

PERFORMANCE OF THE BELGIAN HEALTH SYSTEM – REPORT 2019

SUPPLEMENT



PERFORMANCE OF THE BELGIAN HEALTH SYSTEM – REPORT 2019

SUPPLEMENT: REJECTED INDICATORS

CARL DEVOS, AUDREY CORDON, MÉLANIE LEFÈVRE, CAROLINE OBYN, FRANÇOISE RENARD, NICOLAS BOUCKAERT, SOPHIE GERKENS, CHARLINE MAERTENS DE NOORDHOUT, BRECHT DEVLEESSCHAUWER, MARGARÉTA HAELTERMAN, CHRISTIAN LÉONARD, PASCAL MEEUS)



COLOPHON

Title:	Performance of the Belgian health system – report 2019 – Supplement: rejected indicators
Authors:	Carl Devos (KCE), Audrey Cordon (KCE), Mélanie Lefèvre (KCE), Caroline Obyn (KCE), Françoise Renard (Sciensano), Nicolas Bouckaert (KCE), Sophie Gerkens (KCE), Charline Maertens de Noordhout (KCE), Brecht Devleeschauwer (Sciensano), Margareta Haelterman (FOD Volksgezondheid – SPF Santé Publique), Christian Léonard (KCE), Pascal Meeus (INAMI – RIZIV)
Project coordinator:	Nathalie Swartenbroeckx (KCE)
Senior supervisor:	Christian Léonard (KCE)
Experts consulted for the validation of indicators definitions and results:	Sophie Alexander (ULB), Thomas Allvin (EFPIA), Katrien Beeckman (UZ Brussel, VUB, VBOV), Nadia Benahmed (KCE), Benoit Boland (UCLouvain), Bernard Bolle (IMA – AIM), Christiane Bontemps (CRÉSAM), Jolyce Bourgeois (KCE), Ronny Bruffaerts (UZ Leuven), Hendrik Cammu (SPE, UZ Brussel), Joana Carvalho (UC Louvain), Anne Clercx (SPF Santé Publique – FOD Volksgezondheid), Peter Cosemans (Zorgnet Icuuro), Virginie Dalcq (INAMI), Dominique Declerck (KULeuven) Raf De Rycke (Broeders van Liefde), Harlinde De Schutter (Kankerregister – Registre du Cancer), Dominique Dubourg (AViQ), Régine Goemaes (SPE), Jean-Pierre Gorrissen (FOD Volksgezondheid – SPF Santé Publique), Tine Grammens (Sciensano), Wilfried Gyselaers (ZOL Genk, Universiteit Hasselt), Germaine Hanquet (KCE), David Hercot (CCC Irisnet), Claire Janssens (RIZIV – INAMI), Pascale Jonckheer (KCE), Peter Jouck (FOD Volksgezondheid – SPF Santé Publique), Katrien Latour (Sciensano), Roos Leroy (KCE), Peter Louwagie (KCE), Timothée Mahieu (SPF Santé Publique – FOD Volksgezondheid), Patrick Martens (CvKO), Elise Mendes Da Costa (CCC Observatoire de la Santé et du Social Bruxelles), Dirk Moens (FOD Sociale Zekerheid – SPF Sécurité Sociale), Ingrid Morales (ONE), Jean-Philippe Mousset (RIZIV – INAMI), Gunnar Naulaers (UZ Leuven, college Moeder-Kind), Jozef Pacolet (KULeuven, HIVA), Alex Peltier (Mutualité Chrétienne), Gert Peeters (UZ Leuven), Tatiana Pereira (ONE), Guido Pieters (KULeuven), Pascale Steinberg (SPF Santé Publique – FOD Volksgezondheid), Sabine Stordeur (KCE), Nathalie Terryn (SPF Santé Publique – FOD Volksgezondheid), Bertrand Tombal (UCLouvain), Eline Vandael (Sciensano), Rudi Van Dam (FOD Sociale Zekerheid – SPF Sécurité Sociale), Koen Van den Heede (KCE), Johan Van der Heyden (Sciensano), Carine Van de Voorde (KCE), Therese Vandurme (UCLouvain), Virginie Van Leeuw (CEPIP), Lien van Walle (Kankerregister – Registre du Cancer), Lies Versavel (Expertisecentrum Kraamzorg De Bakermat), Patrick Vyncke (Zorgnet-ICURO), Michel Willems (Statbel), François Wyngaerden (UCLouvain)
Stakeholders:	<p>The following administrations and public institutions have been consulted throughout the duration of the project:</p> <p>At the federal level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Representative of Minister of Health: Mieke Walraevens, Regina De Paepe• INAMI – RIZIV: Benoît Collin, Mickaël Daubie, Gunther Gijsen



