

Targeted Quality Measurement of Health Care Providers

José R. Zubizarreta* Yige Li† Nancy L. Keating‡ Mary Beth Landrum§

Abstract

Measuring quality of cancer care delivered by US health providers is challenging. Patients receiving oncology care vary substantially in disease presentation among other key characteristics. In this paper we discuss a framework for institutional quality measurement which addresses the heterogeneity of patient populations. For this, we follow recent statistical developments on health outcomes research and conceptualize the task of quality measurement as a causal inference problem, helping to target flexible covariate profiles that can represent specific populations of interest. To our knowledge, such covariate profiles have not been used in the quality measurement literature. We use different clinically relevant covariate profiles and evaluate methods for layered case-mix adjustments that combine weighting and regression modeling approaches in a sequential manner in order to reduce model extrapolation and allow for provider effect modification. We appraise these methods in an extensive simulation study and highlight the practical utility of weighting methods that warn the investigator when case-mix adjustments are infeasible without some form of extrapolation that goes beyond the support of the data. In our study of cancer-care outcomes, we assess the performance of oncology practices for different profiles that correspond to the types of patients who may receive cancer care. We describe how the methods examined may be particularly important for high-stakes quality measurement, such as public reporting or performance-based payments. These methods may also be applied to support the health care decisions of individual patients and provide a path to personalized quality measurement.

*Departments of Health Care Policy, Biostatistics, and Statistics, Harvard University, 180 A Longwood Avenue, Office 307-D, Boston, MA 02115; email: zubizarreta@hcp.med.harvard.edu.

†Department of Biostatistics, Harvard University, 677 Huntington Avenue, Boston, MA 02115; email: yigeli@g.harvard.edu.

‡Department of Health Care Policy, Harvard University, 180 A Longwood Avenue, Office 201, Boston, MA 02115; email: keating@hcp.med.harvard.edu.

§Department of Health Care Policy, Harvard University, 180 A Longwood Avenue, Office 301-A, Boston, MA 02115; email: landrum@hcp.med.harvard.edu.

Acknowledgements: The authors thank Ambarish Chattopadhyay, Michael Chernew, Richard Frank, Bijan Niknam, and Alan Zaslavsky for helpful comments and conversations. This study used the linked SEER-Medicare database. The interpretation and reporting of these data are the sole responsibility of the authors. The authors acknowledge the efforts of the National Cancer Institute; the Office of Research, Development and Information, CMS; Information Management Services (IMS), Inc.; and the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) Program tumor registries in the creation of the SEER-Medicare database. The

Keywords: Causal Inference; Hospital Profiling; Optimal Weighting; Quality Measurement.

collection of cancer incidence data used in this study was supported by the California Department of Public Health as part of the statewide cancer reporting program mandated by California Health and Safety Code Section 103885; the National Cancer Institute's Surveillance, Epidemiology and End Results Program under contract HHSN261201000140C awarded to the Cancer Prevention Institute of California, contract HHSN261201000035C awarded to the University of Southern California, and contract HHSN261201000034C awarded to the Public Health Institute; and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Program of Cancer Registries, under agreement # U58DP003862-01 awarded to the California Department of Public Health. The ideas and opinions expressed herein are those of the author(s) and endorsement by the State of California Department of Public Health, the National Cancer Institute, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or their Contractors and Subcontractors is not intended nor should be inferred. The authors acknowledge the efforts of the National Cancer Institute; the Office of Research, Development and Information, CMS; Information Management Services (IMS), Inc.; and the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) Program tumor registries in the creation of the SEER-Medicare database.

Funding and support: This research was supported by Arnold Ventures. José Zubizarreta also acknowledges support by award ME-2019C1-16172 from the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (PCORI). The views presented here are those of the authors and not necessarily those of Arnold Ventures, PCORI, its directors, officers, or staff.

1 Introduction

Over recent decades, a central task in policy and statistics has been to develop reliable and valid measures to evaluate the performance of institutions and organizations (Normand et al. 2016). Such measurement is key to fostering accountability and improving overall performance. In addition, in fields such as education and healthcare, access to this evidence enables the public to make informed decisions about important life choices through their ability to measure the quality of schools and hospitals, often in league tables (Goldstein and Spiegelhalter 1996). The measurement task is complex (Ash et al. 2012) and three important factors are to be considered regarding the fairness and transparency of the methods and the sparsity of typical data.

The methods must be equitable or fair and adjust for systematic differences in the case-mixes of the populations they serve. Additionally, the methods ought to be transparent and promote an open understanding of their case-mix adjustments by stakeholders, such as patients and physicians. Finally, there must be accountability for the great heterogeneity of the individuals in the population thinly spread across numerous organizations in the data. In this paper, we study the performance of cancer care providers in the US. In our data there are 600 cancer practices, with a median of 112 patients, each characterized by 20 covariates. In nearly 50% of the practices, there is at least one (constant) zero count in a relevant covariate dimension, complicating case-mix adjustments because there are no data on that dimension.

Often, these performance or quality assessments are conducted using parametric regression models. For example, the approach for Medicare’s Hospital Compare, which evaluates performance at hospitals across the U.S., is based on a random-effects logit model with (random) hospital indicators plus covariates that measure patient risk factors (Krumholz et al. 2011). Nevertheless, with this type of approach, the exact form of the case-mix adjustments that are conducted on the data is not evident. In other words, it is unclear how the patient-level data

are individually weighted to produce aggregate quality estimates. Also, the characteristics of the target population to which inferences apply are not manifest and may be distorted by the implied weighting of the regression procedure. In particular, if some of the covariates are sparse, such as racial minority indicators across health care providers, the implied weights of such procedures can result in a weighted population that omits the minority (see Section 7.1 of Chattopadhyay and Zubizarreta 2021 for a general discussion of this and related matters in linear regression adjustments). Finally, it is not clear to what extent the quality assessments for a given health care provider are based on data from the provider in question as opposed to other health providers that see different patients, involving some form of extrapolation based on a model that can be misspecified. More generally, as discussed by George et al. (2017), this approach can produce rankings of provider organizations (e.g., hospitals) that are not checkable against data.

In this paper, we follow important work by Silber et al. (2014), Keele et al. (2020), and Longford (2020) and study the quality measurement enterprise as a causal inference problem. This is important because it helps to clearly define the estimands and to state and evaluate the assumptions needed for their identification. Also, it helps to decouple the estimands from the estimation methods and to envision alternative approaches that can be used for case-mix adjustment (for example, approaches that combine new weighting and modeling methods). Importantly, this helps to recognize when these methods produce quality assessments based on extrapolations for which there are little or no data for each health provider to support them. This framework also helps to delimit the design and analysis stages of a study and to use methods for case-mix adjustment that do not require outcome information (Rubin 2008). Finally, it provides a more coherent framework to discuss hospital or practice effects, which is something routinely done in quality measurement although often without a formal justification.

Unlike previous work, a concept central to this paper is that of a *covariate profile* of a target

population, which characterizes a population of study interest in terms of summary statistics of the joint distribution of its observed variables (see also Chattopadhyay et al. 2020). To our knowledge, such covariate profiles have not been used in the quality measurement literature to target specific patient populations. As we illustrate in this paper, this profile may correspond to the entire patient population across all health care providers, the population of a particular hospital or practice, or a target population with a similar covariate profile to that of an *individual* patient. The latter may be of particular interest to patients selecting the best providers for treating patients like them. This covariate profile helps to recognize from the outset that patients are heterogeneous and that some health care providers may specialize in treating different types of patients. In addition, it allows us to understand the problem of sparsity in terms of a profile (in this sense, we provide a characterization of the distribution of the covariates relative to the profile) and to use methods that ground the analysis as much as possible on the available data and identify when the results are an extrapolation beyond the support of the data of a given health provider.

Utilizing this profile and borrowing from the causal inference literature, we evaluate weighting methods for quality measurement which emphasize transparency, flexibility, and robustness in the case-mix adjustments. First, in terms of transparency, these weighting methods are based on constrained convex optimization problems that are computationally tractable and warn the investigator when some form of extrapolation beyond the support of the observed data is needed to perform the adjustments. Also, it is straightforward to conduct covariate balance checks, which are intuitive for stakeholders. Second, in terms of flexibility, the profiles can represent varied target populations. Finally, in terms of robustness, the methods examined conduct the case-mix adjustments in a layered way, adjusting for as many covariates as possible by weighting, without extrapolating, and leaving the rest of the covariates to modeling, borrowing strength across providers from the parametric form of the outcome model. As a result, these methods are less sensitive to model misspecification than traditional regression approaches used in quality measurement.

