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What are we trying to solve?

VA primary care visit + Tech performs eye screening
What kind of problem is this?

• Combinatorial matching problem
  – Deciding locations to offer eye care and how to staff those locations
• Constrained resources
• Multi-criteria decision
  – Consider cost, distance traveled, number of patients seen, etc.
Application

- Low-vision/blindness can have debilitating effects
  - Challenge with low-vision and driving
- Prevalence of diabetes in VA patients (11.4%) higher than general US population (7.2%)
  - Diabetes strongly associated with eye disease and vision impairment
• Why VA research?
  – VA is cost-incentivized to reduce barriers to accessing care
  – Patient utilization of care is relatively consistent

• Why this population?
  – Veterans report greater delays in seeking care than non-veterans
  – Eye care is 3rd most utilized service in VA (after primary care and mental health)
Problem Statement

• Goal: Evaluate **which locations** to offer eye care screenings and **what provider type(s)** to staff each eye care location

• Assumptions:
  – Patients go to “assigned” clinic for eye care screening
  – One-year time frame
  – Patients have homogeneous screening need (one screening every other year)

• Limitations:
  – Considering eye care screening only (follow-up care not included)
  – No consideration for patients’ provider preferences
General modeling approach

Possible eye care locations
• 25 VA locations in Georgia

Decide
• At which locations do we offer eye care?
• What kind(s) of provider(s) should staff each location?

“Assign” patients
• Patients from a given zip code assigned to clinic location(s)

Consider scenarios
• Start from current state
• Start from scratch
Model Overview: Feasibility Constraints

- Patient Capacity

\[ \sum_{z \in Z} x_{zc}^t \leq v^t \cdot y_c^t \quad \forall c \in C, \forall t \in T \]

- Demand

\[ \sum_{t \in T} \sum_{c \in C} x_{zc}^t \geq n_l \cdot p_z \quad \forall z \in Z \]
\[ \sum_{t \in T} \sum_{c \in C} x_{zc}^t \leq n_u \cdot p_z \quad \forall z \in Z \]

- Provider Capacity

\[ y_c^t \leq g_c^t \quad \forall t \in T, \forall c \in C \]
\[ \sum_{t \in T} y_c^t \leq g_c \quad \forall c \in C \]
Model Overview: Three objective functions

I. Maximize patients assigned

\[
\text{Maximize } \sum_{z \in Z} \sum_{c \in C} \sum_{t \in T} x_{ze}^t
\]

+ constraints: budget, distance

II. Minimize overall costs

\[
\text{Minimize } \left[ \sum_{c \in C} \sum_{z \in Z} \sum_{t \in T} (a_c^t \cdot x_{ze}^t + (d_{ze} \cdot x_{ze}^t) \cdot r + f_l^t \cdot y_l^t) \right] + h \cdot \left( \sum_{z \in Z} \left( a_n \cdot p_z - \sum_{t \in T} \sum_{c \in C} x_{ze}^t \right) \right)
\]

+ constraints: patients, distance

III. Minimize furthest distance traveled

+ constraints: budget, patients

\[
\text{Minimize } m
\]
Data Overview

- Patients accessing Georgia VA for (any) care in 2017
  - Approx. 200,000 patients, grouped by zip code
- Clinic locations
  - 25 VA clinics in Georgia
- Driving distance from center of each zip code to each clinic location calculated via Google API
- Budget/costs, provider capacities, and other clinic-specific values obtained from VA
- Model implemented in CPLEX
Results

Model: Maximize Patients Assigned

Constraints:
• Budget: Vary ($20M-$22M)
• Max. Distance Traveled: 150 miles
Results: Maximize Patients Assigned

(max dist: 150 miles)
Model: Minimize cost

Constraints:
- Max. Distance Traveled: Vary (100-200 miles)
- Minimum patients assigned: 5,000
Results: Minimize Cost

(min 5,000 total assigned)
Model: Minimize Maximum Distance Traveled

Constraints:
- Minimum Patients: Vary (10K – 30K patients)
- Budget: $21M
Results: Minimize Maximum Distance Traveled

(budget: $21M)
Conclusions & next steps

• Maximizing number of patients assigned is of most interest to clinical collaborators
• Each objective function inherently considers trade-offs
• Tool can be used by VA when evaluating community care integration
• Next…
  – Incorporate stochasticity
  – Consider implications for follow-up care
  – Generalize beyond Georgia
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