- SPF Santé Publique – FOD Volksgezondheid: Anne Delvaux, Lieven Deraedt, Pol Gerits, Peter Jouck
- Sciensano: Herman Van Oyen
- SPF Sécurité Sociale – FOD Sociale Zekerheid: Sébastien Bastaits, Dirk Moens, Rudi Van Dam

At the regional level:

- Vlaamse Gemeenschap (Vlaams Agentschap Zorg en Gezondheid): Erik Hendrickx
- Région Wallonne (Direction générale opérationnelle des Pouvoirs locaux, de l'Action sociale et de la Santé et observatoire wallon de la santé): Anouck Billiet, Dominique Dubourg
- Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles (Direction générale de la Santé): Annalisa Tancredi
- Communauté Germanophone (DGOV Ministerium der Deutschsprachigen Gemeinschaft): Karin Cormann
- Région Bruxelles Capitale (Observatoire de la Santé et du Social): Murielle Deguerry, Olivier Gillis, David Hercot, Elise Mendes da Costa

External validators:

Jon Cylus (European Observatory on Health systems and Policies), Hans Kluge (WHO – World Health Organisation), Gaetan Lafortune (OECD - Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development)

Acknowledgements:

Delphine Beauport (RIZIV – INAMI), Cécile Camberlin (KCE), Karen Colaert (Agentschap Zorg en Gezondheid), Danielle Croisiaux (AIM – IMA), Marie Dauvrin (KCE), Marie Delnord (Inserm), Marc De Falleur (INAMI – RIZIV), Anne Delvaux (SPF Santé Publique – FOD Volksgezondheid), Annelies De Schrijver (Statbel), Stephan Devriese (KCE), Dominique Dicker (SPF Santé Publique – FOD Volksgezondheid), Christelle Durand (SPF Santé Publique – FOD Volksgezondheid), François Eyskens (CBAA – UZA), Valérie Forton (KSZ-BCSS/eHEALTH), Olivier Gillis (CCC Observatoire de la Santé et du Social Bruxelles), Lon Holtzer (Welzijn, Volksgezondheid en Gezin Vlanderen), Güngör Karakaya (MLOZ), Jean Macq (UCLouvain), Déogratias Mazina (CCC Observatoire de la Santé et du Social Bruxelles), Andries Nelissen (FOD Volksgezondheid – SPF Santé Publique), Marc Nyssen (Vrije Universiteit Brussel), Govin Permanand (WHO), Aurélie Somer (SPF Santé Publique – FOD Volksgezondheid), Nathalie Stallaert (Agentschap Zorg en Gezondheid), Belinda Ten Geuzendam (IMA – AIM), Nancy Thiry (KCE), Sarah Thomson (WHO), Joos Tielemans (RIZIV – INAMI), Xavier Van Aubel (INAMI – RIZIV), Saskia Van den Bogaert (SPF Santé Publique – FOD Volksgezondheid), Isabelle Van Der Brempt (SPF Santé Publique – FOD Volksgezondheid), Elisabeth Van Eycken (Kankerregister – Registre du Cancer), Tom Van Ourti (Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam), Aneke Verbeke (IMA – AIM), Martine Verstreken (IMA – AIM), Erik Vertommen (FOD Volksgezondheid – SPF Santé Publique), Irm Vinck (KCE), Gilda Wimmer (RIZIV – INAMI);

