International Journal of
INTELLIGENT SYSTEMS AND APPLICATIONS IN ENGINEERING
ISSN:2147-6799 www.ijisae.org Original Research Paper

Predictive Analytics Systems for Risk Stratification and Resource Optimization in Healthcare

Bharat Kumar Reddy Karumuri

Abstract: Predictive analytics is a foundational capability as the healthcare system shifts focus from reactive disease treatment to proactive management of populations based on clinical data. The concentration of healthcare costs and outcomes among a small portion of the population creates both a need and an opportunity to create algorithms that target clinical and operational resources on those patients who could benefit most. The formulations of clinical, operational, and financial risks must be precise, and the definitions of how models will be used need to be specific and actionable. EHR, administrative claims, pharmacy, social determinants, and other source domains introduce risk modeling challenges implicit in identity resolution, terminology normalization, and data quality, complicating pre-prediction data transformation into a complete, accurate model input. Domain knowledge-based feature engineering, such as aggregation and transformation of raw data into informative features, generates model inputs that account for comorbidity burden, healthcare utilization trajectories, clinical deterioration signals, and social vulnerability. Model selection involves trade-offs among discrimination, calibration, interpretability, and operational maintainability. Clinical utility considerations extend beyond model performance and involve the actionability and timeliness of model outputs. To be deployed in clinical practice, predicted risk requires careful implementation to avoid alert fatigue and provision of clinically meaningful information on contributing risk factors. Algorithms should be scrutinized for fairness using systematic statistical tests and adjusted to prevent automated tools from exacerbating inequities in access to and quality of care. Governance frameworks that include multidisciplinary oversight, version-controlled documentation, and performance monitoring can help ensure that the deployed systems are accurate, equitable, and aligned with clinical and organizational realities over the life cycle.

Keywords: *Predictive Analytics, Risk Stratification, Health Care Process Optimization, Fairness of Decision Support Systems.*

1. Introduction

The complexity of healthcare delivery has extended beyond the reactive, historical systems that continue to dominate healthcare at a population scale. The growth of data by a collection of sources, including clinical encounters, diagnostic laboratories, radiological imaging, the pharmacy, and administrative claims, has outpaced the ability to make timely and specific clinical decisions. The gap delineated in this section is consistent with a broader observation that a minority of patients are responsible for a majority of healthcare utilization, complications, and hospitalization [1]. It follows that the concentration of need also provides a compelling case for the deployment of predictive analytics as a systematic approach to the challenges of population health.

Predictive analytics is the use of statistical or machine learning techniques to analyze historical or real-time data to generate predicted probabilities of risk for individuals or a cohort. There have been applications in clinical medicine, including predicting the risk of sepsis in a person in the intensive care unit [2] and predicting the risk of a patient being readmitted to hospital after an episode of acute care [3]. Other applications include predicting deteriorations in heart failure [4] and predicting diabetic retinopathy using deep learning on retinal images [5]. The wide range of applications of predictive modeling systems suggests systemic fragmentation in how we design, deploy, and test predictive modeling systems.

One common and important critique of predictive analytics initiatives in the health care sector is that they have too often focused on the technical development and validation of predictive models at the expense of the clinical, operational, and organizational context that is required for successful implementation [6]. Predictive models that perform well on held-out test data sets have not been associated with improved health outcomes because they are poorly integrated into the clinical workflow, poorly understood or trusted by clinical decision-

Deben Services LLC, USA

makers, or because predictions are not linked to intervention pathways. Furthermore, there is evidence of bias in many widely utilized risk models, raising foundational questions about fairness and the potential for algorithmic systems to further exacerbate health disparities [7].

This article describes a design framework for predictive analytics in health care. We first present a framework of design and implementation that spans the life cycle of predictive analytics. Next, we propose clinical and operational principles for risk stratification , and discuss technical design choices, pathways into provider workflows, and ethical and governance principles relevant for the design and implementation of such systems. Our hope is to move from pilots to systematic and equitable approaches that foster proactive population health management and value by documenting improvements in care quality and efficiency.

2. Define Risk and Create Actionable Outcome Frameworks

2.1 Clinical, Operational, and Financial Dimensions of Risk

The type of risk a system is designed to identify and manage should be clearly defined. In the healthcare field, risk can have a variety of meanings, and definitions of risk can be clinical, operational, or financial, among other variants. The chosen risk will determine model design, data source selection, and the intervention's mechanism of action [1].

