^a (0.67-0.77)	0.66 ^a (0.62-0.70)
19	1.00 (0.93-1.08)	0.93 (0.86-1.01)	1.22 ^a (1.14-1.30)
20	0.57 ^a (0.52-0.61)	0.53 ^a (0.49-0.57)	0.61 ^a (0.57-0.66)
21	1.24 ^a (1.16-1.32)	1.25 ^a (1.17-1.33)	1.60 ^a (1.52-1.69)
22	1.09 ^c (1.02-1.16)	1.10 ^c (1.03-1.17)	1.22 ^a (1.16-1.29)
23	0.57 ^a (0.53-0.61)	0.51 ^a (0.47-0.55)	0.59 ^a (0.55-0.62)
Observations, n	7,626,779		
Pseudo R ²	0.0981		

Notes: DS = 0 → TDE = 0; DS = 1-29 → TDE = 1; DS = 30-59 → TDE = 2; DS > 60 → TDE = 3, where DS = days supply.

TDE = 0 serves as the reference category.

The coefficients reported are based on a single multinomial logistic regression.

All drugs were classified according to the same TDE metric.

The F-test for the joint significance of all the coefficients resulted in $P < 0.0001$.

All standard errors are robust and are clustered at the individual patient level.

The multivariate regression includes controls for demographics and clinical characteristics of a patient, the characteristics of the patient's primary care facility, and time dummies.

^a $P < 0.001$.

^b $P < 0.05$.

^c $P < 0.01$.

CI = confidence interval; TDE = thirty-day equivalent; VISN = Veterans Integrated Service Network.

APPENDIX I Odds Ratios (95% CIs) Representing the Odds of a Veteran with Type 2 Diabetes Receiving a Rosiglitazone Prescription as a Function of Location of Patient's Primary Care Facility (Urban Versus Any)

VISN	All Time Periods Location = All (Urban and Rural)	All Time Periods Location = Urban Only
1 (reference)	1.00	1.00
2	0.92 ^a (0.86-0.98)	0.86 ^b (0.80-0.93)
3	0.87 ^b (0.83-0.92)	0.87 ^b (0.82-0.93)
4	0.84 ^b (0.80-0.89)	0.88 ^b (0.83-0.94)
5	0.82 ^b (0.77-0.88)	0.82 ^b (0.77-0.88)
6	0.68 ^b (0.65-0.72)	0.70 ^b (0.66-0.74)
7	0.93 ^a (0.88-0.97)	0.94 ^c (0.89-1.00)
8	1.43 ^b (1.36-1.49)	1.45 ^b (1.38-1.53)
9	0.82 ^b (0.78-0.86)	0.83 ^b (0.78-0.88)
10	0.55 ^b (0.52-0.59)	0.55 ^b (0.51-0.59)
11	0.80 ^b (0.76-0.84)	0.86 ^b (0.81-0.91)
12	0.80 ^b (0.75-0.84)	0.75 ^b (0.71-0.81)
15	1.58 ^b (1.50-1.66)	1.60 ^b (1.51-1.70)
16	1.29 ^b (1.23-1.34)	1.38 ^b (1.31-1.46)
17	1.35 ^b (1.29-1.42)	1.41 ^b (1.33-1.49)
18	0.68 ^b (0.65-0.72)	0.61 ^b (0.57-0.65)
19	1.16 ^b (1.09-1.24)	1.23 ^b (1.14-1.32)
20	0.60 ^b (0.56-0.64)	0.59 ^b (0.55-0.63)
21	1.51 ^b (1.43-1.59)	1.58 ^b (1.49-1.68)
22	1.18 ^b (1.13-1.25)	1.21 ^b (1.15-1.28)
23	0.58 ^b (0.55-0.61)	0.56 ^b (0.52-0.60)
Observations, n	7,626,779	6,735,998
Pseudo R ²	0.105	0.106

Notes: The F-test for the joint significance of all the coefficients resulted in $P < 0.0001$.

All standard errors are robust and are clustered at the individual patient level.

The multivariate regression includes controls for demographics and clinical characteristics of a patient, the characteristics of the patient's primary care facility, and time dummies.

^a $P < 0.01$.

^b $P < 0.001$.

^c $P < 0.05$.

CI = confidence interval; VISN = Veterans Integrated Service Network.