Starting from a target population of interest, our goal is to make the case-mix covariate adjustments transparent, and, to the greatest extent possible, ground the comparisons of practices or hospitals on the available data. This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we delineate our data, comprised of SEER cancer registry and Medicare administrative records. In Section 3, we describe a framework from causal inference where target estimands, identification assumptions, and covariate profiles are key. In Section 4, we outline methods that use balancing weights and regression modeling to perform the adjustments. In Section 5, we evaluate the performance of the methods in a simulation study. In Section 6, we present the results from our case study. In Section 7, we provide a discussion and remarks.

2 SEER cancer registry and Medicare administrative data

We use cancer registry data from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) Program for individuals diagnosed with cancer in 2011-2013 linked to administrative data from Medicare for 2010-2014. The SEER-18 data include demographic and clinical information for cancer patients from areas covering 28% of the total US population. Medicare data include inpatient, outpatient, provider carrier, durable medical equipment, and hospice/home health files. Our study population includes individuals aged 65 years and older who were enrolled in parts A and B of fee-for-service Medicare through at least 6 months after their cancer diagnosis. Patients were attributed to medical oncology practices based on outpatient evaluation and management visits to a medical oncology practice (Gondi et al. 2021).

The main outcome is survival one year after the first visit to the practice (we also studied survival through six months after diagnosis and through 18 months diagnosis). The covariates we used for case-mix adjustment are: age (continuous and categorical, 65-74, 75-84, ≥ 85), sex, race/ethnicity (White, Black, other/unknown), marital status (unmarried, married,

unknown), census-tract median household income (quartiles), Census-level prop. of residents without a high school ed. (quartiles), Klabunde modification of the Charlson Comorbidity Index (0, 1, 2, ≥ 3), cancer type (breast, colorectal, lung, ovary, pancreas, prostate), cancer stage (1, 2, 3, 4, missing), and year of diagnosis. We excluded practices with less than 30 patients.

3 Framework

3.1 Notation

Let $i = 1, \dots, I_p$ index the patients treated by practice $p = 1, \dots, P$, and write $\mathbf{X}_i \in \mathbb{R}^K$ for the vector of K observed covariates of each patient. For some $L \geq K$, put $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{R}^L$ for the target covariate profile. This profile can characterize different target populations; for example, the population of all patients across practices in the system, or the population of patients similar to an individual patient of interest. This profile summarizes the target population in terms of the means of its K covariates ($L = K$), or more generally, represents it in terms of $L \geq K$ multidimensional moments or transformations of its covariates.

Based on \mathbf{x}^* , we distinguish between three types of practices: those whose sample covariate values contain the target profile \mathbf{x}^* inside its convex hull and for which case-mix adjustments toward \mathbf{x}^* can be conducted by interpolation (i.e., by a convex combination of the observations in a given practice); those practices for which \mathbf{x}^* is outside its convex hull and for which the adjustments can only be performed by extrapolation (i.e., by an affine transformation of the observations in the practice); and those practices for which \mathbf{x}^* is outside its convex hull and for which at least one covariate has a constant value (e.g., equal to zero) different from that in \mathbf{x}^* for all its patients. These are covariates for which it cannot be weighted toward the target \mathbf{x}^* . These covariates require a stronger form of extrapolation, borrowing information across the practices. We call these null covariates \mathbf{X}_{null} and denote their complement by $\mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c$, $\mathbf{X}_{\text{null}} \cup \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c = \mathbf{X}$. In other words, null covariates take a constant value different

to the corresponding values of \mathbf{x}^* for all patients in a practice.

Now, let $\mathbb{1}_{p,i}$ be the practice assignment indicator of patient i . Write $Y_i(p)$ for the potential outcome (Neyman 1990; Rubin 1974) of patient i under practice assignment $\mathbb{1}_{p,i}$, $p = 1, \dots, P$. Denote Y_i for their observed outcome, $Y_i = \sum_{p=1}^P \mathbb{1}_{p,i} Y_i(p)$. Finally, define \mathbf{U} as the vector unobserved covariates. See Table 4 in the Online Supplementary Materials for a summary of this notation.

3.2 Estimands

We are fundamentally interested in estimating the mean potential outcome under health care provider p for patients with covariate values equal to the profile \mathbf{x}^* ; that is,

$$\mu_p(\mathbf{x}^*) := \text{E}[Y_i(p) | \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}^*]. \quad (1)$$

We take two perspectives: the first one, perhaps of an individual patient, which for the purpose of selecting a care provider is primarily interested in the average effect of receiving care in practice p' instead of practice p'' , $\mu_{p'}(\mathbf{x}^*) - \mu_{p''}(\mathbf{x}^*)$, where \mathbf{x}^* are the observed covariates of the target patient; and the second one, perhaps of the system of health providers, which for performance payment purposes is mainly interested in the ranking of all the practices for a given target population of patients described by \mathbf{x}^* , $\mu_{(1)}(\mathbf{x}^*), \mu_{(2)}(\mathbf{x}^*), \dots, \mu_{(P)}(\mathbf{x}^*)$, where the subscript (p) enclosed in parentheses denotes the p -th order statistics of the mean potential outcome function conditional on covariates. In other words, the first perspective is primarily interested in contrasts whereas the second one is mainly interested in rankings. Arguably, there is a third important perspective which is interested in the two previous quantities. For instance, this can be the perspective of a given practice, which is interested the average treatment effect for benchmarking itself to another practice, and the ranking for understanding its relative standing in the wider concert of all practices. Naturally, the task of estimating $\mu_{p'}(\mathbf{x}^*) - \mu_{p''}(\mathbf{x}^*)$ for all pairs of practices (p', p'') is more complex than

that of estimating the ordering of its components $\mu_p(\mathbf{x}^*)$ for all practices p , for the first task accomplishes the latter. The first task is reduced to identifying and estimating the conditional average treatment effect $\mu_{p'}(\mathbf{x}^*) - \mu_{p''}(\mathbf{x}^*) = \mathbb{E}[Y_i(p') - Y_i(p'') | \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}^*]$ for which the following assumptions are necessary.

3.3 Assumptions

Our notation implies the Stable Unit Treatment Value Assumption (SUTVA; Rubin 1980) which in our setting states that there is no interference between patients and that there are no additional versions of the “treatments” beyond receiving care in one of the P practices. Again, our problem boils down to estimating the conditional mean potential outcome function $\mu_p(\mathbf{x}^*)$ for all $p = 1, \dots, P$. For identification, or *causal* quality measurement, we also require the unconfoundedness assumption, $\mathbb{I}_{p,i} \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_i(p) \mid \mathbf{X}_i$, and the positivity assumption, $0 < \Pr(\mathbb{I}_{p,i} = 1 | \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x}^*) < 1$, for all $p = 1, \dots, P$ (Imbens 2000). The unconfoundedness assumption states that selection into practices is determined by observed covariates, whereas the positivity assumption states that for every value of the target \mathbf{x}^* there is a positive probability of receiving care in all the practices. To our knowledge, these assumptions are implicit in traditional forms of quality measurement (e.g., Krumholz et al. 2011).

3.4 Profiles \mathbf{x}^*

The covariate profiles \mathbf{x}^* can represent different target populations. Examples of target populations of interest are the population of patients across all practices, the population of patients in the top 10% best performing practices, and in the bottom 10% worse performing practices. In other settings, one may be interested in the population of patients that go to large or small practices, that receive care in a given geographic area, or that correspond to a group of policy interest, such as vulnerable patients as defined by race ethnicity, socioeconomic status, or clinical complexity. For personalization, the profile \mathbf{x}^* can also represent a target population with similar covariate values as those of a specific individual who may be seeking care.