More specifically, clinical risk models predict negative outcomes such as acute decompensation, disease progression, complications, or death. These models heavily depend on diagnostic codes, laboratory results, vital signs, and functional status. Early clinical risk summarization applications established comorbidity indexing methods, which summarize a patient's burden of coexisting medical diagnoses or conditions into interpretable composite scores. Comorbidity indexes remain in wide use in clinical practice both as inputs into predictive models and as performance benchmarks [8]. Clinical risk models are most useful when the risk profile of those to whom these models are applied is modifiable (i.e., the outcome being predicted is temporally viable).

Operational risk considers the likelihood that healthcare use is too high or too variable, resulting in too many emergency department visits, inpatient admissions, or stay durations, or care transitions for available resources. This is used for staffing, bed management, and discharge and admissions planning in hospitals and long-term care settings. They become especially important when supply does not keep up with the variability of demand. Financial risk is the probability of incurring a high cost or inappropriate utilization of healthcare services under one or several given payment/reimbursement agreements. The differences between risk adjustment for payment and simple risk adjustment of prior expenditures for post-hoc reconciliation or auditing are also meaningful [9]. In payment, the risk adjustment must be performed in such a way that predicted costs are based on current patient characteristics.

The most useful stratification systems are built at the intersection of clinical and financial data. High-need patients can be identified and intervened upon to improve outcomes, or avoidable costs can be avoided. Systems built around clinical or avoidable cost outcomes are technically correct but practically irrelevant; they cannot be used clinically or financially.

2.2 Actionable Outcome Definitions

To avoid ill-defined, poorly focused modeling problems, predictive models must have concrete outcome targets. For example, predictive modeling to identify "complex" or "high-cost" patients does not provide a clear target and results in weak predictive signals that are difficult to use in clinical decision support

The primary endpoint that is studied is almost always all-cause readmission within 30 days of discharge from the hospital. Readmission is an important outcome, not only in a clinical way but also as a quality measure with a financial impact on the hospital under a value-based reimbursement model. Another common outcome is avoidable ED utilization, which refers to ED utilization for conditions that could be adequately managed in primary care. High rates of avoidable ED utilization have also been interpreted as evidence of inadequate access to and coordination of ambulatory care [3]. A third important type of actionable outcome is a deterioration trajectory, such as transitioning from a controlled to uncontrolled chronic disease state. This is particularly important in conditions like heart failure, diabetes, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Non-adherence is another common error type; this refers to clinically meaningful gaps in actual medication filling or consumption and is targeted by specific outreach and pharmacist-led

interventions [11]. Non-adherence has also been linked to worse patient outcomes.

The definition of the outcome of interest determines model predictive performance, feature or variable selection, and the relevance of predictive interpretation. Broadly defined outcomes lead to diffuse predictions, while narrowly defined outcomes lead to focused feature engineering and improve understanding of how predictions lead to intervention.

2.3 Care Gaps and Intervention Pathway Alignment

The risk scores will be operationally inert if they are not strongly associated with decisions. In addition to defining each outcome, care gaps could instead be defined as simple discrepancies between recommended and actual care, and intervention pathways could be defined for each type of gap identified.

Others are a lack of follow-up after hospitalization (a well-studied predictor of readmission that structured transition of care programs have been shown to ameliorate), missed preventive services such as screenings and vaccines (which outreach to high-risk groups can improve), and unmet social needs that affect patients' medication adherence, appointment keeping, and self-management. Social determinants of health, including housing instability, food insecurity, and lack of transportation, are independently associated with health outcomes and utilization , and may represent a promising area for equitable risk stratification when integrated into prediction models.

For every care gap, the organizations need to know what is to happen, who should trigger the action, and how the organizations will know whether the actions were taken. Otherwise, the risk scores are meaningless.