This paper uses data from SHARE Waves 1, 2, 3 (SHARELIFE), 4, 5 and 6 (DOIs: [10.6103/SHARE.w1.611](https://doi.org/10.6103/SHARE.w1.611), [10.6103/SHARE.w2.611](https://doi.org/10.6103/SHARE.w2.611), [10.6103/SHARE.w3.611](https://doi.org/10.6103/SHARE.w3.611), [10.6103/SHARE.w4.611](https://doi.org/10.6103/SHARE.w4.611), [10.6103/SHARE.w5.611](https://doi.org/10.6103/SHARE.w5.611), [10.6103/SHARE.w6.611](https://doi.org/10.6103/SHARE.w6.611)), see Börsch-Supan et al. (2013) for methodological details.

The SHARE data collection has been primarily funded by the European Commission through FP5 (QLK6-CT-2001-00360), FP6 (SHARE-I3: RII-CT-2006-062193, COMPARE: CIT5-CT-2005-028857, SHARELIFE: CIT4-CT-



2006-028812) and FP7 (SHARE-PREP: N°211909, SHARE-LEAP: N°227822, SHARE M4: N°261982). Additional funding from the German Ministry of Education and Research, the Max Planck Society for the Advancement of Science, the U.S. National Institute on Aging (U01_AG09740-13S2, P01_AG005842, P01_AG08291, P30_AG12815, R21_AG025169, Y1-AG-4553-01, IAG_BSR06-11, OGHA_04-064, HHSN271201300071C) and from various national funding sources is gratefully acknowledged (see www.share-project.org).

Reported interests:

'All experts and stakeholders consulted within this report were selected because of their involvement in the topic of Performance – Report 4. Therefore, by definition, each of them might have a certain degree of conflict of interest to the main topic of this report'

Membership of a stakeholder group on which the results of this report could have an impact: Gunnar Naulaers (VVK – Vlaamse Vereniging voor Kindergeneeskunde)

Participation in scientific or experimental research as an initiator, principal investigator or researcher: Wilfried Gyselaers (PhD-projects UHasselt : Preclampsie-screening, telemonitoring xxx)

Consultancy or employment for a company, an association or an organisation that may gain or lose financially due to the results of this report: David Hercot (CCC)

Presidency or accountable function within an institution, association, department or other entity on which the results of this report could have an impact: Thérèse Van Durme (Member of the Federal Council for the Quality of the Nursing Activity)

Layout:

Joyce Grijseels, Ine Verhulst

Disclaimer:

- **The external experts were consulted about a (preliminary) version of the scientific report. Their comments were discussed during meetings. They did not co-author the scientific report and did not necessarily agree with its content.**
- **Subsequently, a (final) version was submitted to the validators. The validation of the report results from a consensus or a voting process between the validators. The validators did not co-author the scientific report and did not necessarily all three agree with its content.**
- **Finally, this report has been approved by common assent by the Executive Board.**
- **Only the KCE is responsible for errors or omissions that could persist. The policy recommendations are also under the full responsibility of the KCE.**

Publication date:

25 April 2019

Domain:

Health Services Research (HSR)



MeSH: Delivery of Health Care; Health Services Accessibility; Quality of Health Care; Efficiency; Healthcare Disparities; Benchmarking, Belgium

NLM Classification: W84

Language: English

Format: Adobe® PDF™ (A4)

Legal depot: D/2019/10.273/35

ISSN: 2466-6459

Copyright: KCE reports are published under a “by/nc/nd” Creative Commons Licence
<http://kce.fgov.be/content/about-copyrights-for-kce-publications>.



How to refer to this document?

Devos C, Cordon A, Lefèvre M, Obyn C, Renard F, Bouckaert N, Gerkens S, Maertens de Noordhout C, Devleesschauwer B, Haelterman M, Léonard C, Meeus P. Performance of the Belgian health system – report 2019 – Supplement: rejected indicators. Health Services Research (HSR) Brussels: Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre (KCE). 2019. KCE Reports 313S. D/2019/10.273/35.

This document is available on the website of the Belgian Health Care Knowledge Centre.