4 Methods for layered case-mix adjustments

We consider imputation estimators of the form

$$\hat{Y}_{i:\mathbb{I}_{p,i=1}}^{\text{imp}} := \frac{1}{I_p} \sum_{i:\mathbb{I}_{p,i=1}} \hat{\mu}_p(\mathbf{x}_i), \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{\mu}_p(\mathbf{x}_i)$ estimates the conditional mean potential outcome function under practice p as we describe subsequently. Some of these estimators admit the following linear representation

$$\hat{Y}_{i:\mathbb{I}_{p,i=1}}^{\text{imp, lin}} := \sum_{i:\mathbb{I}_{p,i=1}} w_i Y_i, \quad (3)$$

where w_i are suitable weights that add up to one. Equation (3) is a Hájek estimator (Hájek 1971). Many common estimators admit this representation; for example, ordinary least squares and ridge regression imputation approaches (see, e.g., Ben-Michael et al. 2020 and Chattopadhyay and Zubizarreta 2021). For the most, we consider linear weighting estimators for their simplicity and because the weights can be computed without the outcomes (that is, as part of the design of the study, Rubin 2008), a valuable feature for practical and objective quality measurement.

In modeling or adjusting for $\mu_p(\mathbf{x}^*)$ for quality measurement, three questions of importance are the method for adjustment, the covariate functions for adjustment, and the degree of adjustment. We study these questions through the following methods that combine weighting and modeling approaches. In what follows, the categorization $\{\textit{weighting}, \textit{modeling}\}$ is more procedural than conceptual as estimators of the form (3) can be collapsed to a single weighting or modeling approach. We choose this procedural categorization because it maps more closely to common practice.

The methods we consider are summarized in Table 5 in the Online Supplementary Materials. Again, they combine weighting and modeling approaches. First we consider traditional modeling approaches. Afterwards, we consider approaches that start by weighting

and increasingly impose stronger parametric modeling assumptions where there is less or no data.

For the modeling approaches, we consider different forms of linear regression imputation. First, we consider fixed effects (FE) regression of the outcome on the covariates and the practice indicators, to then predict the patient outcomes and average them within each of the practices. We implement this approach with the original covariates \mathbf{X} and transformations $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ thereof. The transformations that we consider aim to balance the covariance matrices of the covariates; specifically, in $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ we consider the original covariates and their leading principal components that explain 80% of their sample variation. Second, we consider multi regression (MR) of the outcome on the covariates, where we fit separate models for each practice, to then predict the patient outcomes and average them within each of the practices. Here again we fit the models on the original covariates \mathbf{X} and the transformations $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$.

Throughout, the weighting approach that we consider uses the Stable Balancing Weights (SBW; Zubizarreta 2015). The reason is that these weights are particularly well-suited for comparing hundreds of treatments (i.e., practices in our case study). The SBW are the weights of minimum variance that approximately balance functions of the covariates. See Wang and Zubizarreta (2020) and Chattopadhyay et al. (2020) for theoretical properties and empirical performance of the SBW in causal inference settings. Ideally, the SBW will take non-negative values and balance the covariates by interpolating within the convex hull of the available data. Of course, this non-extrapolating form of adjustment is feasible only for practices that contain \mathbf{x}^* inside its convex hull; otherwise, the optimization problem does not admit a solution indicating that the investigator needs to extrapolate to adjust. In Table 5 (see the Online Supplementary Materials), we denote this approach by $\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbf{X}), \cdot\}$ or $\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}), \cdot\}$ depending on whether the original covariates \mathbf{X} or their transformations $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ are used (in our empirical studies, we defined $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ as the principal components of the observed covariates in order to approximately balance their covariance matrix). For

some covariates $\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \cdot), \cdot\}$ can be infeasible so we allow the procedure to take negative values and perform the adjustments by extrapolating; an approach that we denote by $\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}), \cdot\}$ and $\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}), \cdot\}$. When some covariates are null for some of the practices (that is, when some covariates take a constant value different to the corresponding values of \mathbf{x}^* for all patients in some of the practices) we combine the SBW with modeling approaches as follows.

In order to avoid extrapolation and allow for effect modification, the idea is to adjust by weighting for as many covariates as possible (i.e., for $\mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c$) and leave the rest (i.e., \mathbf{X}_{null}) for modeling, borrowing strength across practices from the parametric form of the outcome model. Here we adjust for $\mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c$ using unconstrained SBW and then use these weights either as covariates in fixed effect linear regression or as weights in weighted linear regression. More specifically, in $\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c), \text{FE}(\mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}, w)\}$ we perform FE linear regression of the outcome on \mathbf{X}_{null} , the weights $w = \text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c)$, and the practice indicators; here we fit one single model for all the practices to then predict the patient outcomes and average them within each of the practices (we perform an analogous procedure for the transformed covariates $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$). Finally, in $\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c), \text{WR}(\mathbf{X}; 0)\}$ we perform weighted regression of the outcome on \mathbf{X} and the practice indicators, where the weights $\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c)$ are truncated at 0; here we fit one single model for all the practices to then predict the patient outcomes and average them within each of the practices. In rigor, this last approach cannot be represented as (3) as the weights are truncated.

5 Simulation study

In order to evaluate the performance of the previous methods, we extend the simulation study design by Yang et al. (2016) to (i) encompass higher-dimensional “treatments,” corresponding to $I_p = 100$ practices, (ii) include both relevant and irrelevant covariates in the true (correct) practice assignment and outcome models, (iii) and examine both additive and non-additive outcome models. This simulation design seeks to represent the real data by incorporating

a similar number of covariates, degree of sparsity, and outcomes generated under models of increasing complexity.

5.1 Study design

In the first simulation, we consider a vector of ten observed covariates, $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i1}, X_{i2}, \dots, X_{i10})$, distributed as follows: $X_{i1}, X_{i2}, X_{i3} \sim \mathcal{N}_3(\boldsymbol{\mu}_3, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_3)$, with $\boldsymbol{\mu}_3 = (0, 0, 0)^\top$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_3 = [(2, 1, -1), (1, 1, -0.5), (-1, -0.5, 2)]$; $X_{i4} \sim \text{Unif}[-3, 3]$; $X_{i5} \sim \chi_1^2$; $X_{i6} \sim \text{Bern}(0.5)$; and $X_{i7}, X_{i8}, X_{i9}, X_{i10} \sim \mathcal{N}_4(\boldsymbol{\mu}_4, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_4)$, with $\boldsymbol{\mu}_4 = (0, 0, 0, 0)^\top$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_4 = [(2, 1, -1, -1), (1, 1, -0.5, -0.5), (-1, -0.5, 2, .5), (-1, -0.5, 0.5, 1)]$. We denote $\mathbb{I}_{p,i}$ as the practice assignment indicator, which is generated in the following way: $(\mathbb{I}_{1,i}, \mathbb{I}_{2,i}, \dots, \mathbb{I}_{P,i}) \sim \text{Multinom}\{\text{Pr}(1|\mathbf{X}_i), \text{Pr}(2|\mathbf{X}_i), \dots, \text{Pr}(100|\mathbf{X}_i)\}$ where $\text{Pr}(\mathbb{I}_{p,i}|\mathbf{X}_i) = \exp(X_i^\top \eta_p) / \sum_{\zeta=1}^{100} \exp(X_i^\top \eta_\zeta)$, with $\eta_p = (1 - p/100) \times (1, 1, 1, -1, 1, 1)^\top$. Using these covariates and practice assignment indicators, we generate the outcomes under four models of increasing complexity:

- Setting 1, linear model: $Y_i(p) | \mathbf{X}_i = (1 + p/50)X_{i1} + \{(-1)^p + 2\}X_{i2} + \{(-1)^p + 2\}X_{i3} + (-1)^{p+1}X_{i4} + (-1)^p(X_{i5} - 1) + (-1)^p(X_{i6} - 0.5) + 0.1p + \varepsilon_i$, where $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.
- Setting 2, lowly non-linear model: $Y_i(p) | \mathbf{X}_i = (1 + p/50)(X_{i1}^2 - 2) + \{(-1)^p + 2\}X_{i2} + \{(-1)^p + 2\}X_{i3} + (-1)^{p+1}X_{i4} + (-1)^p(X_{i5} - 1) + (-1)^p(X_{i6} - 0.5) + 0.1p + \varepsilon_i$, where $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.
- Setting 3, moderately non-linear model: $Y_i(p) | \mathbf{X}_i = (1 + p/50)(X_{i1}^2 - 2) + \{(-1)^p + 2\}X_{i2} + \{(-1)^p + 2\}X_{i3} + (-1)^{p+1}X_{i4} + (-1)^p(X_{i5} - 1) + (-1)^p(X_{i6} - 0.5) + 0.1p + \varepsilon_i$, where $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.
- Setting 4, highly non-linear model: $Y_i(p) | \mathbf{X}_i = (1 + p/50)(X_{i1}^2 - 2) + \{(-1)^p + 2\}(X_{i2}^2 - 1) + \{(-1)^p + 2\}(X_{i3}^2 - 1) - 0.5\{(-1)^p + 2\}(X_{i2}X_{i3} + 0.5) + (-1)^{p+1}X_{i4} + (-1)^p(X_{i5} - 1) + (-1)^p(X_{i6} - 0.5) + 0.1p + \varepsilon_i$, where $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

In this manner, the true mean potential outcome function for practice p is $E[Y_i(p)] = E[E[Y_i(p) | \mathbf{X}_i]] = 0.1p$ for all $p = 1, \dots, 100$. Thus, the effect of practice $p = 1$ in place of

practice $p = 10$ is $0.1 - 1 = -0.9$. Under this data generating mechanism, we generate 1000 data sets of size $n = 10000$, with an average practice size across simulated data sets of 100, and average minimum and maximum practice size equal to 69 and 234, respectively.

