Morphpublishing
J. Comput. Intell. Mach. Reason. Decis.-Mak.
open access academic journal
Peer reviewed

Data-Enabled Service-Line Rationalization Frameworks to Enhance Health-System Profitability and Competitive Market Position

Ramesh Thapa[a]

Abstract: In an era of increasing financial pressure and market competition, healthcare systems must make strategic decisions about which service lines to maintain, expand, or consolidate. Traditional approaches to service-line planning often rely on fragmented data and heuristic methods that may overlook key interdependencies. This research presents a comprehensive framework for service-line rationalization in healthcare systems using advanced data analytics and mathematical modeling techniques. We develop a novel approach that integrates financial performance metrics, market demand analysis, competitive positioning, and operational efficiency measures into a unified decision-support system. The framework employs stochastic optimization models to account for uncertainty in patient volumes, reimbursement rates, and resource utilization. Through implementation of multidimensional scaling and hierarchical clustering algorithms, our methodology identifies strategic service-line portfolio configurations that maximize system-wide contribution margins while maintaining essential healthcare access. A game-theoretic market equilibrium model further enhances the framework by incorporating competitive responses to service-line changes. Mathematical validation using Monte Carlo simulations demonstrates the framework's robustness under various market conditions. The computational experiments reveal potential profitability improvements of 8–13% with simultaneous enhancements in market coverage metrics. This approach provides healthcare executives with quantitative tools to navigate the complex interplay between financial sustainability and market position, enabling data-driven service-line rationalization decisions aligned with both institutional objectives and community healthcare needs.

1. Introduction

Healthcare systems across developed economies face unprecedented financial pressures amid evolving reimbursement landscapes, shifting demographics, workforce constraints, and increasing competitive intensity [1].

[a]**Pokhara University, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Dhungepatan Road, Pokhara, Kaski, Nepal**

Service-line rationalization—the strategic process of evaluating, modifying, and optimizing the portfolio of clinical services offered by a healthcare organization—has emerged as a critical strategic imperative for health system executives seeking to enhance financial viability while maintaining appropriate community access to care.

Historically, service-line rationalization decisions have been predominantly driven by intuition, organizational politics, and retrospective financial analyses [2]. This approach has proven inadequate in capturing the complex, interconnected nature of healthcare delivery systems wherein changes to one service line may produce ripple effects across other clinical domains through shared resources, referral patterns, and market perception. Moreover, traditional approaches often fail to incorporate sophisticated forecasting methodologies that account for demographic shifts, emerging care models, and potential competitive responses. [3]

The emergence of advanced data analytics capabilities, coupled with more sophisticated healthcare economic modeling techniques, creates new opportunities for developing comprehensive frameworks to guide service-line rationalization decisions. This research introduces a multilayered analytical framework that integrates financial, operational, market, and competitive dimensions to produce optimal service-line portfolio configurations for healthcare systems. [4]

Our framework advances beyond existing approaches by incorporating stochastic elements that address the inherent uncertainty in healthcare demand forecasting, reimbursement dynamics, and resource utilization. Through the application of mathematical programming techniques, multivariate statistical methods, and game-theoretic models, we develop a comprehensive approach that enables healthcare leaders to make data-driven service-line decisions aligned with strategic objectives. [5]

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. First, we review the theoretical foundations underpinning service-line rationalization and position our work within the broader context of healthcare management science. Next, we detail the mathematical construction of our framework, including the formulation of objective functions, constraint specifications, and algorithmic approaches [6]. We then present computational experiments using synthesized data reflecting typical healthcare market dynamics. The discussion section explores practical implementation considerations and methodological limitations [7]. Finally, we summarize key insights and outline directions for future research.

2. Theoretical Foundations of Service-Line Rationalization

Service-line rationalization in healthcare exists at the intersection of multiple theoretical domains, including resource allocation theory, healthcare economics, market competition, and patient access considerations [8]. To establish the foundation for our framework, we first explore these theoretical constructs and their relevance to service-line decision-making in contemporary healthcare environments.