Risk Dimension	Primary Focus	Typical Data Inputs	Example Outcome Target
Clinical Risk	Adverse health outcomes, disease progression, and mortality	Diagnoses, lab values, vital signs, functional status	Acute decompensation, complication onset
Operational Risk	Utilization patterns, capacity strain, care bottlenecks	ED visits, bed-days, care transition records	Unplanned readmission, prolonged stay
Financial Risk	Cost concentration, unfavorable utilization under payment models	Claims, capitation data, procedure costs	High-cost episode prediction, risk adjustment
Intersectional Risk	Combined clinical-financial burden amenable to intervention	Multi-source longitudinal records	Preventable hospitalization, avoidable spending

Table 1: Dimensions of Healthcare Risk and Corresponding Model Targets [1, 8, 9]

3. Data Integration and Feature Engineering

3.1 Fragmented Data Sources and Integration Challenges

Longitudinal, multi-sourced views of patients are needed for risk adjustment, both over time, in different clinical or care settings, and sometimes across organizational or payer boundaries. This data may include electronic health record data, including diagnoses, procedures, vital signs, and lab results; administrative claims data, including utilization and payment information from payers; pharmacy dispensing data; and social and environmental data from area-level indices or patient-reported information.

There are also technical challenges in integrating these heterogeneous data sources using a common analytic framework. One of the tasks in this integrated clinical infrastructure is patient identity resolution or matching patient data across separate systems with their separate identification schema, which is often underestimated. Substantial patient-matching errors can also arise when common methods are applied, which can lead to spurious associations and missing data that will ultimately prevent good models from being developed [14]. Additionally, standardizing clinical codes (diagnostic codes, procedure codes, drug, and laboratory identifiers) will be required before developing consistent feature engineering. Normalization and validation may also require addressing variations in coding between patients, providers, and locations where patients are receiving care.

Missing data, inconsistent coding and temporal misalignment of data sources can be problematic. Profiling and remediating these issues should take place before model implementation. Selection of imputation methods must take into account the patterns and mechanisms that underlie missingness; naive imputation methods may introduce systematic bias in model inputs.

3.2 Feature Engineering for Clinical Predictive Models

Feature engineering, the process of transforming raw data into features or variables suitable for use as predictors in predictive modeling, is considered one of the most important aspects of healthcare predictive modeling and a process that utilizes the strengths of both data scientists and clinical domain experts.

Feature categories include comorbidity indices summarizing the burden of concurrent conditions in a patient population [8] or utilization pattern summaries of recent healthcare consumption, such as counts of emergencies, hospitalizations, and outpatient encounters over a lookback window. Clinical trajectory features based on time series of laboratory tests or vital sign trajectories may preview clinical deterioration prior to its emergence as an acute event. Social determinant features are area-level variables based on indices of area deprivation or patient-level features obtained from social needs assessments [13]. They capture systematically identifiable social risks that are potentially influential at a population level. Each type of feature captures a distinct dimension of risk and, when combined, gives a richer basis for prediction than any individual data type.

Feature selection and construction should be guided by clinical hypotheses on the mechanism driving the outcome, iteratively reviewed with clinical collaborators, and tested empirically through exploratory data analysis and ablation studies. Poorly constructed features can introduce noise in the data, impact generalizability, and lead to less trust in the model's predictions, even if the underlying covariate set is of high quality.

Feature Category	Description	Clinical Rationale
Comorbidity indices	Composite scores summarizing the burden of concurrent conditions	Captures overall clinical complexity and baseline risk
Utilization pattern summaries	Counts of ED visits, hospitalizations, and outpatient encounters in lookback windows	Reflects the trajectory and intensity of healthcare consumption
Clinical deterioration signals	Trends in serial laboratory values, vital signs, and medication escalation	Identifies worsening trajectories before acute events manifest
Social determinant features	Area-level deprivation indices, patient-reported social needs scores	Encodes non-clinical drivers of health outcomes and utilization
Medication adherence indicators	Pharmacy fill records, prescription gap durations	Proxy for self-management capacity and care engagement

Table 2: Key Feature Categories for Healthcare Predictive Modeling [8, 13, 14]

4. Model Development, Selection, and Evaluation

4.1 Model Selection Trade-offs

There is a trade-off involved when choosing the model that is used to stratify patient risk in the healthcare environment between achieving the best possible predictive performance, interpretability, and operational maintainability. Current machine learning algorithms range from logistic regression or survival analysis to ensemble models like gradient-boosted trees and deep neural networks [4].

Both discrimination and calibration of model performance need to be evaluated when assessing a model's utility for clinical practice. Discrimination (often measured with the area under a receiver operating characteristic curve) is a measure of how well the model is able to separate patients into higher and lower risk categories. Calibration measures how closely predicted probabilities agree with the observed outcome frequencies across the range of risk scores . For most clinical decision support applications, however, calibration is usually the more important property: for example, a model that predicts a probability of 30% for patients who have a 30% probability of an outcome is often preferable to a model with high discrimination but systematically miscalibrated predicted probabilities [15]. Miscalibration can also lead to incorrect triage decisions, incorrect enrollment into care management programs, and problems with clinician credibility when observed outcomes do not match predicted probabilities.

