

CaravanHealth

Amy Jung

2022-04-26

```
library(data.table)

library(sandwich)
library(lmtest)

library(AER)

library(ggplot2)
library(patchwork)

library(stargazer)
library(cregg)
```

Load Data

```
##      patient_id date_of_birth patient_age gender zip_code date_of_delivery
## 1:      101511   1992-02-24         24     F   37027   2017-01-23
## 2:      101143   1992-08-22         25     F   37013   2017-09-16
## 3:      193330   1983-02-22         34     F   37250   2017-10-07
## 4:      142808   1978-02-25         38     F   37027   2017-01-12
## 5:      142808   1970-09-11         47     F   37250   2017-12-13
## ---
## 64149:      102809   1989-07-22         27  <NA>   37122   2017-02-02
## 64150:      136397   1981-09-28         35     F   37013   2017-08-22
## 64151:      190534   1976-06-25         40     F   37250   2017-04-21
## 64152:      137050   1969-05-11         47     F   37250   2017-03-06
## 64153:      157354   1998-08-29         18     F   37250   2017-08-21
##      icd_10_diagnosis_code length_of_stay total_claim_cost
## 1:                        080              5         15590.55
## 2:                        082              7         37930.46
## 3:                        082              7         24965.33
## 4:                        080              4          8669.38
## 5:                        082              8         21954.30
## ---
## 64149:                        080              4         11357.88
## 64150:                        082              8         22995.74
## 64151:                        069              6         18503.37
## 64152:                        080              7         11688.88
## 64153:                        069             11         31829.80
```

Regression

Model 1: only length_of_stay

The intuition is that length_of_stay would be the best indicator of total_claim_cost (more time at hospital = greater cost).

Null hypothesis: no correlation between length_of_stay and total_claim_cost.

```
# model with only length_of_stay

mod_1 = lm(total_claim_cost ~
            length_of_stay, data=d)

mod_1$cluster_se <- sqrt(diag(vcovCL(mod_1)))

stargazer(
  mod_1,
  se = list(mod_1$cluster_se),
  type = 'text'
)

##
## =====
##                               Dependent variable:
##                               -----
##                               total_claim_cost
## -----
## length_of_stay                4,228.162***
##                               (47.564)
##
## Constant                      -4,302.775***
##                               (231.021)
##
## -----
## Observations                  64,153
## R2                            0.134
## Adjusted R2                   0.134
## Residual Std. Error   25,907.470 (df = 64151)
## F Statistic            9,895.957*** (df = 1; 64151)
## =====
## Note:                         *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
```

Interpretation: The correlation between length_of_stay and total_claim_cost is statistically significant. An increase in 1 day in the hospital leads to an increase in \$4,228.16 in claim costs, according to model 1.

Model 2: length_of_stay + icd_10_diagnosis_code + zip_code + patient_age

The intuition is that icd_10_diagnosis_code, zip_code, and patient_age would also have an impact on total_claim_costs – with ICD codes used for billing purposes, zip codes relating to SDH (social determinants of health), and patient age maybe correlating with more procedures needed for older mothers.

```
# model with other variables
```

```
mod_2 = lm(total_claim_cost ~
            length_of_stay +
            icd_10_diagnosis_code +
            as.factor(zip_code) +
            patient_age,
            data=d)

mod_2$cluster_se <- sqrt(diag(vcovCL(mod_2)))

stargazer(
  mod_2,
  se = list(mod_2$cluster_se),
  type = 'text'
)
```

```
##
## =====
##                               Dependent variable:
##                               -----
##                               total_claim_cost
## -----
## length_of_stay                2,452.569***
##                               (53.035)
##
## icd_10_diagnosis_code067      12,233.250***
##                               (711.954)
##
## icd_10_diagnosis_code069      8,857.200***
##                               (726.090)
##
## icd_10_diagnosis_code080     -9,072.846***
##                               (453.496)
##
## icd_10_diagnosis_code082      7,714.229***
##                               (582.724)
##
## as.factor(zip_code)37013       685.245
##                               (2,968.024)
##
## as.factor(zip_code)37027       446.126
##                               (2,971.945)
##
## as.factor(zip_code)37122       831.668
##                               (2,976.875)
##
## as.factor(zip_code)37167       713.181
##                               (2,974.235)
##
## as.factor(zip_code)37250       615.119
##                               (2,968.470)
##
```

```

## patient_age                -18.152**
##                           (9.161)
##
## Constant                   7,644.931**
##                           (3,010.982)
##
## -----
## Observations                64,153
## R2                         0.206
## Adjusted R2                 0.206
## Residual Std. Error        24,806.080 (df = 64141)
## F Statistic                 1,511.571*** (df = 11; 64141)
## =====
## Note:                      *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

```

Model 2 Constant is when: ICD code O03, length of stay 0, patient age 0, zip code 35896.

Interpretation: The correlation of length_of_stay, icd_10_diagnosis_code, patient_age to total_claim_cost is statistically significant. The correlation between zip_code and total_claim_cost is not significant.

Interesting insights according to Model 2: - with the other variables factored in (compared to Model 1), the coefficient for length_of_stay decreases by 60% (from 4,228.162 to 2,452.569), which indicates omitted variable bias in Model 1 - ICD code O80 has a negative significant coefficient (-9,072.846) - an increase in patient age decreases total_claim_cost (-18.152)