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## WHAT'S THE BIG IDEA?

- Do you struggle to visualize results of predictive modeling and segmentation within your healthcare member network?
- Would you also like to leverage new opportunities within specific patient/member segments?
$\square$ A streamlined data mining approach utilizing PROC GTILE to answer these questions has arrived.



## PHASE I - DATA PREPARATION



## Gsas

- Blue represents numerical information.

Orange represents categorical variables with many levels, which result in a cardinality issue.

Green represents categorical attributes deemed to be acceptable for analysis. Red represents categorical information with too many levels, such as diagnosis codes.

## PHASE II - SEGMENTATION ANALYSIS

$\square$ Four pieces of output
I. Variable Importance Table
II. Segment Size Graph
III. Segment Plot
IV. Cluster Profiling
A. Descriptive Statistics
B. Cluster Graphs


## PHASE II - SEGMENTATION ANALYSIS

## Variable Importance

| NAME | IMPORTANCE |
| :--- | ---: |
| MEMBER_AGE_GROUP | 1 |
| Administrative_social_admission | 0.896642401 |
| Otitis_media_and_related_conditi | 0.85285383 |
| Other_perinatal_conditions | 0.801733151 |
| Liveborn | 0.801567926 |
| Fever_of_unknown_origin | 0.801512875 |
| Disorders_of_lipid_metabolism | 0.738280497 |
| Other_screening_for_suspected_co | 0.723012037 |
| Nonmalignant_breast_conditions | 0.678949144 |
| Medical_examination_evaluation | 0.678829698 |
| Hyperplasia_of_prostate | 0.627194163 |
| MEMBER_GENDER | 0.595882802 |
| Other_female_genital_disorders | 0.567331453 |
| Menstrual_disorders | 0.564605493 |
| Immunizations_and_screening_for | 0.518495087 |
| Other_connective_tissue_disease | 0.462305147 |
| Other_male_genital_disorders | 0.448082511 |

Overall measure of variable significance among the 6 clusters

PHASE II - SEGMENTATION ANALYSIS

## Segment Size Graph



GSaS

PHASE II - SEGMENTATION ANALYSIS
Segment Plot


Stacked Bar Graphs Illustrating Variable Dominance for the
Clusters...Children 0-10 Yrs Old
Comprise Cluster 2

# PHASE II - SEGMENTATION ANALYSIS 

Cluster Profiling - Descriptive Statistics

| Segment Id | N Obs | Variable | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | 3051 | member_age | 7.56 |
|  |  | paid_amount_sum | $\$ 2,228.09$ |
| 6 | 336 | member_age <br> paid_amount_sum | 33.31 |
|  |  | $\$ 10,764.86$ |  |



Two values are created for each cluster: 1) the average for the cluster and 2) the average for the overall population. The deviation is simply (1) $-(2) \rightarrow$ This is the true drivers for each of the clusters.

## PHASE II - SEGMENTATION ANALYSIS

 Cluster Profiling - Cluster Graphs

## SSaS ${ }^{\text {wisw }}$

Two values are created for each cluster: 1) the average for the cluster and 2) the average for the overall population. The deviation is simply (1) $-(2) \rightarrow$ This is the true drivers for each of the clusters.

## PHASE III - PREDICTIVE MODELING



THE
POWER
PHASE III - PREDICTIVE MODELING

Modell-Decision Tree
Significant splitting rules include...
Paid amount sum (medical risk)
Liveborn
Normal pregnancy and/or delivery
OB related trauma to perinatal care
Member gender
Other aftercare
Appendicitis and other appendix issues
Sprains and strains
Administrative social admission
Both techniques were close: Lift of 4.5 \& Misclassification rate of $3 \%$ !

Decision Tree Wins To Predict Hospitalization Likelihood!

## Model I - Regression

1. Whether the member had a pregnancy where the baby was liveborn
2. The paid amount sum (medical risk)
3. Whether the member had a normal pregnancy or delivery
4. Whether the member had appendicitis

## GsaS

## COST ANALYSIS

The median was chosen instead of the mean, since the median is not as sensitive to outliers within the data. In a cost
analysis of Model I, the median paid amount sum (cost) for a patient/member being hospitalized is $\$ 14,078$. Model I yielded a total of 201 false positives (an associated total cost of $\$ 2,829,678$ ) and 175 false negatives (an associated
total cost of $\$ 2,463,650$ ). Although false negatives may be more of a concern because health initiative efforts must be
increased in those cases, false positives and false negatives are both misclassifications from the model.

In a cost analysis of Model II, the median paid amount (cost) for a patient/member being diagnosed with a thyroid disorder is $\$ 2,129$. Model II yielded a total of 13 false positives (an associated total cost of $\$ 27,677$ ) and 438 false negatives (an associated total cost of $\$ 932,502$ ). This is a high cost despite the fact that models I and II both have
very good accuracy, so it might be useful to be rather strict when deeming what a "good" misclassification rate is (such as less than 1 percent).