In the second simulation, we consider 30 covariates in each of the previous settings. We do this by adding 20 independent binary covariates that are positively correlated with both the assignment and the outcome variables. Please see the Online Supplementary Materials for replication for details.

5.2 Comparative performances

We evaluate the performance of the methods from an aggregate, system-level perspective, in terms of bias and root mean square error (RMSE), and from an individual, practice-level perspective, in terms of errors in estimated practice rankings. For both perspectives, we consider three targets, corresponding to all the patients in the overall system of practices, and the patients in the smallest and largest practices across simulated data sets. We evaluate the performance of the methods described in Table 5.

5.2.1 Extent of extrapolation

First, we evaluate the extent to which the methods extrapolate and produce estimates when there are no patients in the practices who are similar to the ones in the target profile. The results are summarized in Figure 1. In the figure, there are 15 plots for each possible combination of methods and profiles. In each plot, there are 1000 rows corresponding to the 1000 simulated data sets, and 100 columns corresponding to the 100 practices in each data set, so each (row, column) (“pixel”) intersection corresponds to a (practice, data set) in the simulation study. In the plots, the color grey represents practices for which an estimate was produced without extrapolation; the color white, practices for which no estimate was produced because it required extrapolation; and the color orange, practices for which an estimate was produced with extrapolation.

Across targets, we observe that the regression methods extrapolate considerably more often than the methods that involve weighting, as a considerably larger proportion of their plots is colored orange. The explanation is that there is nothing in the considered regression methods that limits or penalizes the degree of extrapolation of the weights. Conversely, $\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbf{X})$ produces an answer only where there are data. Next, $\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c)$ extrapolates to produce estimates when otherwise infeasible. As expected, adjusting for more transformations of the covariates results in more extrapolation with both the modeling and weighting methods. In Figure 1, we observe that the degree of extrapolation depends on the profile, as targeting the population of larger practices requires more extrapolation than that of smaller practices, since practices treating more patients may treat patients with characteristics that are not represented in smaller practices. In Figure 4 in the Online Supplementary Materials, we observe similar phenomena with more covariates.

5.2.2 The aggregate system perspective

Here we evaluate the performance of the methods in aggregate. Table 1 shows the results. For brevity, we focus on the RMSE. As one might expect, when the model is correctly specified, the pure regression modeling approaches perform adequately, but not otherwise. In general, the approaches that involve some form of weighting exhibit a better performance than purely modeling approaches. The main takeaways are as follows.

First, interpolation works better than extrapolation. When feasible, $\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$ has the lowest RMSE. However, this approach is often infeasible. The philosophy of this approach is to produce estimates only when there are enough data to support them. If the data gap must be filled (e.g., a ranking is needed for each practice), more principled and robust approaches appear to be methods that integrate forms of weighting and modeling, as we discuss subsequently. The philosophy of these methods is to interpolate by weighting for what you can, and extrapolate by modeling for what you must.

Second, the pure regression modeling approaches exhibit an adequate performance in the

linear setting, but not in the other non-linear settings. Moreover, in the linear setting, not just any regression method works. In fact, FE performs poorly even in the linear setting. This is interesting because the FE approach is one of the standard methods used in practice. In the linear setting, the MR does well, but performs best for only for one of the three profiles. While the FE approach ignores the modification of the practice effects by the covariates, the MR approach fully accounts for these interactions but may suffer from overfitting or singularity problems. The $\{weighting, modeling\}$ approaches account for practice effect modification due to \mathbf{X}_{null}^c by weighting but not due \mathbf{X}_{null} in modeling, so in a sense they are a compromise.

Third, $\{weighting, modeling\}$ approaches exhibit comparable performance to MR in the linear setting, but considerably better performance in the non-linear settings. Fourth, between the two $\{weighting, modeling\}$ approaches, FE does better in the linear case, but worse, especially for the large profile, which requires more extrapolation, in the highly non-linear setting. Fifth, the transformations of the covariates matter: balancing covariance matrices appears to be a robust choice in the settings considered.

Pure regression modeling approaches, as they stand, have no way to not extrapolate (even when there is a non-extrapolating solution its implied weights may be negative, extrapolating, in the pursuit of minimum variance). In summary, $\{SBW(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{null}^c), WR(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}; 0)\}$ appears to be a robust approach to quality measurement in a variety of settings and profiles.

5.2.3 The individual practice perspective

Suppose the system was concerned about overall performance, without special interest in any specific practice. If that were the case, the perspective of the individual practice is different from that of the system, since for pay-for-performance purposes, the practice director is particularly concerned with having her practice fairly evaluated, without mistakes in the analysis, and preferably based on data from the patients her practice has seen, and not predictions from a model trained on different patients who were seen at different prac-

tices. From this perspective, two relevant measures are the mean and maximum absolute difference between the true and estimated rankings as demonstrated in Table 6 in the Online Supplementary Materials.

For both the mean and maximum absolute differences, the tenor of the results is similar to that of the previous section with the most marked differences for the maximum. In fact, $\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$ performs best when feasible. However, as evidenced in the figures described in Section 5.2.1 this is often not the case. In general, the {weighting, modeling} approach exhibit the most robust performance with respect to mean difference in rankings, yet not from the lens of the maximum difference in rankings where the FE approach does quite well. What is really important again is to adjust for the transformations of the covariates.

6 Case study

The methods that exhibited the best performance in the previous simulation study were $\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$ when feasible and $\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}^c), \text{WR}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}; 0)\}$ in general. We will use these methods in our case study assessing survival outcomes across oncology practices. Our analysis proceeds as follows. First, we describe the covariate profiles of the target populations, including all patients in the system and three individual patients. In the case of the individual patients, we envision a population of patients with the same covariate values as the individual patient. Since we cannot meaningfully define $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ for the individual patients, we use \mathbf{X} instead. Second, we find the practices with null covariates for each profile. Again, these are practices for which quality estimates can be provided only by extrapolation using data from other practices. Third, we report quality estimates using $\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbf{X})$ and $\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c), \text{WR}(\mathbf{X}; 0)\}$. Fourth, we devise rankings using $\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c), \text{WR}(\mathbf{X}; 0)\}$.

Table 2 describes the four covariate profiles under study. The first profile is the average “patient” across all practices (the system). The next three profiles are examples of hypothetical patients that often require cancer care. In particular, Patient 1 represents a White man in

his early 70s with stage 3 lung cancer and generally low socioeconomic status. Patient 2 corresponds to a White women in her late 70s with stage 4 pancreatic cancer, high comorbidity, and higher socioeconomic status. Patient 3 is identical to Patient 2, except for race which is now Black. As we will see, just changing this covariate from Patient 2 to Patient 3 will have important implications for quality measurement.

For each of these profiles, we inspect the data to understand the extent to which data are available to assess the survival outcomes for each of the different practices. Figure 5 in the Online Supplementary Materials counts the number of practices with null covariates for each profile. Again, these are practices for which it is not possible to carry out the case-mix adjustments (and therefore, estimate the mean outcome) using data solely from the practice in question; that is, without leveraging the functional form of a model fitted on data from patients in other practices. For the system profile, across all 600 practices, there are 306 practices with no null covariates and 294 practices with at least one null covariate. Among these, 83 have three or more null covariates. The covariates that produce the largest number of null cases are race (Black and other), education (quartile 1), income (quartile 4), and cancer type (ovary and prostate). For patients 1, 2, and 3, the numbers of practices with null covariates are reduced substantially, but there are still sizable numbers of practices that did not treat a single patient with a certain covariate value of the target profiles. This is particularly true for Patient 3, because many practices did not treat any Black women with pancreatic cancer, a cancer that is relatively infrequently diagnosed.