■ APPENDIX REPORT

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 – Quality of care – safety: rejected indicators.....	2
Table 2 – Accessibility of care: rejected indicators	2
Table 3 – Sustainability of the healthcare system: rejected indicators	3
Table 4 – Preventive care: rejected indicators.....	4
Table 5 – Mental health care: rejected indicators	4
Table 6 – Care for the elderly: rejected indicators	5
Table 7 – Mother and new-born: rejected indicators	6



1. REJECTED INDICATORS

Hereafter are the lists, ordered by chapter, of indicators that have been considered but not selected, with an explanation of the reason for their exclusion.

Table 1 – Quality of care – safety: rejected indicators

Indicator	Reason for exclusion
Excessive polymedication (9 or more different medicines within last 24 hours) (% pop aged 65+)	No recent data available

Table 2 – Accessibility of care: rejected indicators

Indicator	Reason for exclusion
Individuals with a private health insurance (% of the population)	For the 2019 performance report, there were discussions on the interest of evaluating the proportion of individuals with private health insurance. Nevertheless, current data do not allow us to calculate this indicator appropriately (e.g. double counting for individuals having a voluntary insurance both with a private company and with a sickness fund). More precise data on this indicator would, however, be useful in the future, as it is included in European databases (OECD, Eurostat) with numerous limitations, showing a misleading picture of the Belgian situation (overestimation).
Nursing hours per patient day (NHPPD)	For the 2019 performance report, there were discussions on the interest of reporting nursing hours per patient day as principal indicator, in addition to the patient-to-nurse ratio. Nevertheless, since 2016, the registration of the nursing hours is no longer compulsory. NHPPD was therefore only reported as secondary indicator in the patient-to-nurse ratio technical fiche.
Unmet dental needs	Available data do not seem reliable.

**Table 3 – Sustainability of the healthcare system: rejected indicators**

Indicator	Reason for exclusion
S-12 W.A.I.T indicator for innovative medicines (in days)	<p>W.A.I.T indicator for innovative medicines is not anymore reported in the Performance report 2019 for the following reasons:</p> <p>Firstly, this indicator is currently based on data coming from industry (European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations) and the report is no longer public (only a PowerPoint presentation is available). This makes difficult to assess the reliability of data provided.</p> <p>Secondly, the coverage rate is underestimated due to methodologic choices: To carry out the study, they selected 145 medicines that obtained a marketing authorization by EMA between January 2014 and December 2016 (145 out of 232). Details on how the selection was done and which pharmaceutical products were selected were not published. Of these 145 drugs, 68 (47%) were on the list of drugs reimbursed in December 2017 (datum of the analysis). However, the reasons for non-inclusion in the list on December 2017 can be various: 1) the company has not yet applied in Belgium, 2) the reimbursement was refused, or 3) the procedure is still in progress. This low percentage in Belgium could therefore simply be explained by the fact that companies wait some months before introducing a demand in Belgium (as shown by the second indicator of the report). Without having the list of these 145 selected drugs, we cannot perform more in-depth analysis to have a precise estimation of the coverage rate. We therefore decided to not report this coverage rate and to make calculations by ourselves for the next report.</p> <p>Thirdly, the delay between EU marketing authorisation (MA) and national accessibility is more dependent of the pharmaceutical companies' strategies than on the "performance" of Belgian procedures. Once companies have introduced a reimbursement request, the minister has 180 days to provide a decision. This delay is set by law in accordance with the European Transparency Directive. What has an impact, therefore, is the delay between the MA and the introduction of a reimbursement request by the company. Even if this reflect the capacity of the Belgian market to attract innovative pharmaceuticals, a long delays is not due to a lack of "performance" of the Belgian procedures. As showed by the study, pharmaceutical companies choose first to introduce pharmaceuticals in large and advantageous countries such as Germany.</p>