At its core, service-line rationalization represents a resource allocation problem wherein healthcare organizations must determine how to optimally distribute finite resources across multiple potential service offerings to maximize organizational value [9]. This value function typically incorporates both financial performance metrics and non-financial considerations such as community benefit, academic mission, and strategic positioning. The allocation problem is further complicated by the presence of both fixed and variable costs, cross-subsidization between service lines, and the temporal dimensions of capital investment cycles.

From a healthcare economics perspective, service-line decisions must account for the unique characteristics of healthcare markets, including information asymmetry between providers and consumers, the presence of third-party payers, the non-profit status of many providers, and certificate-of-need regulations that may constrain market entry and exit [10]. These factors create market distortions that influence both supply and demand dynamics for healthcare services, necessitating more sophisticated analytical approaches than those used in traditional competitive markets.

Market competition theory provides another crucial dimension for service-line rationalization [11]. Unlike perfectly competitive markets, healthcare services frequently exhibit characteristics of monopolistic competition or oligopoly, particularly in specialized service lines requiring significant capital investment or specialized expertise. Strategic interactions between competing health systems influence service-line profitability through impacts on volume, payor mix, and pricing power [12]. Consequently, optimal service-line decisions cannot be made in isolation but must incorporate expectations about competitor responses.

Patient access considerations introduce additional complexities to service-line rationalization [13]. Healthcare organizations, particularly non-profit systems and academic medical centers, maintain missions that include providing essential healthcare services to their communities. This creates an inherent tension between purely financial optimization and ensuring appropriate access to care, especially for underserved populations or rural communities [14]. Service-line decisions must therefore balance financial performance with access implications, often requiring the incorporation of explicit constraints or objective function components addressing minimum service requirements.

The integration of these theoretical perspectives necessitates a multidimensional framework that can simultaneously address financial optimization, market competition dynamics, and access considerations. Such a framework must be flexible enough to accommodate varying organizational priorities while providing robust analytical support for complex service-line decisions [15]. Our work advances this integration through mathematical formulations that explicitly capture these interdependencies and trade-offs.

3. Mathematical Framework Development

We now present the formal mathematical construction of our service-line rationalization framework [16]. The framework consists of interconnected modules addressing financial performance, demand forecasting, resource allocation, and competitive positioning. These modules are integrated through a unified optimization structure that identifies service-line configurations maximizing organizational value while satisfying operational and strategic constraints. [17]

3.1. Notation and Core Formulation

Let $S = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ represent the set of potential service lines a healthcare system may offer. For each service line $i \in S$, we define the following parameters:

r_i = average reimbursement per case for service line i [18] v_i = projected annual volume for service line i c_i^v = variable cost per case for service line i c_i^f = fixed cost associated with maintaining service line i [19] q_i = quality metric for service line i (normalized to $[0, 1]$) a_i = access importance weight for service line i [20]

The binary decision variable x_i indicates whether service line i is included in the portfolio ($x_i = 1$) or eliminated ($x_i = 0$).

The core optimization problem can be formulated as: [21]

$$\max_x \sum_{i \in S} x_i \cdot [(r_i - c_i^v) v_i - c_i^f] + \alpha \sum_{i \in S} x_i \cdot q_i \cdot a_i \cdot v_i$$

subject to:

$$\sum_{i\in S} x_i \cdot c_i^f \leq B$$

$$\sum_{i\in S} x_i \cdot R_{ij} \geq M_j \quad \forall j \in R$$

$$x_i \in \{0,1\} \quad \forall i \in S$$

Where B represents the budget constraint for fixed costs, R_{ij} denotes the resource requirements of service line i for resource type j, M_j is the minimum required utilization for resource type j, and R is the set of shared resources. The parameter α represents the relative weight assigned to the quality and access component of the objective function compared to the financial component. [22]

This formulation, while capturing the fundamental trade-offs in service-line rationalization, requires substantial enhancement to address the complex realities of healthcare delivery systems. The following subsections detail these enhancements. [23]

3.2. Stochastic Demand and Reimbursement Modeling

To account for uncertainty in volume projections and reimbursement rates, we replace the deterministic parameters v_i and r_i with probability distributions. Let V_i and R_i represent random variables for volume and reimbursement, respectively, with associated probability density functions $f_{V_i}(v)$ and $f_{R_i}(r)$.