Finally, the trade-off between predictive power and interpretability is especially problematic in healthcare, where predictive modeling methods such as gradient increasing ensembles or deep nets may offer better discrimination , but are not interpretable to clinicians, patients, or regulators alike [6]. At the same time, there are simple, highly interpretable models such as logistic regression with a suitable

choice of features that show competitive performance on many clinical prediction tasks. They may also be easier to interpret and validate, which might outweigh lower statistics in terms of clinical applicability. This further complicates the decision between a statistical and scientific approach, which must be made depending on the clinical and regulatory environment and the trust required of the users.

Another aspect that is sometimes neglected when selecting prediction models is operational maintainability. By using the model in production, practitioners must monitor the model to determine if performance is deteriorating, retrain models, and update the models when new data sources and outcome definitions become available. Additionally, simpler models are often easier to maintain and monitor.

4.2 Clinical Utility Evaluation

Predictions should be evaluated not only based on customary technical metrics but also on their clinical application. Net benefit analysis and decision curve analysis have been described as methods of evaluating whether making a prediction-based choice at a certain risk threshold gives better outcomes than always treating or never treating [15]. They account for the different costs of false positives and false negatives in the clinical decision and provide a common unit of measurement for comparing different statistical models or thresholds. Other important evaluation dimensions related to deployment are lead time (e.g., when the model alerts which patients are at high risk , and how long until actions can be taken based on the predicted risk) and actionability (i.e., do the variables driving patients' risk scores identify targets for action by the clinical teams).

Model Type	Discrimination	Calibration Tractability	Interpretability	Maintainability
Logistic Regression	Moderate	High	High	High
Survival Models	Moderate	High	Moderate	High
Gradient Boosting Ensembles	High	Moderate	Low	Moderate
Deep Neural Networks	High	Low–Moderate	Low	Low
Interpretable Rule-based Models	Moderate	High	Very High	High

Table 4: Model Selection Trade-offs in Healthcare Risk Stratification [2, 4, 6, 15]

5. Integrating predictive models into clinical workflows

5.1 Timing and Operational Integration

The clinical and organizational performance of a predictive model will depend on both the statistical performance of the model and the timing and location of the prediction in the clinical workflow. Timing considerations vary for different clinical scenarios. At admission, risk scores can help target discharge planning, care coordination, and transition of care protocols. During admission, risk scores can provide actionable information to help clinicians decide whether to increase the intensity of treatment, consult a specialist, or increase the frequency of monitoring . Risk scores can help guide post-acute care programs, follow-up appointments, home health and community-based care when a patient is discharged. In an ambulatory care setting, risk scores may be calculated periodically using longitudinal data and used to guide patient outreach, chronic disease management, and population management activities [12].

Each timing scheme has unique integration requirements with EHR systems and implications for data completeness and model latency. Models for real-time inpatient alerts are subject to stringent computational requirements and must be tolerant of the incomplete and rapidly evolving data environment in the inpatient setting in which they are implemented.

5.2 User experience and alert design

How decision-support tools deliver their predictions will impact their effectiveness. Alert fatigue (or alarm fatigue), the condition in which clinicians become desensitized to frequent automated alerts (especially non-actionable alerts or alerts with low positive predictive value), represents a challenge risk stratification systems must overcome to succeed in the clinical environment [6].

Interface design principles for risk stratification tools inform that risk should be presented as risk categories that are easy to understand, that primary drivers of a person's risk score should be presented in lay clinical language, and the risk scores and their drivers should be integrated into existing clinical

workflows and dashboards rather than separate screens. Risk driver information can help clinicians' reasoning, encourage healthy skepticism about model predictions, and increase the likelihood of clinicians not entirely ignoring or over-relying on model predictions. Co-design processes are consistently linked to higher levels of adoption and appropriate use of clinical decision support tools among clinical teams when involving frontline clinicians and care managers in the iterative design.

5.3 Closing the Loop: Intervention Playbooks and Outcome Tracking

Furthermore, a risk stratification system is only as good as its ability to operationalize its predictions so each category has an associated intervention playbook. This should include what type of intervention is needed, who or what program is responsible for it, a time frame, and how care will be monitored afterwards. High-risk patients may benefit from intensive case management with frequent multidisciplinary review; moderate-risk patients may be contacted at regular intervals, monitored remotely, or seen proactively; and low-risk patients may receive standard care and automated reminders about preventive services.

