

The Classification and Modification of A.I. Generated Drug Diversion Signals in a Hospital System Setting Nathan Bryce Cuizon, PharmD Candidate, Joshua Schmees, PharmD, Elizabeth Canterbury, PharmD

Background

- Drug Diversion illegal distribution or abuse of prescription drugs for purposes not intended by the prescriber
- High presence of drug diversion related events in North America
- Push for diversion related mitigation strategies
- Use of custom computer logic to flag possible diversion related events
- Previous study on computer logic mediated drug diversion:
- Tom Knight, et al, Detecting drug diversion in health-system data using machine learning and advanced analytics, American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy, Volume 79, Issue 16, 15 August 2022, Pages 1345– 1354, https://doi.org/10.1093/ajhp/zxac035

Methods

- Using drug diversion software from LogicStream[™] Health
- Six months of computer-generated data taken from healthcare ministry headquartered in Springfield, IL.
- 15 total facilities ranging from acute care to Level 1 trauma centers across Illinois, Missouri and Wisconsin (January 1 – July 31 2022)
- Data was analyzed and sorted in Microsoft Excel[®] in order to create end-user friendly deliverables and determine accuracy of current iteration of drug diversion program
- Two primary deliverables: Modular scorecard detailing ministrywide trend data, and additional modular scatterplot to determine program accuracy versus overall signal utilization
- Scatterplot Quadrant Definitions:
- Class I: functioning signal, ideal
- Class II: High utilization, High False Positive Rate
- Class III: Low utilization, High False Positive Rate \bullet
- Class IV: Low utilization, Low False Positive Rate
- Use developed tools to postulate improvements to Diversion App

QR Codes (must have SIUe Login)





Ministry-wide Scorecard

Di	ug Diversion Scorecard	(NBC - 2023)			Last Update:		8/25/20
Date Range: 1/1/2022				to			7/1/2
,-,-,-,			Minis	stry-Wide Data			.,.,.
	Total Events			Total Events w/ Outcome		Z of All Events tha	t were assigned an outcome
		120,263			14,489		12.05%
		· · ·	Ministry wide	e False Positives Trends			
Tata	l False Positives		winistry-wide		Catal Eugete with a	scienced outcome	
TOLA	in raise Fusitives	10,025		Total False Positives	69.17%	assigned outcome	
		10,020	Ministry Divors	ion Signals by Event Count	00.1171		
Signal Name	Europe Courses Europe	:		ion Signals by Event Count events with outome		• - (T El J E. •.	/ _{
Administration Delay	Event Count Events v 27677	ith an assigned Ou 1539	7. total	5.56%	689	e or frue riagged Cy / 850	of reviewed events that are 44.
Waste Delay	27677	183		0.82%	46	137	
Reconciliation Discrepancy	22354	9250		43.57%	5993	3257	64.
Dispense Amount	21229	53		0.73%	35	18	66
Dispense Count	7269	49		0.68%	32	17	65
Administration Count	7255	45		0.69%	33	12	73.
Administration Amount	6557	49		0.79%	27	22	55
Full Vial Waste	6228	2561		42.10%	2480	81	96.
Waste Buddies	6083	30		0.50%	30	0	100
Return Delay	6003	28		0.54%	5	23	17.
Administration With Low Pain Score	5197	28		1.04%	5	23	17.
)ispense From Unexpected Location		515		70.94%	499	16	96.
Dispenses from multiple departments		4		0.94%	3	1	75.
Dispense After Transfer or Discharge	427	100		47.85%	97	3	97.
ministration After Transfer or Dischar		34		19.65%	26	8	76
Dispense After Discharge	173	13		15.66%	13	0	100.
Unwitnessed Return	83	9		21.43%	9	0	100.
Avg Amount Administered	42	0		0.00%	0	0	0.
Avg Administrations	39	0		0.00%	0	0	0.
Unwitnessed Waste	15	3		100.00%	3	U	100.
-	Unused Diversion Signals t					on Signals By Event Cou	
	Event Count Unproce					Events with Outcom(2	of total events with an out
Administration Delay	27677	26138		Administration With Low Pain Score	2694	28	1
Waste Delay	22354	22171		Dispense From Unexpected Location	726	515	70
Reconciliation Discrepancy	21229	11979 7216		Dispenses from multiple departments	427		0
Dispense Amount	7269 7255	7216		Dispense After Transfer or Discharge Administration After Transfer or Discharge	209 173	34	47
Dispense Count Administration Count	6557	6512		Dispense After Discharge	83		19 15
Administration Amount	6228	6179		Unwitnessed Return	42	U 9	
Waste Buddies	6003	5973		Avg Amount Administered	39		
Return Delay	5197	5169		Avg Administrations	15	0 0	0.
Actain Beidy	0.01	0.100		ds by Hospital			
Hospital Name	Number of ever % of tota	l ministru sussts	# of events with outcome and the second s	· · ·	# of Falco Docit	t of True Flagged Fr	of Outcomes that were Fal
riospitar name	43890	36.7%	9311			1986	or outcomes that were rai
	17358	14.5%	2	0.0%		1	5
	13640	11.4%	1743			730	5
	12426	10.4%	1404			936	3
	8607	7.2%	27			14	4
	5947	5.0%	764			300	6
	3728	3.1%	411			108	7
	3446	2.9%	493			260	4
	2747	2.3%	5	0.2%	1	4	2
	1862	1.6%	21	1.1%	12	9	5
	1726	1.4%	192			67	ť
	1599	1.3%	114			47	5
	1171	1.0%	0			0	
	1043	0.9%	2	0.2%		2	
	300	0.3%	0	0.0%	0		(

