

# Improving Chemotherapy Make-ahead Policies through Discrete-event Simulation

Donald Richardson

Advised by Dr. Amy Cohn

IISE

May 21<sup>st</sup> 2018

# Research Team/Collaborators

**Marian Grace Boxer, MD**

**Stephanie Castaing, RN**

**Amy Cohn, Ph.D.**

**Diane Drago**

**Anna Kempke, PharmD**

**Vincent Larroca, PharmD**

**Carol McMahon, RN**

**Matthew See, Pre-Med Student**

**Hwon Tak, Masters Student**

**Carolina Typaldos, Administration**

Patient & Family Advisory Board

UMHS

Associate Director, CHEPS (Research Advisor)

Patient & Family Advisory Board

Pharmacist, Infusion

Lead Pharmacist, Infusion

Nurse Supervisor, Infusion

Chemistry

Industrial and Operations Engineering

Administrative Manager Associate Healthcare

- Background
  - Motivation
  - Problem Statement
- Prediction Model
  - Patient Deferrals
  - Data Description
- Simulation Model
  - Condition
  - Simulation flow
  - Inputs/Outputs
- Summary/Future Work



- Background
  - Motivation
  - Problem Statement
- Prediction Model
  - Patient Deferrals
  - Data Description
- Simulation Model
  - Condition
  - Simulation flow
  - Inputs/Outputs
- Summary/Future Work




Reduce patient waiting time by mixing chemotherapy drugs before patients arrive in the system or at earlier stages in the process

- Cancer
  - ~1.7 million new cases estimated in 2018
  - More than half require chemotherapy treatment
  - Variable infusion treatment times (30 min – 8 hr)
- Infusion centers
  - Increased outpatient demand leads to undesirable outcomes such as:
    - Increased patient waiting times
    - Overworked staff

Source:  
American Cancer Society (2018) <http://www.cancer.org>

# Outpatient Infusion Patient Flow



- Typically require solutions to be made in pharmacy
- Variable doses correlate to patient weight
- Solution administered by IV over time (variable)
- Used to
  - Control
  - Cure
  - Ease





- UMRCC Pharmacy has a goal to keep the order turnaround-time (TAT) under 1 hour for each patient.
  - Current TAT can be as much as 2 hours.
- Our focus is to improve the drug TAT in the pharmacy and in turn reduce the overall time in the system for patients
  - We propose various pre-mix policies ranging in risk tolerance
  - Must assess the trade off of saved time vs drug waste if a patient defers

- Background
  - Motivation
  - Problem Statement
- Prediction Model
  - Patient Deferrals
  - Data Description
- Simulation Model
  - Condition
  - Simulation flow
  - Inputs/Outputs
- Summary/Future Work



- Patient arrives at the cancer center but is unable to receive their treatment (i.e. last minute cancellation)
  - Oncologist or nurse may deem them too ill for treatment after arrival
  - Unplanned treatment change

Covariate	Description	Mean	St. Dev	Min	Max
Length	Scheduled infusion appointment length in minutes	195.6	133.2	30	780
Age	Patients age in years	59	13.6	16	95
Total Pervious Cancellations	Number of cancellations since the patient's last completed visit	.8	1.4	0	21
Days since Last Cancellation	Number of days since the last cancelled visit	27.3	59.5	0	504
Total Previous Visits	Number of the patient's previously completed visits	8.4	9.2	0	83
Days since Last Visit	Number of days since the patient's last completed Visit	15.3	23.3	0	448
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	Patient's last recorded BMI	28	6.8	12.7	78.7


Factor	Levels	Description
Status (Response)	2	Appointment completed or deferred/no-show
Sex	2	Either male or female
Race	8	Patient's Race: White or Caucasian (WC), Black or African American (BA), Asian, American Indian and Alaska Native (AA)/Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (NO), BA and other, Multi-racial and WC, WC/BA, and Multi-racial
Ethnicity	4	Patient's Ethnicity: Non-Hispanic, Hispanic, Patient Refused, Unknown
Marital Status	8	Patient's Marital Status: Single, Married, Legally Separated, Divorced, Widowed, Unknown, Significant other, Other
Protocol	51	The various treatment protocols a patient is prescribed by an oncologist. This consists of the type of chemotherapy drug, solution, frequency of treatment, and additional treatment regimen notes.
Region	10	Region of the U.S. that the patient's permanent address is reported

- BART Model
  - Example decision threshold at probability 0.75
  - Correctly predicted 93% of completed appointments and 21% of deferrals/no shows
  - Overall prediction accuracy of 84%.
- Probabilities incorporated in simulation
- Additional details on model selection
  - Richardson, D. B., Guikema, S. D., & Cohn, A. E. (2017). Predicting Patient Treatment Deferrals at an Outpatient Chemotherapy Infusion Center: A Statistical Approach. *JCO Clinical Cancer Informatics*, 1, 1-8.