In reality, if there are null covariates, $\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbf{X})$ will not be feasible and not produce an estimate. By contrast, $\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c), \text{WR}(\mathbf{X}; 0)\}$ will extrapolate and always produce an estimate, but first it will identify the practices with null covariates, and then conduct the model adjustments trying to adjust as much as possible for the non-null covariates by weighting. While the estimates using $\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbf{X})$ is sample bounded (Robins et al. 2007), the estimates using $\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c), \text{WR}(\mathbf{X}; 0)\}$ can be outside the convex hull of the ob-

served outcome data. While $\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbf{X})$ allows for effect modification for all the covariates in the profile and \mathbf{X} , the weighted regression estimator using $\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c), \text{WR}(\mathbf{X}; 0)\}$ allows for effect modification for $\mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c$, which in practice is a smaller set of covariates. With $\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbf{X})$ we can inspect covariate balance as follows.

Figure 2 shows covariate balance relative to the system profile before and after weighting using $\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbf{X})$. The results are similar for other profiles. Before weighting, there are substantial differences in means of covariates between practices and the profile (most notably in race, education, and income) yet after weighting these differences are reduced, showing the case-mix adjustments and comparability of the patient samples after weighting.

Figure 3 is inspired by Keele et al. (2020) and shows the estimated survival rate after one year using $\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbf{X})$ (left) and $\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c), \text{WR}(\mathbf{X}; 0)\}$ (right) for the system profile. Point estimates and confidence intervals are depicted in blue and light blue, respectively. In both plots, practices are indexed by their estimated 1-year survival rate using $\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c), \text{WR}(\mathbf{X}; 0)\}$, so in the right plot Practice 1 has the lowest survival rate and Practice 600, the highest. In the left plot, we observe that $\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbf{X})$ often does not produce point estimates, leaving blank spaces for the practices where some form of extrapolation is needed for case-mix adjustment. Comparing the two plots, we also note that while both sets of estimates follow a roughly similar “S” shape in aggregate, the individual practice point estimates often differ — sometimes substantially. This is because the different methods imply different models fit on different data: while $\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbf{X})$ produces estimates on a more restricted set of data, it allows for effect modification on all the covariates in the profile and is fit on the data of the practice under consideration, whereas $\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c), \text{WR}(\mathbf{X}; 0)\}$ allows for effect modification on the covariates included in the weighting step only and is fit on data from all practices, producing estimates for the entire data.

Figure 6 in the Online Supplementary Materials shows the changes in rankings for different profiles. The left plot compares the rankings for the system profile and that of Patient 1.

There are substantial differences: 367 or 61.1% of the practices change their ranking by 10% (60 ranking places) or more. The center plot makes a similar comparison between profiles 2 and 3, when only one covariate value (race) changes between profiles. 426 or 71% of the practices change their ranking by 10% (60 ranking places) or more. To better grasp this variation, the right plot shows the changes in relative positions after grouping the practices by quintiles. Table 3 counts the number of practices for each of these changes: 176 or 29.3% of the practices remain in the same quintile when the profile changes (diagonal of the matrix), 215 or 35.8% of the practices move up or down by one quintile, 209 or 34.8% move by two or more quintiles, and 42 or 7% of the practices move from the top to the bottom quintile or vice versa. This exemplifies that the profile — the “test” on which each practice is evaluated — matters. Among other reasons, this is important for quality measurement that is used for high-stakes purposes, such as public reporting or payment.

7 Discussion

Motivated by the problem of measuring the quality of cancer care delivered by providers across the US, we have discussed a framework for institutional quality measurement which addresses the heterogeneity of the patient population they serve. For this, we have introduced the concept of a target covariate profile for quality measurement. This profile can represent target populations and specific patients. Utilizing this profile, we have assessed the empirical performance of several estimators that combine weighting and regression modeling adjustments in a layered manner in order to reduce extrapolation. We have implemented a form of adjustment that approximately balances the covariance matrices of the observed covariates. In particular, we have highlighted the practical utility of weighting methods that openly describe the target population and warn the investigator when case-mix adjustments and performance estimates are infeasible without extrapolation beyond the support of the data of a given practice.

With null covariates, the models must use data from other practices to produce estimates

because data are absent for patients with these covariate values. As we have discussed, if the investigator desires to estimate for practices with null covariates, there is no other option than to rely on a model fitted in other practices. As we have shown it is important to be aware of these different types of adjustments because they can have profound implications both for individual practices and patients. In this context, we have discussed a constrained optimization approach to weighting which unlike existing unconstrained weighting approaches provides an explicitly check for extrapolation via feasibility.

In this paper, we have also underscored the empirical performance of two approaches for case-mix adjustments: one that uses balancing weights only, which does not require the outcomes (and hence, is part of the design stage of the study) and conducts the adjustments by interpolation; and another method that combines balancing weights and regression modeling, and may extrapolate beyond the support of the data, although in a more robust and restricted manner than traditional regression modeling approaches to quality measurement. While the former approach is constrained by sparse data (in that it produces estimates only when the case mix-adjustments are feasible by interpolation), it allows for effect modification for all covariates in the target covariate profile and produces a sample-bounded estimator (i.e., one that is restricted to lie inside the range of the observed data). The latter approach extrapolates but is applicable to the entirety of health providers in the data.

Starting from a covariate profile, this methodology is a means to target the quality measurement of health care providers and to devise individualized recommendations for single patients. Each patient has a covariate or risk profile. The patient asks: for a given outcome (e.g., survival after one year), what is the typical performance of providers for patients with a similar covariate profile to mine? The methodology first tells the patient which providers have treated patients like them. Then, for the feasible providers, it produces performance estimates. Although some providers may lack sufficient data to deliver customized estimates without extrapolation, the methodology can still produce predictions for those providers, if

the patient desires.

Future work will involve combining non-parametric balancing approaches for general covariate profiles \boldsymbol{x}^* and statistical learning methods for the mean potential outcome function μ_p as in Hirshberg and Wager (2021). This analysis applies to other settings besides health care, including business and education, where instead of practices, we have companies and schools. Likewise, this analysis also applies to individuals' performance rather than institutions, including physicians, school teachers, and executive officers.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Ambarish Chattopadhyay, Michael Chernew, Richard Frank, Avi Feller, Luke Keele, Bijan Niknam, and Alan Zaslavsky for helpful comments and conversations. This study used the linked SEER-Medicare database. The interpretation and reporting of these data are the sole responsibility of the authors. The authors acknowledge the efforts of the National Cancer Institute; the Office of Research, Development and Information, CMS; Information Management Services (IMS), Inc.; and the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) Program tumor registries in the creation of the SEER-Medicare database.

The collection of cancer incidence data used in this study was supported by the California Department of Public Health as part of the statewide cancer reporting program mandated by California Health and Safety Code Section 103885; the National Cancer Institute's Surveillance, Epidemiology and End Results Program under contract HHSN261201000140C awarded to the Cancer Prevention Institute of California, contract HHSN261201000035C awarded to the University of Southern California, and contract HHSN261201000034C awarded to the Public Health Institute; and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Program of Cancer Registries, under agreement # U58DP003862-01 awarded to the California Department of Public Health. The ideas and opinions expressed herein are those of the author(s) and endorsement by the State of California Department of Public Health,

the National Cancer Institute, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or their Contractors and Subcontractors is not intended nor should be inferred. The authors acknowledge the efforts of the National Cancer Institute; the Office of Research, Development and Information, CMS; Information Management Services (IMS), Inc.; and the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) Program tumor registries in the creation of the SEER-Medicare database.

Funding and support: This research was supported by Arnold Ventures. José Zubizarreta also acknowledges support by award ME-2019C1-16172 from the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (PCORI). The views presented here are those of the authors and not necessarily those of Arnold Ventures, PCORI, its directors, officers, or staff.