Equally important is to maintain a feedback loop between predictions and interventions applied and the outcomes. The information loop between predictions and actions and between actions and outcomes allows for continual improvement and provides the information needed for an organization to determine whether its risk stratification system is providing value to the population [4]. Without the ability to track outcomes, organizations are unable to tell which interventions are effective or to make iterative improvements.

Integration Point	Prediction Timing	Data Availability Constraints	Primary Clinical Action
Pre-admission	Before the scheduled encounter	Limited to prior records and outpatient data	Early triage, pre-authorization, care planning
Hospital admission	At registration or within the first hours	Baseline clinical data, prior records	Discharge planning initiation, care management enrollment
Inpatient monitoring	Continuous or periodic re-scoring	Evolving, incomplete inpatient data	Escalation decisions, specialist consultation triggers
Discharge	At the care transition point	Full inpatient episode data	Post-acute enrollment, follow-up scheduling
Ambulatory outreach	Scheduled population-level scoring	Full longitudinal record	Chronic disease management, proactive patient engagement

Table 5: Workflow Integration Points and Operational Requirements [4, 6, 12]

6. Ethical Considerations and Governance Frameworks

6.1 Fairness and Algorithmic Bias

While predictive models are being applied to advance health care delivery, concerns have been raised about whether these models may inadvertently reinforce existing health inequities. This is due to the fact that health care data, as generated by historical and current practices, is influenced by demographics and socioeconomic variables. Models trained on this data could learn to reproduce these disparities, leading to risk scores that systematically underpredict the clinical needs of populations historically underrepresented in health care [7].

Clinical impacts of algorithmic bias include unequal distribution of resources, forgoing treatment for specific high-need patients in a protected group, and lower trust in the healthcare system. Fairness metrics, including fairness for demographic differences in performance metrics, calibration curves, and clinical impact metrics, are used to quantify demographic fairness and validate the model prior to its deployment in practice. Where performance differences are established, these should be discussed with clinical, ethical, and community experts and addressed through mechanisms such as re-weighting training data, group-specific models, adjusting decision thresholds, or tailoring outcomes to reflect need as opposed to the level of prior use [7].

6.2 Transparency and Explainability

In addition to accuracy alone, it is important that a patient or clinical end-user understands how a particular risk category has been assigned by a predictive system. Explainability in AI is an emerging ethical and regulatory requirement for healthcare AI systems. This presents an opportunity to design with explainability as a first-class design

requirement, rather than addressing it as an afterthought.

At the model developer and validator levels, technical understanding of model architecture, training data, performance characteristics, and known limitations may provide adequate explainability. At the clinician and care manager levels, patient-level explanations that identify the main clinical and social drivers of an individual's risk score expressed in close-to-local clinical language may support clinical decision-making and appropriate application of model output. Post-hoc explanation methods, such as feature attribution methods, can be applied to explain complex models with a high degree of predictive performance [6]. Plain language summaries can be used to explain the reason for the risk classification in non-technical terms to patients and their family members.

6.3 Governance, Lifecycle Management, and Continuous Oversight

It is therefore essential to develop a strong governance structure. Such governance structures and processes will help ensure that risk stratification systems continue to be valid, reliable, and aligned with organizational and clinical priorities, despite the fluid nature of healthcare environments and patients' needs and conditions over time. Static models that are not re-evaluated and updated on a regular basis may no longer reflect the conditions under which they were developed and validated and may lead to erroneous or harmful recommendations [9].

Experts recommend a governance framework for healthcare predictive analytics that includes multi-disciplinary oversight committees composed of clinicians, technical experts, clinicians, operational leaders, legal counsel, and ethics professionals; documentation of model development, data used, results of performance metrics, and changes made; automated monitoring dashboards or alerts for model performance drift and distributional shift; and periodic review and retraining cycles to ensure that software is not a stagnant artifact that remains too long, especially when used to support high-stakes clinical decisions.