- Background
  - Motivation
  - Problem Statement
- Prediction Model
  - Patient Deferrals
  - Data Description
- **Simulation Model**
  - Simulation flow
  - Conditions
  - Inputs/Outputs
- Summary/Future Work



# Simulation Flow





- Pre-mix from 6:00am-7:30am, then service patients from 7:30am until finished
- We assume that all pre-mixed orders will not expire before they are administered if the patient appointment is at noon or before
- All arrivals are deviated from patient appointment times (no walk-ins)
- We assume a single drug order for each patient with a drug compounding probability of failure of 5%.
- There is also a chance for pre-mixed orders to be wasted if a patient defers or doesn't show.

# Estimated Input Parameters

Process	Distribution	Description
Patient Arrivals	JohnsonSU (-0.43, 1.41, -2.77, 45.51)	Negative values=early arrival Positive=late arrival
First Verification	Triangular (1, 2, 15)	Expert Opinion in min
Second Verification	Triangular (1, 2, 5)	Expert Opinion in min
Print Labels/Kit	Triangular (1, 3, 5)	Expert Opinion in min
Drug Mix Time	Beta (1.78, 47.89, 0, 240)	Historical Data
Safety Check	Pearson3(2.509, 3.583, 3.240)	Historical Data

- Case 1
  - Pre-mix drugs for first 20 patients who have a probability of deferral/no-show of 0.1 or lower
- Case 2
  - Pre-mix proportionally based on appointment time (i.e. if 50% of appointments between 9-10 am mix the first 10 drugs in that hour)
- Case 3
  - Combination of Case 1 and 2

# Test Case Outputs

## Time in System and Wasted Drug Results

Metrics		Scenarios
Days	No Pre-mix	
1	Average	52.79
	CI	(49.51, 56.07)
2	Average	85.63
	CI	(80.79, 90.46)
3	Average	58.04
	CI	(54.74, 61.34)
4	Average	38.10
	CI	(36.3, 39.89)
5	Average	47.86
	CI	(44.95, 50.78)
Avg of Avg # of Drugs Wasted		0

# Test Case Outputs

## Time in System and Wasted Drug Results

Metrics		Scenarios	
Days		No Pre-mix	1
1	Average	52.79	30.70
	CI	(49.51, 56.07)	(29.53, 31.87)
2	Average	85.63	46.60
	CI	(80.79, 90.46)	(44.43, 48.8)
3	Average	58.04	35.44
	CI	(54.74, 61.34)	(33.65, 37.22)
4	Average	38.10	24.78
	CI	(36.3, 39.89)	(24.18, 25.37)
5	Average	47.86	28.32
	CI	(44.95, 50.78)	(27.53, 29.09)
Avg of Avg # of Drugs Wasted		0	2.81

First 20 below probability of deferral threshold

# Test Case Outputs

## Time in System and Wasted Drug Results

Metrics		Scenarios		
Days		No Pre-mix	1	2
1	Average	52.79	30.70	26.64
	CI	(49.51, 56.07)	(29.53, 31.87)	(26.23, 27.05)
2	Average	85.63	46.60	41.73
	CI	(80.79, 90.46)	(44.43, 48.8)	(39.21, 44.25)
3	Average	58.04	35.44	37.69
	CI	(54.74, 61.34)	(33.65, 37.22)	(34.87, 40.51)
4	Average	38.10	24.78	22.82
	CI	(36.3, 39.89)	(24.18, 25.37)	(22.35, 23.33)
5	Average	47.86	28.32	25.73
	CI	(44.95, 50.78)	(27.53, 29.09)	(25.27, 26.19)
Avg of Avg # of Drugs Wasted		0	2.81	3.13

Pre-mix proportionally based on appointment time

# Test Case Outputs

## Time in System and Wasted Drug Results

Metrics		Scenarios			
Days		No Pre-mix	1	2	3
1	Average	52.79	30.70	26.64	26.17
	CI	(49.51, 56.07)	(29.53, 31.87)	(26.23, 27.05)	(25.65, 26.68)
2	Average	85.63	46.60	41.73	38.19
	CI	(80.79, 90.46)	(44.43, 48.8)	(39.21, 44.25)	(36.19, 40.19)
3	Average	58.04	35.44	37.69	27.47
	CI	(54.74, 61.34)	(33.65, 37.22)	(34.87, 40.51)	(26.59, 28.35)
4	Average	38.10	24.78	22.82	22.43
	CI	(36.3, 39.89)	(24.18, 25.37)	(22.35, 23.33)	(22.06, 22.81)
5	Average	47.86	28.32	25.73	25.70
	CI	(44.95, 50.78)	(27.53, 29.09)	(25.27, 26.19)	(24.71, 26.7)
Avg of Avg # of Drugs Wasted		0	2.81	3.13	2.32

Combination of 1 and 2

- Utilized patient specific data to predict their chance of deferral
- Simulated pharmacy orders from order arrival to patient delivery patient
- Presented “rule of thumb” policies and showed their improvement compared to not pre-mixing




- Drug mixing times
- Order arrival Stream
- Test optimization model
- Simulation optimization to explore dynamic policies

# Thank You!



Donald Richardson: [donalric@umich.edu](mailto:donalric@umich.edu)

# Pharmacy Work Flow



- Use prediction model to determine binary outcome
- Count projected number of patients scheduled for each drug
- Use IP to determine optimal drug set
  
- Additional prediction models
  - Classification and Regression Trees
  - Random Forest