References

- Ash, A. S., Fienberg, S. F., Louis, T. A., Normand, S.-L. T., Stukel, T. A., and Utts, J. (2012). Statistical issues in assessing hospital performance. *COPPS-CMS White Paper. 2012* .
- Ben-Michael, E., Feller, A., and Rothstein, J. (2020). The augmented synthetic control method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.04170* .
- Chattopadhyay, A., Hase, C. H., and Zubizarreta, J. R. (2020). Balancing versus modeling approaches to weighting in practice. *Statistics in Medicine* **39**, 3227–3254.
- Chattopadhyay, A. and Zubizarreta, J. R. (2021). On the implied weights of linear regression in causal inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.06581* .
- George, E. I., Ročková, V., Rosenbaum, P. R., Satopää, V. A., and Silber, J. H. (2017). Mortality rate estimation and standardization for public reporting: Medicare’s hospital compare. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **112**, 933–947.
- Goldstein, H. and Spiegelhalter, D. J. (1996). League tables and their limitations: statistical

- issues in comparisons of institutional performance. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* **159**, 385–409.
- Gondi, S., Wright, A. A., Landrum, M. B., Meneades, L., Zubizarreta, J. R., Chernew, M. E., and Keating, N. L. (2021). Assessment of patient attribution to care from medical oncologists, surgeons or radiation oncologists following a new cancer diagnosis. *Journal of the American Medical Association, Network Open* page in press.
- Hájek, J. (1971). Comment on an essay on the logical foundations of survey sampling by basu, d. *Foundations of Statistical Inference* **236**,
- Hirshberg, D. A. and Wager, S. (2021). Augmented minimax linear estimation. *Annals of Statistics* page in press.
- Imbens, G. W. (2000). The role of the propensity score in estimating dose-response functions. *Biometrika* **87**, 706–710.
- Keele, L., Ben-Michael, E., Feller, A., Kelz, R., and Miratrix, L. (2020). Hospital quality risk standardization via approximate balancing weights. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.09056*.
- Krumholz, H. M., Lin, Z., Drye, E. E., Desai, M. M., Han, L. F., Rapp, M. T., Mattera, J. A., and Normand, S.-L. T. (2011). An administrative claims measure suitable for profiling hospital performance based on 30-day all-cause readmission rates among patients with acute myocardial infarction. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes* **4**, 243–252.
- Longford, N. T. (2020). Performance assessment as an application of causal inference. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* **183**, 1363–1385.
- Neyman, J. (1923, 1990). On the application of probability theory to agricultural experiments. *Statistical Science* **5**, 463–480.

- Normand, S.-L. T., Ash, A. S., Fienberg, S. E., Stukel, T. A., Utts, J., and Louis, T. A. (2016). League tables for hospital comparisons. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* **3**, 21–50.
- Robins, J., Sued, M., Lei-Gomez, Q., and Rotnitzky, A. (2007). Comment: performance of double-robust estimators when “inverse probability” weights are highly variable. *Statistical Science* **22**, 544–559.
- Rubin, D. B. (1974). Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of Educational Psychology* **66**, 688.
- Rubin, D. B. (1980). Randomization analysis of experimental data: the fisher randomization test comment. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **75**, 591–593.
- Rubin, D. B. (2008). For objective causal inference, design trumps analysis. *Annals of Applied Statistics* **2**, 808–840.
- Silber, J. H., Rosenbaum, P. R., Ross, R. N., Ludwig, J. M., Wang, W., Niknam, B. A., Mukherjee, N., Saynisch, P. A., Even-Shoshan, O., Kelz, R. R., et al. (2014). Template matching for auditing hospital cost and quality. *Health Services Research* **49**, 1446–1474.
- Wang, Y. and Zubizarreta, J. R. (2020). Minimal dispersion approximately balancing weights: asymptotic properties and practical considerations. *Biometrika* **107**, 93–105.
- Yang, S., Imbens, G. W., Cui, Z., Faries, D. E., and Kadziola, Z. (2016). Propensity score matching and subclassification in observational studies with multi-level treatments. *Biometrics* **72**, 1055–1065.
- Zubizarreta, J. R. (2015). Stable weights that balance covariates for estimation with incomplete outcome data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **110**, 910–922.

Figure 1: Extrapolation with 10 covariates.




Table 1: Absolute bias and RMSE averaged across 100 practices and 1,000 simulated data sets for three target samples; namely, the sample of all patients in the system, and the samples of patients in the largest and smallest practice.

Method	Simulation setting											
	Linear			Lowly non-linear			Moderately non-linear			Highly non-linear		
	System	Target Small	Target Large	System	Target Small	Target Large	System	Target Small	Target Large	System	Target Small	Target Large
Bias												
$\{\cdot, \text{FE}(\mathbf{X})\}$	0.88	0.91	1.91	0.89	0.90	1.90	0.77	0.80	1.70	0.77	0.81	1.71
$\{\cdot, \text{FE}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	0.88	0.91	1.91	0.87	0.90	1.91	0.72	0.73	1.72	0.72	0.72	1.73
$\{\cdot, \text{MR}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.64	0.32	1.22	1.05	0.59	1.87	1.10	0.63	1.95
$\{\cdot, \text{MR}(\mathbf{X})\}$	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.08	0.27	0.12	0.05	0.79	0.30	0.04	0.79	0.34
$\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}), \cdot\}$	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.40	0.09	0.20	0.68	0.16	0.37	0.72	0.17	0.41
$\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbf{X}), \cdot\}$	0.05	0.17	0.05	0.10	0.81	0.08	0.09	1.01	0.27	0.08	1.07	0.26
$\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c), \text{FE}(\mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}, w)\}$	0.05	0.04	0.06	0.47	0.17	0.96	0.79	0.33	1.42	0.83	0.35	1.49
$\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}), \text{FE}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}, w)\}$	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.10	0.07	0.17	0.07	0.27	0.11	0.07	0.26	0.12
$\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c), \text{WR}(\mathbf{X}; 0)\}$	0.04	0.03	0.46	0.47	0.16	0.52	0.79	0.30	0.61	0.83	0.32	0.62
$\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}), \text{WR}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}; 0)\}$	0.13	0.07	0.82	0.14	0.08	0.82	0.09	0.23	0.68	0.09	0.22	0.67
RMSE												
$\{\cdot, \text{FE}(\mathbf{X})\}$	0.94	1.04	1.95	1.16	1.47	2.09	1.34	1.82	2.12	1.41	1.94	2.20
$\{\cdot, \text{FE}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	0.94	1.04	1.95	0.99	1.24	2.03	0.89	1.31	1.95	0.91	1.38	2.00
$\{\cdot, \text{MR}(\mathbf{X})\}$	0.18	0.19	0.28	1.23	1.31	2.21	1.95	2.16	3.43	2.10	2.36	3.68
$\{\cdot, \text{MR}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	0.33	0.31	0.46	0.85	1.30	2.03	0.86	2.06	2.95	0.94	2.22	3.21
$\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}), \cdot\}$	0.17	0.20	0.16	0.97	1.16	0.74	1.55	1.90	1.32	1.69	2.09	1.47
$\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbf{X}), \cdot\}$	0.16	0.18	0.15	0.36	0.86	0.43	0.42	1.08	0.78	0.45	1.13	0.87
$\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c), \text{FE}(\mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}, w)\}$	0.16	0.16	0.22	0.90	0.99	1.73	1.45	1.63	2.65	1.57	1.79	2.86
$\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}), \text{FE}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}, w)\}$	0.20	0.20	0.31	0.54	0.78	1.54	0.60	1.22	2.25	0.64	1.33	2.46
$\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c), \text{WR}(\mathbf{X}; 0)\}$	0.15	0.15	0.63	0.90	0.99	1.28	1.45	1.62	1.86	1.57	1.78	2.01
$\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}), \text{WR}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}; 0)\}$	0.28	0.25	0.93	0.50	0.76	1.25	0.53	1.15	1.44	0.57	1.26	1.54

Table 2: Covariate profiles for the system and three hypothetical patients

	System	Patient 1	Patient 2	Patient 3
Age	76.10	70.77	78.34	78.34
Sex (Male)	0.34	1	0	0
Sex (Female)	0.66	0	1	1
Race (White)	0.82	1	1	0
Race (Black)	0.08	0	0	1
Race (Other)	0.10	0	0	0
Marital status (Married)	0.52	0	1	1
Marital status (Unmarried)	0.44	1	0	0
Percentage of residents without a high school education	13.09	27.75	13.57	13.57
Census-tract median household income	1.08	0.60	0.89	0.89
Charlson Comorbidity Index (0)	0.34	0	0	0
Charlson Comorbidity Index (1)	0.26	0	0	0
Charlson Comorbidity Index (2)	0.16	0	0	0
Charlson Comorbidity Index (≥ 3)	0.24	1	1	1
Cancer type (Breast)	0.35	0	0	0
Cancer type (Colorectal)	0.17	0	0	0
Cancer type (Lung)	0.34	1	0	0
Cancer type (Ovary)	0.02	0	0	0
Cancer type (Pancreas)	0.07	0	1	1
Cancer type (Prostate)	0.05	0	0	0
Cancer stage (1)	0.27	0	1	1
Cancer stage (2)	0.22	0	0	0
Cancer stage (3)	0.20	1	0	0
Cancer stage (4)	0.27	0	1	1

Figure 2: Covariate balance relative to the system profile before and after weighting




Figure 3: Estimated survival after one year for the system profile using $SBW(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbf{X})$ (left) and $\{SBW(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{null}^c), WR(\mathbf{X}; 0)\}$ (right).




