HEALTHCARE INTELLIGENCE · BRIEF 01

Why Retrospective Claims Management Is Failing Employers.

For three decades, the dominant model for managing employer healthcare costs has been a retrospective one. Claims arrive, costs are tallied, narratives are constructed, and the cycle repeats. The model is now reaching its structural limit, and the next decade of cost management will be defined by employers who learn to operate ahead of the claim instead of behind it.

Metra Healthcare Intelligence · Editorial Brief · Approximately 1,650 words ·

Published with full assumption disclosure

Every benefits leader and chief financial officer at a mid market or enterprise employer in the United States has been trained in essentially the same operating discipline. The plan year closes. The carrier or third party administrator delivers a claims report. Aggregate spend is reconciled against budget. High cost claimants are identified. The renewal conversation begins. Adjustments are made. The cycle starts again. This pattern has been refined to a near science. It is also the reason employer healthcare costs continue to rise by six to eight percent every year with very little organizational ability to interrupt the trajectory.

The defining feature of this entire model is that it operates on data that describes events which have already taken place. A claim is filed only after a condition has progressed to the point of clinical encounter. By the time a single line of claims data is available, the metabolic deterioration that produced it has been accumulating, in most cases, for years. Type two diabetes, hypertension, nonalcoholic fatty liver disease, obesity, and coronary heart disease are not events. They are trajectories. Yet the entire infrastructure of employer cost management is built to recognize them only at the moment they cross the threshold into a billable encounter.

The Twelve to Eighteen Month Lag

The gap between the formation of metabolic risk and its appearance in a claims report is not a few weeks or a few months. It is most commonly between twelve and eighteen months, and in many cases substantially longer. The progression from impaired fasting glucose to clinical type two diabetes can unfold over three to six years before any care encounter records it. The Diabetes Prevention Program demonstrated that even after diagnosis, lifestyle intervention can reduce progression by fifty eight percent over roughly three years of follow up, a finding that has been replicated repeatedly since its publication in the New England Journal of Medicine in 2002 by Knowler and colleagues.

What this means in practice is that the claims report a chief financial officer receives in the first quarter of 2026 describes biological processes that began, in many cases, sometime in 2023 or earlier. The cost is being incurred today. The underlying risk was formed before the current plan year started. By the time the data is actionable, the action it points to is no longer prevention. It is mitigation, treatment, and cost absorption.

> *"We have built an entire industry around managing the consequences of metabolic disease, and almost no infrastructure around managing the trajectory that produces it."*

The Industrial Logic of the Status Quo

It would be easy to assume that the retrospective model persists because nobody has thought to change it. The opposite is true. Carriers, brokers, third party administrators, stop loss writers, and pharmacy benefit managers have all built sophisticated analytic capabilities on top of claims data. The reason the model persists is that, until very recently, claims data was the only data available at the scale and structure required for actuarial analysis. There was no equivalent dataset describing the metabolic trajectory of a workforce in real time.

The result is a remarkable institutional alignment around a single, lagging signal. Underwriting decisions are made from claims experience. Renewal negotiations are conducted on claims experience. Cost containment programs are designed against claims experience. Even the wellness industry, which positions itself as preventive, is overwhelmingly evaluated on participation metrics rather than on shifts in metabolic trajectory. The retrospective model is not failing because anyone designed it badly. It is failing because the world has produced new categories of data that the model was never built to consume.

What Metabolic Data Adds

Metabolic data is fundamentally different from claims data in three respects that matter for cost management.

The first is temporal. Metabolic signals exist continuously. Blood pressure, weight trajectory, waist circumference, and fasting patterns are present every day of the year. They do not require a clinical encounter to become observable. When an organization can see these signals at the population level, it can identify cost exposure long before it becomes a claim.

The second is causal. Metabolic syndrome is the upstream condition that produces most of what eventually appears in a claims report from the conditions employer plans actually carry the most cost on. Tabák and colleagues, writing in The Lancet in 2012, showed that fasting glucose, post load glucose, and insulin resistance follow predictable trajectories for years before clinical diabetes is diagnosed. The same upstream logic holds for hypertension, fatty liver disease, and the cardiovascular cluster. Tracking the upstream metabolic state is closer to tracking the cause than to tracking the symptom.