Governance Component	Purpose	Key Activities
Multidisciplinary oversight committee	Cross-functional review of model performance and clinical alignment	Regular performance reviews, change approval, dispute adjudication
Version-controlled documentation	Auditability and reproducibility of model design and evolution	Model cards, data dictionaries, and change logs
Automated performance monitoring	Early detection of degradation or distributional shift	KPI dashboards, drift alerts, threshold-triggered reviews
Fairness assessment protocol	Detection and mitigation of demographic performance disparities	Subgroup calibration analysis, equity metric reporting
Scheduled retraining cycles	Maintenance of model accuracy under evolving clinical conditions	Periodic refit, outcome recalibration, feature relevance review

Table 6: Governance Framework Components for Deployed Risk Models [6, 7, 9]

Conclusion

Risk stratification and optimization through predictive analytics are key to a transformed healthcare system focused on proactive, equitable, and value-based population health management. The increasing availability of clinical data and machine-learning algorithms and the growing recognition of the concentration of need among high-risk patients have made the technical advances and organizational imperatives to implement scalable risk stratification systems ever more compelling. However, practical translation of algorithmically valid models into clinically useful tools requires clinically and operationally relevant definitions for each outcome, logical multi-source data integration to resolve fragmentation and quality issues, domain-based feature engineering, and evaluation based on clinical relevance and calibration, in addition to standard discrimination metrics, in order to produce interpretable and usable decision aids for clinicians. Embedding those predictions into clinical workflows using low cognitive load interfacing, transparently exposing human-readable risk factors, and targeting clinical decision support to define pathways for clinical interventions is how the overall statistical performance of the system is translated into real, concrete patient benefits. Lastly, informed by the ethical principle of algorithmic fairness, every system should undergo continuous evaluation for

bias and active bias mitigation strategies to prevent the dataset and system from exacerbating existing inequalities. Governance frameworks that enable active monitoring, iteration, and accountability throughout the model lifecycle are not red tape, but rather the essential infrastructure that responsible, scalable adoption will require. Developing the full benefits of predictive analytics for healthcare will demand sustained, multidisciplinary engagement throughout the design process that is grounded in clinical need, operational reality, and human equity.

References

[1] Emily M. Mitchell, "Concentration of Health Expenditures in the U.S. Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population, 2014," Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2016. [Online]. Available: https://meps.ahrq.gov/data_files/publications/st497/stat497.pdf

[2] Nemati, Shamim et al., "An Interpretable Machine Learning Model for Accurate Prediction of Sepsis in the ICU," Critical Care Medicine, 2018. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0000000000002936

[3] John Billings et al., "Impact Of Socioeconomic Status On Hospital Use In New York City," Health Affairs, 1993. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.12.1.162

[4] Alvin Rajkomar et al., "Scalable and accurate deep learning with electronic health records," npj digital medicine, 2018. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-018-0029-1

[5] Varun Gulshan et al., "Development and Validation of a Deep Learning Algorithm for Detection of Diabetic Retinopathy in Retinal Fundus Photographs," Innovations in Health Care Delivery, 2016. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2016.17216

[6] Mark P Sendak et al., "Real-World Integration of a Sepsis Deep Learning Technology Into Routine Clinical Care: Implementation Study," JMIR Medical Informatics, 2020. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.2196/15182

[7] Ziad Obermeyer et al., "Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations," Science, 2019. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aax2342

[8] Mary E. Charlson et al., "A new method of classifying prognostic comorbidity in longitudinal studies: Development and validation," Journal of Chronic Diseases, 1987. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9681(87)90171-8

[9] Gregory C. Pope et al., "Risk Adjustment of Medicare Capitation Payments Using the CMS-HCC Model," Health Care Financ Rev, 2004. [Online]. Available: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4194896/

[10] Rachael B. Zuckerman et al., "Readmissions, Observation, and the Hospital Readmissions Reduction Program," New England Journal of Medicine, 2016. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsa1513024

[11] Lars Osterberg et al., "Adherence to Medication," New England Journal of Medicine, 2005. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra050100

[12] Eric A. Coleman et al., "The Care Transitions Intervention Results of a Randomized Controlled Trial," JAMA Internal Medicine, 2006. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.166.17.1822

[13] Seth A. Berkowitz et al., "Food Insecurity and Health Care Expenditures in the United States, 2011–2013," Health Services Research, 2017. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12730

[14] Vincent X Liu et al., "The number needed to benefit: estimating the value of predictive analytics in healthcare," Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 2019. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocz088

[15] Ben Van Calster et al., "Calibration: the Achilles heel of predictive analytics," BMC Medicine, 2019. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-019-1466-7