**Table 4 – Preventive care: rejected indicators**

Indicator	Reason for exclusion
Incidence rate of pneumococcal infection in nursing homes	No readily available data
Proportion of the population with a “contact with a dentist for preventive care” 2 different years during the last 3 years	Preventive care are not always registered if the dentist gives curative care (underestimation)
Cervical cancer screening (P-8)	No validated methodology to calculate the coverage at the Belgian level
Colorectal cancer screening (P-9)	No validated methodology to calculate the coverage at the Belgian level

Table 5 – Mental health care: rejected indicators

Indicator	Reason for exclusion
Proportion of patients committing suicide while in mental health treatment	To avoid confusion, the indicator of the previous report (Deaths due to suicide (/100 000 pop), MH-1) was kept.
Psychiatric care hospital beds per 100,000 inhabitants	Contextual indicator, few added value compared to indicator <i>Number of hospitalisation days in psychiatric hospital wards (/1000 pop)</i> (MH-10)
Proportion of children with antidepressants prescriptions over the year	Included in the indicator <i>Use of antidepressants (% of adult population, at least once in the year)</i> (MH-7)
Proportion of psychiatric patients with paid employment	Not possible to identify psychiatric patient in the indemnity datamart (IMA – AIM).
Follow-Up After Hospitalisation for Mental Illness (7-Day Follow-Up)	Data coupling (RPM – MPG with IMA – AIM) is not possible
Excess mortality schizophrenia/etc.	OECD indicator; currently no Belgian data available.
Patient satisfaction/experience (Vlaamse patiënten Peiling)	No national data available at the moment; mentioned in the main report



Table 6 – Care for the elderly: rejected indicators

Indicator	Reason for exclusion
Average length of stay in residential facilities for the elderly (RIZIV-INAMI data)	This indicator is difficult to interpret, there is no international comparison and long stays might be necessary as people might live longer and hence stay longer.
Percentage of population aged 50+ who received professional services at home (help with personal care, help with domestic tasks, meals-on-wheels or help with other activities)	Concerns services outside the healthcare system.
Percentage of population aged 50+ who received help from others from outside the household (a family member that does not live with the patient, or a colleague or neighbour) for practical household assistance, help in paperwork or personal care within 12 months preceding the survey (SHARE data)	Overlap with indicator ELD-3 Informal carers (% of population aged 50+)
Percentage of population aged 50+ who received help from a person within the household for personal care and assistance in basic activities (washing, clothing, getting up) received daily, or almost daily within three months preceding the survey (SHARE data)	Overlap with indicator ELD-3 Informal carers (% of population aged 50+)
Medication stops in 75+ according to STOPP criteria. Stop of at least one of the following groups: lipid lowering drugs, NSAIDs, antipsychotics, antidepressants, PPIs (EPS data)	Indicator was retained but data were not available
Prescription of statins in patients 80+ (start/stop/globally)	Overlap with previous indicator on medication stops

**Table 7 – Mother and new-born: rejected indicators**

Indicator	Reason for exclusion
Proportion of pregnant women who get pertussis maternal vaccination	The e-Vax data still suffer from important methodological weaknesses that do not make them yet comparable to the data available in Flanders. In addition, it is difficult to interpret this indicator in terms of health system performance.
Ultrasound foetal assessments of pregnancy.	Redundant with the selected indicator on the number of antenatal consultations. In addition, ultrasounds are under-recorded.
Percentage of women who deliver without health insurance coverage	Weaknesses in the assurance type coding in RHM-MZG make this indicator difficult to interpret.
Percentage of new-born who are discharged from hospital at the same time as the mother	Not measurable
Teenage pregnancies	In addition to data on deliveries, data on voluntary termination of pregnancy would be necessary. However these data are not available in Belgium since 2012. In addition, it is difficult to interpret this indicator in terms of health system performance.
Breastfeeding percentage at 3 or 6 months	Only partial data are available
Prenatal consultations during 1st trimester of pregnancy	Impossible to identify the 1st trimester of pregnancy in IMA-AIM database, as some pregnancies last less than 9 months
Incidence of (third- and fourth-degree) tears to the perineum	Unavailability of data
Presence of the paediatrician at delivery	No national guideline, not always required presence, and highly dependent of hospital's protocols