## PHASE ||| - PREDICTIVE MODELING Model II - Decision Tree <br> Model II - Regression

Significant splitting rules include...
Medical examination and evaluation
Malaise and fatigue
Paid amount sum (medical risk)
Nutritional deficiencies
Member gender
Cancer of thyroid

```
Lift }->\mathrm{ Decision Tree = 2.9;
Regression = 3.6
```

Misclassification rate $\rightarrow$ Decision
Tree = 3.9\%; Regression = 3.7\%

1. Whether the member had a medical examination and evaluation
2. Member age
3. Whether the member had malaise and fatigue
4. Member gender
5. Whether the member had nutritional deficiencies

## 

In a cost analysis of Model II, the median paid amount (cost) for a patient/member being diagnosed with a thyroid disorder is $\$ 2,129$. Model II yielded a total of 13 false positives (an associated total cost of $\$ 27,677$ ) and 438 false
negatives (an associated total cost of $\$ 932,502$ ). This is a high cost despite the fact that models I and II both have very good accuracy, so it might be useful to be rather strict when deeming what a "good" misclassification rate is (such as less than 1 percent).

## PHASE IV - LINKING OF SEGMENTATION ANALYSIS AND PREDICTIVE MODELING



GsaS

## PHASE V - TREE MAPS

## Treemapping

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia
Treemapping is a method for displaying tree-structured data using nested rectangles.
Contents [show]


Main idea
Treemaps display hierarchical (tree-structured) data as a set of nested rectangles. Each branch of the tree is given a rectangle, which is then tiled with smaller rectangles representing sub-branches. A leaf node's rectangle has an area proportional to a specified dimension on the data. (In the illustration, this is proportional to a waiting time). Often the leaf nodes are colored to show a separate dimension of the data.

When the color and size dimensions are correlated in some way with the tree structure, one can often easily see patterns that would be difficult to spot in other ways. A second advantage of treemaps is that, by construction, they make efficient use of space. As a result, they can legibly display thousands of items on the screen simultaneously.

Gsas

## PHASE V - TREE MAPS

LIBNAME SGF 'C: \SGF2011'; $\longrightarrow$ Assign Library \& Path
DATA SGF.Finaltreemap; $\longrightarrow$ Create Permanent Tree Map Data Set SET Treemapin;

ODS LISTING CLOSE; $\longrightarrow$ Close Any Open Delivery System That Existed

ODS HTML FILE $=\rightarrow$ Tree Map Location
'C: \SGF2011\TreeMaps\clusterseg.html' GPATH = 'C:\';

GOPTIONS RESET = ALL DEVICE = JAVA HSIZE = 8.42
VSIZE $=5.31 ; \quad \rightarrow$ Tree Map Sizing

## PHASE V - TREE MAPS

PROC GTILE DATA $=$ SGF.Finaltreemap; $\longrightarrow$ Procedure Used \& Tree Map Input Data Set


Gsas

THE POWER
TOKNOW.

PHASE V - TREE MAPS

## The Tree Map - Input Data

| Population_Cluster | Top_Clinical_Diver | Predicted_ivedical_RIsk viember_Count |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Back-to-School Youths | Abdominal_pain Otitis_media_and_related_conditi | \$ | 3,402 | 29 |
| Back-to-School Youths | Acute_and_chronic_tonsillitis Otitis_media_and_related_conditi | \$ | 4,535 | 32 |
| Back-to-School Youths | Joint_disorders_and_dislocations MEMBER_AGE | 5 | 2,585 | 3 |
| Back-to-School Youths | MEMBER_AGE Acute_and_chronic_tonsillitis | \$ | 2,518 | 30 |
| Back-to-School Youths | MEMBER_AGE Fracture_of_upper_limb Otitis_media_and_related_conditi | \$ | 6,192 | 12 |
| Back-to-School Youths | Medical_examination_evaluation Otitis_media_and_related_conditi | \$ | 3,818 | 9 |
| Back-to-School Youths | Other_aftercare | \$ | 3,637 | 25 |
| Back-to-School Youths | Other_gastrointestinal_disorders | \$ | 1,994 | 36 |
| Back-to-School Youths | Other_nervous_system_disorders | \$ | 2,537 | 38 |
| Back-to-School Youths | Otitis_media_and_related_conditi | \$ | 1,655 | 357 |
| Female Routine Utilizers | Disorders_of_lipid_metabolism | \$ | 2,094 | 37 |
| Female Routine Utilizers | Disorders_of_lipid_metabolism Nonmalignant_breast_conditions | \$ | 7,763 | 6 |
| Female Routine Utilizers | Headache_including_migraine | \$ | 3,750 | 17 |
| Female Routine Utilizers | MEMBER_AGE | \$ | 1,361 | 442 |
| Female Routine Utilizers | Nonspecific_chest_pain | \$ | 3,618 | 27 |
| Female Routine Utilizers | Nutritional_deficiencies Disorders_of_lipid_metabolism | \$ | 8,054 | 6 |
| Female Routine Utilizers | Spondylosis_intervertebral_disc | \$ | 2,488 | 38 |
| High Risk Pregnancy | Hemorrhage_during_pregnancy__abr Other_complications_of_pregnancy | \$ | 3,957 | 6 |
| High Risk Pregnancy | Other_complications_of_pregnancy | \$ | 3,598 | 7 |
| Male Accidental Youths | Joint_disorders_and_dislocations | \$ | 2,295 | 19 |
| Male Accidental Youths | Other_male_genital_disorders | \$ | 3,046 | 13 |

Layer 1 - Cluster

Layer 2 - Subgroup Within Cluster

Predicted Medical Risk From EM $\rightarrow$ Tree Map Color Gradient

Frequency Member Count Within Sub-group

## Proactively Identified Avg Medical Risk of \$145,120 For a SubGroup within the Back-to-School Youths Segment



## Tree Map Demonstration
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