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An Expanding Longevity Gap

Number of people age 65 and over, by age group, selected years 1900-2010 and projected 2020-2050

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Medicare Spending

Trends in Medicare Revenues and Expenses

Data from the Congressional Budget Office reveal rising Medicare expenses without a matching increase in offsetting receipts. This deficit is funded by general tax revenues. Medicare Parts B and D accounted for 55% of Medicare expenditures in 2015 and are projected to account for 59% in 2025.
Specialty Pharmaceuticals

PCSK9 Inhibitors and the Choice Between Innovation, Efficiency, and Affordability

Mark and Schulman. JAMA August 22/29, 2017 (318) 711-712
Flow of Pharmaceutical Funds, Products, and Services Adapted from a figure by the Congressional Budget Office. Services represent contractual relationships between entities. Rebates are payments from manufacturers to pharmaceutical benefit managers. Chargebacks are payments from manufacturers to distributors. Retailers include pharmacies, hospitals, group purchasing organizations, and mail-order programs. AMP indicates average manufacturer price; WAC, wholesale acquisition cost.
How Do We Transform the Health Care System?
Health Informatics
The Economics of Health IT

- Scale
- Network Economics
- Disruptive Innovation
- Organizational Innovation
- Business Process Improvement
- Analytics
- Workflow
- Connectivity and Services
- Patient Engagement
- Substitution
Scale
The Collective Dynamics of Smoking in a Large Social Network

Nicholas A. Christakis, M.D., Ph.D., M.P.H., and James H. Fowler, Ph.D.
Network Economics

- **Metcalfes Law:** The value of a network goes up with the square of the number of users

- Value = \( n^2 \)
- 1 = 1
- 10 = 100
- 100 = 10000
- 1000 = 1000000
Disruptive Innovation

AMDAHL → DEC → COMPAQ

iPhone ← BlackBerry™ ← IBM

Clay Christensen
Organizational Innovation

We Interviewed Health Care Leaders About Their Industry, and They’re Worried
by Michael Poku and Kevin A. Schulman
DECEMBER 14, 2016

Finance

Operations
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### Table 1. Characteristics of Chief Innovation Officers by Primary Function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Strategic (n = 13)</th>
<th>Operational (n = 6)</th>
<th>Financial (n = 6)</th>
<th>Total (N = 25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting directly to chief executive officer, %</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business unit outside existing structures, %</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget (in millions), median, $^a$</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount, median, No. $^b$</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Budget data were provided by 9 of 13 chief innovation officers in the strategic function, 5 of 6 in the operational function, and 6 of 6 in the financial function.

$^b$ Headcount data were provided by 13 of 13 chief innovation officers in the strategic function, 6 of 6 in the operational function, and 5 of 6 in the financial function.
Business Architecture

A business model/business architecture is a fixed characteristic of an organization that is resilient and resistant to incremental change.

Richman, Barak D., Mitchell, Will and Schulman, Kevin A., 2013
“Organizational Innovation in Health Care. HMPI, 1(3): 36-44
Organizational Structure
Organizational Innovation

Innovation Agenda

Production Engine

We are excited about...

- Getting more ambitious things done.
- Taking the long-term view.
- Empowering great entrepreneurs and companies to flourish.
- Investing at the scale of the opportunities and resources we see.
- Improving the transparency and oversight of what we’re doing.
- Making Google even better through greater focus.
- And hopefully... as a result of all this, improving the lives of as many people as we can.

What could be better? No wonder we are excited to get to work with everyone in the Alphabet family. Don’t worry, we’re still getting used to the name too!

Larry Page
CEO, Alphabet

http://investor.google.com/releases/2015/0810.html
Business Process Improvement

- Define Business Process Today
- Define Technology Today
- Define New Business Process
- Define New Technology

BPI
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Table 1. Estimated Billing and Insurance-Related Administrative Costs by Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs and Processing Time</th>
<th>Primary Care Visit</th>
<th>Emergency Department Visit</th>
<th>General Inpatient Stay</th>
<th>Ambulatory Surgery</th>
<th>Inpatient Surgery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total processing time, min</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>$20.49 100%</td>
<td>$61.54 100%</td>
<td>$124.26 100%</td>
<td>$170.40 100%</td>
<td>$215.10 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost breakdown by activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- and intra-encounter costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration and preregistration</td>
<td>$3.82 19%</td>
<td>$5.58 9%</td>
<td>$16.48 13%</td>
<td>$16.48 10%</td>
<td>$16.48 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician time</td>
<td>$6.36 31%</td>
<td>$10.97 18%</td>
<td>$13.29c 11%</td>
<td>$51.20 30%</td>
<td>$51.20 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-encounter costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional billing</td>
<td>$4.22 21%</td>
<td>$11.72 19%</td>
<td>$4.22c 3%</td>
<td>$45.55 27%</td>
<td>$45.55 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital billing</td>
<td>$13.70 22%</td>
<td>$44.43 36%</td>
<td>$17.44 10%</td>
<td>$44.43 21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>$6.10 30%</td>
<td>$19.57 32%</td>
<td>$45.84 37%</td>
<td>$39.72 23%</td>
<td>$57.43 27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Percentages may not sum to 100 because of rounding.
b Emergency department visit without hospital admission.
c For a general medicine inpatient stay, the billing and insurance-related cost of physician time assumes that auto-population of the EHR after the first inpatient day occurs correctly without subsequent need for physician time or alterations. The cost of professional billing assumes that the incremental cost of additional inpatient days is minimal with respect to the first inpatient day and that physicians are timely with their billing responsibilities, such that all inpatient professional rounding charges are processed and submitted to payers concurrently.
Analytics: Business Challenges to Solve

