

# Emergency Department Length of Stay: Statistical Modeling Report

**Author:** Annelise Thorn

**Project:** Hospital Length of Stay Analysis

**Report Date:** February 20, 2026

## Executive Summary

This report analyzes emergency department (ED) length of stay (LOS) using a synthetic healthcare dataset with 100,000 encounters and 28 variables. The objective is to identify key factors associated with LOS and compare predictive modeling approaches.

The analysis combines:

- exploratory data analysis,
- inferential statistics (two-sample t-test and one-way ANOVA),
- multiple linear regression (MLR),
- and a Gamma generalized linear model (GLM) with log link.

The central modeling conclusion is that a Gamma GLM is better aligned with LOS data characteristics (positive, right-skewed, heteroscedastic) than standard linear regression.

## 1. Problem Statement

Emergency departments must balance throughput and quality of care under crowding constraints. LOS is a key operational outcome linked to patient flow and system efficiency.

### Research question:

What factors drive emergency department LOS, and how well can LOS be predicted?

## 2. Data Source and Scope

- **Dataset:** Hospital Length of Stay Dataset (Microsoft) from Kaggle
- **Rows:** 100,000
- **Columns:** 28
- **Target variable:** lengthofstay

The dataset includes demographics, comorbidity flags, lab values, vital signs, facility identifiers, and discharge information.

## 3. Data Preparation

Preprocessing steps in the notebook include:

- date parsing (`vdate`, `discharged`),
- categorical encoding (`gender`, `rcount`, `facid`),
- target type correction (`lengthofstay`),
- checks for missing values and duplicates,
- filtering of physiologically implausible values in selected lab and vital variables.

These steps improve data consistency and statistical validity before inference and model fitting.

## 4. Exploratory Data Analysis

EDA findings described in the notebook indicate:

- LOS is heavily right-skewed,
- most encounters have relatively short LOS,
- a smaller subset of encounters has prolonged LOS,
- facility-level distributions appear to differ.

Visuals produced include LOS distribution, gender distribution, and facility distribution.

## 5. Inferential Statistics

### 5.1 Two-Sample t-Test (Gender)

- **Null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ):** mean LOS is equal for male and female patients.
- **Alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ):** mean LOS differs by gender.

Notebook interpretation indicates no meaningful gender difference in LOS.

### 5.2 One-Way ANOVA (Facility)

- **Null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ):** all facilities have the same mean LOS.
- **Alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ):** at least one facility mean differs.

Notebook interpretation indicates facility-level LOS differences are statistically significant.

## 6. Predictive Modeling

### 6.1 Baseline Model: Multiple Linear Regression (MLR)

The baseline MLR uses demographic, facility, comorbidity, laboratory, and vital-sign predictors.

Model assessment includes:

- coefficient estimates and confidence intervals,
- $R^2$ ,
- AIC and BIC,

- residual diagnostics,
- and holdout test performance via mean squared prediction error (MSPE).

## 6.2 Model Selection

Three nested linear models are compared:

- full model,
- clinically focused model,
- minimal model.

Selection criteria: AIC, BIC, and test-set MSPE.

## 6.3 Improved Model: Gamma GLM (Log Link)

Given LOS is strictly positive and right-skewed, the notebook fits a Gamma GLM with log link and compares it to linear alternatives.

Evaluation includes:

- AIC and BIC,
- pseudo- $R^2 = 1 - \frac{\text{residual deviance}}{\text{null deviance}}$ ,
- test-set MSPE,
- and residual diagnostics.

Notebook conclusions state Gamma GLM improves fit and predictive stability relative to MLR.

## 7. Key Findings

- Clinical complexity variables are more informative than basic demographics for LOS.
- Facility differences are meaningful, suggesting operational variability across sites.
- Classical MLR assumptions are strained for this outcome distribution.
- Gamma GLM is statistically more appropriate for LOS-type outcomes.

## 8. Practical Implications

This workflow can support healthcare operations and analytics use cases such as:

- capacity planning,
- throughput monitoring,
- and prioritization of interventions to reduce prolonged ED stays.

## 9. Limitations

- Dataset is synthetic and may not fully represent real-world EHR complexity.

- Results may not generalize directly to specific institutions.
- Additional operational variables (arrival time, occupancy, staffing) could improve explanatory power.

## 10. Recommended Next Steps

1. Add operational features (time-of-day, census, staffing proxies).
2. Evaluate interaction effects and non-linear relationships.
3. Compare additional positive-outcome model families (for example, log-normal or Tweedie).
4. Add reproducible model performance tables exported as artifacts.

## 11. Reproducibility

Primary analysis source:

- `notebooks/ed_length_of_stay_analysis.ipynb`

Python script conversion:

- `notebooks/ed_length_of_stay_analysis.py`

## 12. References

- <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/aayushchou/hospital-length-of-stay-dataset-microsoft?resource=download>
- <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1755599X20301026>