We employ a Monte Carlo approach to handle these stochastic elements. For each service line i, we generate N scenarios representing possible volume-reimbursement combinations: [24]

$$\{(v_i^1, r_i^1), (v_i^2, r_i^2), \ldots, (v_i^N, r_i^N)\}$$

The expected contribution margin for service line i is then approximated as:

$$E[CM_i] \approx \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N}[(r_i^k - c_i^v)v_i^k - c_i^f]$$

To incorporate risk preferences, we modify the objective function using a mean-variance approach: [25]

$$\max_x \sum_{i\in S} x_i \cdot E[CM_i] - \lambda \sum_{i\in S} x_i \cdot Var[CM_i] + \alpha \sum_{i\in S} x_i \cdot q_i \cdot a_i \cdot E[V_i]$$

where λ represents the risk aversion parameter and $Var[CM_i]$ is the variance of the contribution margin for service line i across the generated scenarios.

For healthcare systems with multiple facilities, we extend this formulation to account for facility-specific parameters: [26]

$$\max_x \sum_{f\in F}\sum_{i\in S} x_{fi} \cdot E[CM_{fi}] - \lambda \sum_{f\in F}\sum_{i\in S} x_{fi} \cdot Var[CM_{fi}] + \alpha \sum_{f\in F}\sum_{i\in S} x_{fi} \cdot q_{fi} \cdot a_{fi} \cdot E[V_{fi}]$$

where F represents the set of facilities, and x_{fi} indicates whether service line i is offered at facility f.

3.3. Service Line Interdependencies

Healthcare service lines often exhibit significant interdependencies through clinical pathways, shared resources, and referral patterns. We model these interdependencies using a directed graph $G = (S, E)$ where each node represents a service line and edges represent relationships between service lines. [27]

For each edge $(i, j) \in E$, we define a parameter δ_{ij} representing the proportion of volume in service line j that is dependent on the presence of service line i. This leads to a modified volume calculation:

$$V_j = V_j^{base} \cdot \prod_{i:(i,j)\in E} (1 - \delta_{ij} \cdot (1 - x_i))$$

where V_j^{base} represents the baseline volume projection for service line j assuming all interdependent service lines are present.

To incorporate this interdependency structure into our optimization framework, we linearize the expression by introducing additional variables and constraints:

$$V_j \leq V_j^{base} \quad \forall j \in S$$
$$V_j \leq V_j^{base} \cdot (1 - \delta_{ij} \cdot (1 - x_i)) + M \cdot (1 - y_{ij}) \quad \forall (i, j) \in E$$
$$\sum_{(i,j)\in E} y_{ij} \geq 1 \quad \forall j \in S$$
$$y_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall (i, j) \in E$$

where M is a large constant and y_{ij} are auxiliary binary variables.

4. Advanced Mathematical Modeling for Market Dynamics

Healthcare service-line optimization requires sophisticated modeling of market dynamics, competitive responses, and strategic positioning [28]. In this section, we develop mathematical formulations that capture these complex interactions and integrate them into our rationalization framework.

4.1. Market Share Modeling with Competitive Response

We employ a multinomial logit model to estimate market share for each service line across competing healthcare systems [29]. For each service line i, patient population segment p, and healthcare system k (including our focal system and competitors), we define a utility function:

$$U_{ipk} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot q_{ik} + \beta_2 \cdot d_{pk} + \beta_3 \cdot z_{ik} + \varepsilon_{ipk}$$

where: [30] - q_{ik} represents the quality metrics for service line i at system k - d_{pk} represents the average distance from population segment p to system k - z_{ik} represents other service line attributes - ε_{ipk} represents unobserved factors, assumed to follow a Gumbel distribution

The probability that a patient from segment p will choose system k for service line i is given by:

$$P_{ipk} = \frac{\exp(U_{ipk})}{\sum_{k' \in K} \exp(U_{ipk'})}$$

where K is the set of all healthcare systems in the market. [31]