Business Process Intelligence
- Clinical use cases
- Data collection (structure)
- Clinical Performance

Population Health
- Clinical risk prediction
- Cost/utilization prediction

Patient Experience and Behavior
- Engagement
- Access
- Portal Services

Research & Innovation
- Novel Insights
- Technology Assessment

Financial Optimization
- Plan negotiations
- Cost allocation
Data Culture

- Lean
- Six-Sigma
- Toyota Production System (TPS)
## Risk Stratification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Size</th>
<th>100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Per Member Per Year</td>
<td>$2,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Case Volume

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient Type</th>
<th>I: Highest Users</th>
<th>II: Next Percentile</th>
<th>III: Next Percentile</th>
<th>IV: Prevention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Distribution Count</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cost of Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Per Person Cost of Care</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disease Management Costs</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>$3,250</th>
<th>$1,000</th>
<th>$375</th>
<th>$45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disease Management Cost Reduction</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$61,750</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$7,125</td>
<td>$855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Delivering Actionable Data to Clinicians

- Detailed physician & nurse-specific reporting
- Peer Comparisons and mentorship for actionable improvement
- Downloadable reports
- Mobile provider report card

#### Mentors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Top-Box</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Provider 2321</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient Centered Care</td>
<td>Provider 2011</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider Expertise and Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>Provider 2011</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Top-Box</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Patient Centered Care</th>
<th>Provider Expertise and Interpersonal Skills</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
<th>Download Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Group Average</td>
<td>66.17</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>167.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider 1992</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider 1998</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider 2011</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider 2034</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider 2043</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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www.Bivarus.com
Workflow

RESPONSE SPECTRUM: ‘This EHR helps me see more patients per day (or go home earlier) than I could with paper charts.’

Copyright © 2012 by the American Academy of Family Physicians.
This content is owned by the AAFP. A person viewing it online may make one printout of the material and may use that printout only for his or her personal, non-commercial reference. This material may not otherwise be downloaded, copied, printed, stored, transmitted or reproduced in any medium, whether now known or later invented, except as authorized in writing by the AAFP. Contact fpmserv@aafp.org for copyright questions and/or permission requests.
Connectivity

Hospital Health Record

Personal Health Record
Wouldn’t it be helpful and assuring if, each time you see your doctor, he has your past medical record? You wouldn’t have to try to remember past episodes of illnesses or test results. Your doctor would see your record even if you had visited different public hospitals or clinics using the National Electronic Health Record (NEHR) system.

The NEHR is a data exchange system that stores the medical record of every person in Singapore who has seen a doctor in the public healthcare system since February 2011.

Through the NEHR, doctors have access to the medical history of patients to support them in decision-making. The goal of the NEHR is to ensure a seamless healthcare experience for each patient.

Your doctor can access your medical history

Why NEHR?
The NEHR is a key enabler of Singapore’s strategic vision, “One Patient, One Health Record”, a vision that focuses on providing customised and convenient care to patients. By providing a consolidated view of a patient’s medical history, the NEHR ensures that healthcare professionals have the necessary information to help them make the best care decisions for the patient.

Your doctor can make more informed patient care decisions

What medical information is in the NEHR?
Information in the NEHR includes:
1. Admission and visit history
2. Hospital inpatient discharge summaries
3. Laboratory results
4. Radiology results
5. Medication history
6. History of past operations
7. Allergies and adverse drug reactions
8. Immunisations

Is your medical record safe?
Your medical record is safe. The confidentiality of your medical record, whether manual or online, is governed by law and only authorised users of the NEHR can access it. Neither can the information be forwarded to a third party. All access to the records are logged and reviewed periodically.