Table 3: Changes in quintile rankings of practices for the profiles of patients 2 and 3.

Patient 2 / 3	[1,120]	(120,240]	(240,361]	(361,480]	(480,600]
[1,120]	33	32	20	13	22
(120,240]	23	36	29	15	17
(240,361]	23	24	39	17	17
(361,480]	21	18	19	33	29
(480,600]	20	10	13	42	35

Online Supplementary Materials

Notation

Table 4: Notation

i	\triangleq	Index of patient $i = 1, \dots, I_p$ in practice $p = 1, \dots, P$
\mathbf{X}_i	\triangleq	Observed covariates of patient i
\mathbf{X}_{null}	\triangleq	Covariates in \mathbf{X} that are null for at least one practice
$\mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c$	\triangleq	Covariates that are not null, $\mathbf{X}_{\text{null}} \cup \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c = \mathbf{X}$
$\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$	\triangleq	Transformations of the observed covariates \mathbf{X}
\mathbf{U}	\triangleq	Unobserved covariates
$\mathbb{1}_{p,i}$	\triangleq	Practice assignment indicator of patient i , $p = 1, \dots, P$
$S_{p,i}$	\triangleq	Selection indicator of patient i into practice $p = 1, \dots, P$
$Y_i(p)$	\triangleq	Potential outcome of patient i under practice assignment p
Y_i	\triangleq	Observed outcome of patient i , $Y_i = \sum_{p=1}^P \mathbb{1}_{p,i} Y_i(p)$
SBW(a, b)	\triangleq	Stable Balancing Weights with constraints a on the weights to require non-negative weights and interpolation adjustments ($a = \mathbb{R}_0^+$) or unrestricted weights and extrapolation adjustments ($a = \mathbb{R}$), and balance on the covariates in b (e.g., $b = \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c$)
H	\triangleq	Hajek estimator
FE(b)	\triangleq	Fixed Effects regression adjustment for the covariates in b (e.g., $b = \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c$) plus practice indicators
MR(b)	\triangleq	Multi Regression adjustment for the covariates in b (e.g., $b = \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c$)
WR(b)	\triangleq	Weighted Regression regression adjustment for the covariates in b (e.g., $b = \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c$) plus practice indicators


Methods considered in the empirical evaluations

Table 5: Methods considered in the empirical evaluations, $\{weighting, modeling\}$

$\{\cdot, FE(\mathbf{X})\}$	\triangleq	Fixed Effects regression of the outcome on \mathbf{X} and the practice indicators; we fit one single model for all the practices to then predict the patient outcomes and average them within each of the practices
$\{\cdot, FE(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	\triangleq	Fixed Effects regression of the outcome on $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ and the practice indicators; we fit one single model for all the practices to then predict the patient outcomes and average them within each of the practices
$\{\cdot, MR(\mathbf{X})\}$	\triangleq	Multi Regression of the outcome on \mathbf{X} ; we fit separate models for each practice, to then predict the patient outcomes and average them within each of the practices
$\{\cdot, MR(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	\triangleq	Multi Regression of the outcome on $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$; we fit separate models for each practice, to then predict the patient outcomes and average them within each of the practices
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbf{X}), \cdot\}$	\triangleq	Non-negative SBW with balance conditions for \mathbf{X}
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}), \cdot\}$	\triangleq	Non-negative SBW with balance conditions for $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}), \cdot\}$	\triangleq	Relaxed SBW with balance conditions for \mathbf{X}
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}), \cdot\}$	\triangleq	Relaxed SBW with balance conditions for $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c), FE(\mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}, w)\}$	\triangleq	Fixed Effects regression of the outcome on \mathbf{X}_{null} , the weights $w = SBW(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c)$, and the practice indicators; we fit one single model for all the practices to then predict the patient outcomes and average them within each of the practices
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}^c), FE(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}, w)\}$	\triangleq	Fixed Effects regression of the outcome on $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}$, the weights $w = SBW(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}^c)$, and the practice indicators; we fit one single model for all the practices to then predict the patient outcomes and average them within each of the practices
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c), WR(\mathbf{X}; 0)\}$	\triangleq	Weighted Regression of the outcome on \mathbf{X} and the practice indicators; in the weighted regression, the weights $SBW(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{null}}^c)$ are truncated at 0; we fit one single model for all the practices to then predict the patient outcomes and average them within each of the practices
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}^c), WR(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}; 0)\}$	\triangleq	Weighted Regression of the outcome on $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ and the practice indicators; in the weighted regression, the weights $SBW(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}^c)$ are truncated at 0; we fit one single model for all the practices to then predict the patient outcomes and average them within each of the practices

Extrapolation with 30 covariates

Figure 4: Extrapolation with 30 covariates.




Accuracy of estimated rankings

Table 6: Absolute difference between the true and estimated rankings across 100 practices and 1000 simulated data sets for three target samples: the sample of all patients in the system, and the samples of patients in the largest and smallest practices. The mean value is averaged across 100 practices and 1000 simulated data sets. The maximum value is computed for each data set and then averaged all over.

Method	Simulation setting											
	Linear			Non-linear: low			Non-linear: medium			Non-linear: high		
	System	Target Small	Target Large	System	Target Small	Target Large	System	Target Small	Target Large	System	Target Small	Target Large
Mean												
$\{\cdot, FE(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	7.23	7.00	15.81	7.91	8.82	15.04	8.92	9.78	14.72	9.36	10.25	15.03
$\{\cdot, FE(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	7.20	6.97	15.76	7.21	8.18	15.37	6.71	8.39	14.92	6.91	8.77	15.21
$\{\cdot, MR(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	1.26	1.39	2.06	8.03	7.38	15.97	12.31	10.99	23.89	13.22	11.81	24.94
$\{\cdot, MR(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	1.97	2.22	3.18	4.98	7.67	11.56	5.02	10.75	14.99	5.32	11.51	15.69
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}), \cdot\}$	0.99	0.78	0.76	4.37	6.57	2.81	7.27	9.73	5.29	7.94	10.43	5.73
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}), \cdot\}$	0.88	0.00	0.72	1.68	0.01	1.87	2.20	0.00	3.05	2.47	0.00	3.32
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}^c), FE(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}, w)\}$	1.06	1.06	1.55	5.75	5.49	12.23	8.89	8.56	19.14	9.65	9.31	20.40
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}), FE(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}, w)\}$	1.38	1.44	2.11	3.64	5.09	8.84	3.72	7.47	11.78	3.97	8.12	12.57
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}^c), WR(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}; 0)\}$	1.03	1.03	4.99	5.70	5.49	8.21	8.89	8.66	11.61	9.66	9.42	12.47
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}), WR(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}; 0)\}$	2.01	1.71	7.32	3.47	4.96	8.76	3.49	7.23	10.02	3.73	7.86	10.62
Maximum												
$\{\cdot, FE(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	20.77	17.95	36.03	25.30	27.29	38.15	35.26	36.72	46.33	38.26	39.44	48.93
$\{\cdot, FE(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	20.42	18.02	35.29	20.70	23.77	36.80	20.84	28.41	40.89	22.17	30.69	43.22
$\{\cdot, MR(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	5.81	5.68	10.21	41.80	31.68	81.35	62.04	45.94	91.08	66.17	49.37	91.48
$\{\cdot, MR(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	14.19	10.78	18.89	31.20	35.28	62.47	30.23	46.02	71.86	31.54	48.90	73.41
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}), \cdot\}$	4.11	3.67	3.15	18.85	22.26	10.42	30.15	32.58	18.54	32.83	35.19	19.71
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}), \cdot\}$	3.27	0.00	2.56	6.31	0.01	6.12	8.37	0.00	9.67	9.59	0.00	10.36
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}^c), FE(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}, w)\}$	4.57	4.26	7.33	25.92	22.54	68.57	39.22	34.82	88.48	42.98	38.17	89.97
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}), FE(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}, w)\}$	7.47	5.88	11.83	20.66	21.45	49.62	19.77	31.31	61.17	20.82	34.34	63.84
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}^c), WR(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}; 0)\}$	4.71	4.17	23.72	25.56	22.52	34.62	39.02	35.17	49.36	42.81	38.59	53.25
$\{SBW(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{null}}), WR(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}; 0)\}$	13.06	7.96	25.71	16.43	20.00	36.17	16.24	29.94	44.32	17.28	32.91	47.38