Scatterplot to Determine Program Accuracy

	Waste Buddies				•	Dispens
	Dispense After I	Discharge	Unwitnesse	d Return	- Full Via	I Waste
90%						
001/	Administration After Transfer o	r Discharge				
80%	Dispenses from multiple departmen	its				
	 Administration Count 					
70%	Dispense Amount					
	Dispense Count				• Rec	conciliation Disci
60%	Administration Amount	III	II			
50%						
	 Administration Delay 	IV	Ι			
40%						
30%						
	Waste Delay					
20%	Return Delay					
	••					
10%	Administration With Low Pain Score					
1070	- Avg Amount Administered					
0%	Avg Administrations					

Southern Illinois University Edwardsville School of Pharmacy

After Transfer or Discharge	 Dispense Fr 	rom Unexpected Location	Unwitnessed Wa
ancy			

• Over 6 months, 120,263 total events were created, • Of those, 14,489 events were reviewed by an end user. • Most fired signals: Administration Delay (27,677 events), Waste Delay (27,677 events), Reconciliation Discrepancy (22,354 events), Dispense Amount (21,229 events), and Dispense Count (7,269) events)

• Of the 9,311 events reviewed, 7,325 events (21.2%) labeled as False Positive

Scorecard

• Top five signals that fired ministry wide were also the top five most under-reviewed

Uneven event distribution between hospitals

Uneven utilization of signals between hospitals Scatterplot

Most signals require some form of adjustment to mitigate false positive percentage

• Low signal utilization overall • End user bias towards reviewing certain signals

Short term time, financial and personnel restrictions

Unbalanced usage of program between hospitals

•	Со
	pr
•	Es
	Di
•	Εv
	in
•	Fu

necianed an outcome?

Results

 Most under processed signals(%): Administration Delay (94.44%), Waste Delay (99.18%), Dispense Amount (99.27%), Dispense Count (99.32%)

• Hospital with most events: (A) - 43,890 events (36.7% of ministry events).

Conclusions

Possible Signal Improvements based on quadrant

Class II: Adjust signal parameters (timing, criteria)

Class III: Same as Class II changes, focus on user-perceived signal importance, reduce number of events occurring

Class IV: Reevaluate signal importance, bolster utilization above threshold to determine true false positive rate

Confounding Variables/ Limitations:

Implications

ontinued research in the application of custom computer rograms into healthcare systems and data mining.

stablished baseline scoring tools to assess and improve the Drug

iversion app's accuracy at detecting possible diversion events ventual reduction in costs associated with drug diversion

patient.

Further study and refinement of scoring tool warranted.