You may avoid duplicate tests or referrals

Patients are automatically included in the NEHR to enjoy the benefits that it brings. For more information, including your opt-out option, please speak to the staff at your healthcare institution. You can also contact the MOH Quality Service hotline at 1800 225 4122.
# Patient Portal

## Welcome back to HealthView

### Implant Cardiovascular Devices

#### Patient:
- **Date of Birth:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device Type</th>
<th>Implant Date</th>
<th>Device Description</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Model Number</th>
<th>Serial Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacemaker</td>
<td>01/04/2010</td>
<td>PACEMAKER, DUAL CHAMBER ADAPTA OR ADDR01</td>
<td>Medronic</td>
<td>ADDR01</td>
<td>NWB456356H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>01/04/2010</td>
<td>Lead, Capsurefix Novus 5076-52</td>
<td>Medronic</td>
<td>5076-52</td>
<td>PZN2055114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>01/04/2010</td>
<td>Lead, Capsurefix Novus 5076-58</td>
<td>Medronic</td>
<td>5076-58</td>
<td>PZN1966423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mHealth: Data and Services

mPower
Placing patients at the center of their healthcare experience

Patel, Rajan | Nguyen, Thao | Popli, Karishma | Iwelumo, Chioma | Hwang, Laurie

Background
• Patient-centered care is gaining prevalence in hospital systems worldwide
• Electronic health records can play a key role in patient-centered care, but they currently fail to do so
• Patients have very limited access to their records and information is difficult to comprehend
• Current EHRs are created for and owned by provider systems, and information sharing across provider systems is a challenge
• EHR vendors prioritize maximizing provider profits over improvements in the storage and transfer of patient health information
• Implementing provider-centric EHR systems is expensive and many countries have yet to adopt them at scale

Objectives:
• Empower patients to easily store, access, understand and utilize their health records from their mobile phone.
• Provide interactive and customized health information and education to patients, enabling them to take ownership of their healthcare.

Product development

Key system features
• Mobile and cloud-based: Patients can have access to their records whenever, wherever
• Tiered access: patients control who can see their record, and how much information they will see.
• Modular approach: A patient’s EHR starts small, and grows to meet their needs, through the addition of health and service modules
• Education modules: Patients can easily become informed about their diseases and treatment
• Personal health plan: Based on their records, patients can set short- and long-term goals with their provider, to improve their health
• Patient-provider interaction: Patients can easily communicate and collaborate with their care team directly from the application

Future directions
• Develop mobile application prototype
• Leveraging our Nigerian advisors, conduct a pilot test in Abuja, Nigeria to evaluate and increase the usability of product for our initial target market.

Acknowledgements
• Dr. Kevin Schulman, Dr. Eric Green, Dr. Mohammad Pate, DIHI, Dr. Okoronkwo Ogan
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MedRec: Medical Data Management on the Blockchain
Use Cases:
- Prevention
- Compliance
- Population Health

Approaches:
- Market Segmentation
- Behavioral Economics

Table 2: Engagement Methods for Health Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Factor</th>
<th>Facilitating Social Support</th>
<th>Goal Setting</th>
<th>Reinforcement Tracking</th>
<th>Self-monitoring</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diet/Caloric Intake</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness/Training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Resource</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Casewriters.

Note: The number of apps for each health factor or engagement method may represent overlapping categories.
## Population Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Commitment Ladder</th>
<th>Qualifiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staunch</td>
<td>Takes medication every day as prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td>Takes medication on correct day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Takes most medication as prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Confused</td>
<td>Wants to take medication – multiple instructions and medications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cost Conscious</td>
<td>Wants to take meds – worried about expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Splitters</td>
<td>Takes some medication as prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lapse – a – daisical</td>
<td>Know they have medication but does not pay attention to refills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Unaware</td>
<td>Does not know they have a medication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Reject Doctor</td>
<td>Does not like their doctor, won’t follow doctor’s instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Reject Medication</td>
<td>Does not believe in medication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Substitution (Capital for Labor)
Validation Set Performance for All-Cause Referable Diabetic Retinopathy in the EyePACS-1 Data Set (9946 Images)

Performance of the algorithm (black curve) and ophthalmologists (colored circles) for all-cause referable diabetic retinopathy, defined as moderate or worse diabetic retinopathy, diabetic macular edema, or ungradable image. The black diamonds highlight the performance of the algorithm at the high-sensitivity and high-specificity operating points. For the high-sensitivity operating point, specificity was 84.0% (95% CI, 83.1%-85.0%) and sensitivity was 96.7% (95% CI, 95.7%-97.5%). For the high-specificity operating point, specificity was 93.8% (95% CI, 93.2%-94.4%) and sensitivity was 90.7% (95% CI, 89.2%-92.1%). There were 8 ophthalmologists who graded EyePACS-1. The area under the receiver operating characteristic curve was 97.4% (95% CI, 97.1%-97.8%).
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Business Model Innovation

What if 50% of health care was delivered via mHealth technology by 2025?
“We predict that by 2018, our virtual visits will outnumber the in-person ones.”

Robert M. Pearl, MD
The Permanente Medical Group

http://catalyst.nejm.org/engaging-physicians-in-telehealth/
Discussion