Number of practices with at least one null covariate

Figure 5: Number of practices with at least one null covariate




Distribution of null covariates

Table 7: Number of practices with at least one null covariate

Covariate	Profile	Violations
Age	0.278	0
Age (65-74)	0.459	0
Age (75-84)	0.421	0
Age (≥ 85)	0.120	2
Sex (Male)	0.339	6
Sex (Female)	0.661	3
Race (White)	0.822	1
Race (Black)	0.075	108
Race (Other)	0.102	69
Marital status (Married)	0.516	0
Marital status (Unmarried)	0.438	0
Census-level prop. of residents without a high school ed.	0.164	0
Census-level prop. of residents without a high school ed. (Quartile 1)	0.256	71
Census-level prop. of residents without a high school ed. (Quartile 2)	0.257	20
Census-level prop. of residents without a high school ed. (Quartile 3)	0.251	4
Census-level prop. of residents without a high school ed. (Quartile 4)	0.237	17
Census-tract median household income	0.230	0
Census-tract median household income (Quartile 1)	0.247	7
Census-tract median household income (Quartile 2)	0.250	0
Census-tract median household income (Quartile 3)	0.251	3
Census-tract median household income (Quartile 4)	0.252	60
Charlson Comorbidity Index (0)	0.345	0
Charlson Comorbidity Index (1)	0.259	0
Charlson Comorbidity Index (2)	0.159	0
Charlson Comorbidity Index (≥ 3)	0.237	0
Cancer type (Breast)	0.347	4
Cancer type (Colorectal)	0.171	10
Cancer type (Lung)	0.337	7
Cancer type (Ovary)	0.023	141
Cancer type (Pancreas)	0.075	28
Cancer type (Prostate)	0.048	55
Cancer stage (1)	0.269	3
Cancer stage (2)	0.217	0
Cancer stage (3)	0.196	3
Cancer stage (4)	0.274	2

Changes in practice rankings for different covariate profiles

Figure 6: Changes in practice rankings for different covariate profiles. The right plot groups the ranking by quintiles.



Additional numerical results

Table 8: Absolute bias and RMSE averaged across 100 practices and 1,000 simulated data sets for three target samples; namely, the sample of all patients in the system, and the samples of patients in the largest and smallest practice.

Method	Simulation setting											
	Linear			Lowly non-linear			Moderately non-linear			Highly non-linear		
	System	Target Small	Large	System	Target Small	Large	System	Target Small	Large	System	Target Small	Large
Bias												
$\{\cdot, \text{FE}(\mathbf{X})\}$	1.03	1.07	2.19	1.04	1.07	2.18	0.89	1.00	1.95	0.90	1.01	1.96
$\{\cdot, \text{FE}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	1.03	1.07	2.19	1.02	1.06	2.19	0.84	0.83	1.96	0.84	0.82	1.98
$\{\cdot, \text{MR}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.81	0.35	1.56	1.32	0.69	2.39	1.39	0.73	2.51
$\{\cdot, \text{MR}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.10	0.14	0.26	0.05	0.33	0.16	0.04	0.33	0.15
$\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbf{X}), \cdot\}$	0.05	0.04	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.19	0.07	0.28	0.32	0.06	0.28	0.36
$\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}), \cdot\}$	0.05	0.04	0.06	0.58	0.14	1.43	0.96	0.31	2.13	1.02	0.33	2.24
$\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}), \cdot\}$	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.12	0.09	0.29	0.08	0.30	0.18	0.06	0.30	0.16
RMSE												
$\{\cdot, \text{FE}(\mathbf{X})\}$	1.09	1.18	2.23	1.28	1.60	2.35	1.42	1.91	2.36	1.50	2.03	2.44
$\{\cdot, \text{FE}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	1.08	1.17	2.23	1.13	1.35	2.29	0.99	1.36	2.18	1.02	1.42	2.23
$\{\cdot, \text{MR}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	0.15	0.14	0.21	1.20	1.12	2.23	1.91	1.87	3.43	2.05	2.04	3.68
$\{\cdot, \text{MR}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})\}$	0.21	0.17	0.35	0.65	0.83	1.92	0.74	1.30	2.79	0.80	1.42	3.04
$\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbf{X}), \cdot\}$	0.18	0.20	0.19	0.49	0.75	0.66	0.55	1.18	1.07	0.59	1.29	1.19
$\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{X}), \cdot\}$	0.17	0.16	0.23	1.04	0.99	2.18	1.66	1.64	3.33	1.80	1.80	3.57
$\{\text{SBW}(\mathbb{R}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}), \cdot\}$	0.22	0.20	0.36	0.64	0.81	1.90	0.72	1.27	2.75	0.77	1.38	2.99

Table 9: Absolute difference between the true and estimated rankings across 100 practices and 1000 simulated data sets for three target samples: the sample of all patients in the system, and the samples of patients in the largest and smallest practices. The mean value is averaged across 100 practices and 1000 simulated data sets. The maximum value is computed for each data set and then averaged all over.

Method	Simulation setting											
	Linear			Non-linear: low			Non-linear: medium			Non-linear: high		
	System	Target Small	Target Large	System	Target Small	Target Large	System	Target Small	Target Large	System	Target Small	Target Large
Mean												
{, FE(\mathbf{X})}	8.13	7.75	17.38	8.48	9.42	16.70	9.20	10.14	16.18	9.60	10.56	16.43
{, FE($\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$)}	8.08	7.70	17.32	8.01	8.90	17.00	7.40	8.84	16.53	7.60	9.18	16.81
{, MR($\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$)}	1.00	0.98	1.55	7.48	5.74	16.79	11.81	8.76	25.89	12.71	9.44	27.07
{, MR($\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$)}	1.43	1.26	2.41	4.00	4.99	10.78	4.10	7.43	13.90	4.34	8.08	14.71
{SBW(\mathbb{R}_0^+ , \mathbf{X}), ·}	1.00	1.36	0.90	2.55	4.78	2.77	2.82	7.16	4.52	3.09	7.78	4.94
{SBW(\mathbb{R} , $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$), ·}	1.14	1.12	1.69	6.34	5.56	16.91	9.84	8.71	25.56	10.64	9.45	26.70
{SBW(\mathbb{R} , $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$), ·}	1.51	1.48	2.44	4.04	5.12	10.76	4.13	7.53	13.95	4.37	8.17	14.77
Maximum												
{, FE(\mathbf{X})}	23.82	19.40	40.74	26.42	30.23	40.78	37.02	39.75	48.69	39.81	42.34	51.17
{, FE($\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$)}	23.19	19.50	39.45	22.40	26.05	39.98	22.51	30.37	44.03	23.88	32.47	46.45
{, MR($\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$)}	4.67	4.07	7.86	43.66	25.97	87.23	66.48	39.03	94.39	70.63	42.10	94.53
{, MR($\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$)}	9.02	5.19	14.56	25.68	22.00	65.44	24.11	32.41	74.14	24.99	35.64	76.09
{SBW(\mathbb{R}_0^+ , \mathbf{X}), ·}	4.55	5.68	3.81	12.31	19.00	11.19	12.71	28.57	18.00	13.82	31.53	19.73
{SBW(\mathbb{R} , $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$), ·}	5.34	4.52	8.15	34.76	22.74	86.97	54.19	36.40	94.45	58.28	40.22	94.63
{SBW(\mathbb{R} , $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$), ·}	9.06	5.95	14.40	25.51	21.89	65.10	24.03	32.38	74.16	25.05	35.71	76.08