The third is interventional. A claim describes a fact. A metabolic trajectory describes a probability. Probabilities are modifiable. Once a workforce trajectory is visible, the organization can model what changes if a particular intervention shifts a particular segment of the workforce by a particular margin. This is what a forecasting model does for revenue. It is what a metabolic forecasting model can finally do for healthcare cost.

> **THE CORE ASYMMETRY**
>
> Every other major operating expense at an enterprise employer has a leading indicator layer. Revenue has pipeline. Workforce cost has headcount planning. Cash flow has receivables aging. Healthcare cost, the second or third largest line item at most companies, has had no leading indicator layer at all. It has been managed entirely from the trailing report. The category of metabolic intelligence and forecasting closes that asymmetry.

The Cost of a Twelve Month Blind Spot

The financial implication of operating without a leading indicator is not abstract. The Centers for Disease Control reports that more than ninety percent of the United States' $4.5 trillion in annual healthcare expenditure is attributable to chronic and mental health conditions, and that roughly seventy percent of employer healthcare cost is driven by preventable chronic

conditions, most of them metabolic in origin. The Milken Institute, in its 2019 report on chronic disease, estimated the total economic burden of chronic disease in the United States at $3.7 trillion when accounting for both direct medical costs and lost productivity.

For a single mid market employer, the practical translation is straightforward. A five hundred person organization typically carries between $1.5 million and $2.5 million in annual claims exposure attributable to preventable metabolic conditions, depending on workforce demographics and plan design. Across the full duration of the twelve to eighteen month lag between metabolic risk formation and claims appearance, that exposure has been accumulating without organizational visibility and without any infrastructure capable of triggering an early response.

What a Forecasting Layer Actually Looks Like

A leading indicator layer for employer healthcare is not a wellness platform with better dashboards. It is a structurally different category of system. It must take in metabolic data continuously, model risk at the individual level while only ever returning aggregated and de identified output to the employer, produce thirty, sixty, and ninety day forecasts of metabolic trajectory, and translate those forecasts into projected cost exposure that finance can model alongside its other operating lines.

Once such a layer is in place, the cost conversation inside the organization changes shape. The chief financial officer stops asking the chief human resources officer to explain a variance that has already been incurred, and starts asking what intervention scenario produces the best return on the next quarter's exposure. The broker stops arriving with a renewal narrative and starts arriving with a forecast. The carrier stops being the only party with predictive insight, because the employer now has predictive insight of its own.

The Transition Has Already Begun

Several signals indicate that the retrospective model is approaching the end of its dominance. Continuous glucose monitoring, once restricted to insulin dependent populations, is now used by tens of millions of healthy adults. Home blood pressure monitoring has become widely available. Body composition tracking is part of consumer devices. The metabolic signal layer that did not exist a decade ago now exists in the hands of the workforce itself. What has been missing is the intelligence and forecasting layer that converts that signal into a financial instrument an employer can manage.

The retrospective model is not failing because it was ever wrong. It is failing because the conditions that produced it no longer hold. The data exists. The science exists. The financial logic for using both is overwhelming. Employers who continue to manage healthcare cost only from the trailing claims report are not making a neutral choice. They are choosing to operate with a twelve to eighteen month blind spot in their second or third largest operating expense, in a market where their competitors will not.

REFERENCES

1. **Knowler WC, Barrett-Connor E, Fowler SE, et al.** Reduction in the incidence of type 2 diabetes with lifestyle intervention or metformin. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2002; 346(6): 393 to 403.
2. **Tabák AG, Herder C, Rathmann W, Brunner EJ, Kivimäki M.** Prediabetes: a high risk state for diabetes development. *The Lancet*. 2012; 379(9833): 2279 to 2290.
3. **Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.** Health and Economic Costs of Chronic Diseases. National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, 2017 with subsequent updates.
4. **Milken Institute.** The Costs of Chronic Disease in the United States. 2019.
5. **Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.** National Health Expenditure Data. 2022 release reporting United States expenditure at $4.5 trillion.
6. **Kaiser Family Foundation.** Employer Health Benefits Annual Survey. 2023.
7. **Willis Towers Watson.** Best Practices in Health Care Employer Survey. 2023.
8. **PwC Health Research Institute.** Medical Cost Trend: Behind the Numbers. 2024.