The expected volume for service line i at our focal system ($k = 0$) is then:

$$V_i = \sum_{p \in P} N_p \cdot P_{ip0} \cdot x_i$$

where N_p is the size of population segment p and P is the set of all population segments. [32]

To model competitive responses, we employ a game-theoretic approach using best response dynamics. For each competitor $k \in K \setminus \{0\}$, we model their service-line decisions x_{ik} as a function of our decisions x_i. Using a Nash equilibrium framework, we iteratively solve:

$$x_{ik}^{t+1} = \arg\max_{x_{ik}} \pi_k(x_{ik}, x_{-ik}^t, x_0^t) \quad \forall k \in K \setminus \{0\}$$
$$x_i^{t+1} = \arg\max_{x_i} \pi_0(x_i, x_{-i}^t)$$

where π_k represents the profit function for system k, x_{-ik}^t represents the service-line decisions of all systems except service line i in system k at iteration t, and x_0^t represents our focal system's decisions at iteration t.

4.2. Mathematical Programming with Quadratic Constraints

The incorporation of market share models and competitive responses transforms our linear programming formulation into a quadratically constrained problem [33]. The contribution margin for service line i becomes:

$$CM_i = x_i \cdot \left[(r_i - c_i^v) \cdot \sum_{p \in P} N_p \cdot \frac{\exp(U_{ip0})}{\sum_{k' \in K} \exp(U_{ipk'})} - c_i^f \right]$$

This nonlinear formulation presents computational challenges [34]. We address these through piecewise linear approximation techniques. Specifically, we partition the domain of the market share function into L segments and introduce auxiliary variables to represent the linearized approximation: [35]

$$CM_i = \sum_{l=1}^{L} w_{il} \cdot CM_{il}$$
$$\sum_{l=1}^{L} w_{il} = x_i$$
$$0 \leq w_{il} \leq 1 \quad \forall l \in \{1, 2, \ldots, L\}$$

where CM_{il} represents the precomputed contribution margin for service line i in segment l, and w_{il} are weights determining the convex combination.

4.3. Multiobjective Optimization with Pareto Frontier Exploration

Healthcare service-line rationalization inherently involves multiple competing objectives including profitability, market share, quality, and access. We employ multiobjective optimization techniques to explore the Pareto frontier of non-dominated solutions. [36]

Let $f_1(x)$, $f_2(x)$, ..., $f_m(x)$ represent m objective functions corresponding to different organizational priorities. The multiobjective optimization problem is formulated as:

$$\min_x [f_1(x), f_2(x), \ldots, f_m(x)]$$

[37] subject to $x \in X$, where X represents the feasible region defined by our constraints.

We implement the augmented ε-constraint method to generate points along the Pareto frontier [38]. This involves solving a sequence of problems:

$$\min_x f_1(x) + \rho \sum_{j=2}^{m} s_j$$

subject to: [39]

$$f_j(x) + s_j = \varepsilon_j \quad \forall j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, m\}$$
$$s_j \geq 0 \quad \forall j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, m\}$$
$$x \in X$$

where s_j are slack variables, ρ is a small positive scalar, and ε_j are upper bounds on the respective objective functions that are systematically varied to explore the Pareto frontier. [40]

5. Computational Implementation and Algorithmic Considerations

The mathematical complexity of our service-line rationalization framework necessitates careful consideration of computational implementation strategies. In this section, we discuss algorithmic approaches, data preprocessing requirements, and performance optimization techniques that enable practical application of the framework in healthcare settings. [41]

5.1. Decomposition Methods for Large-Scale Problems

For healthcare systems with numerous service lines across multiple facilities, the resulting optimization problem may exceed computational capacities when solved directly. We implement a Benders decomposition approach that separates the problem into a master problem addressing service-line selection decisions and subproblems handling resource allocation and market share calculations.

The master problem at iteration t is formulated as: [42]

$$\max_x \sum_{i \in S} x_i \cdot \hat{CM}_i + \sum_{k=1}^{t-1} \theta_k$$

subject to:

$$\eta^k + \sum_{i \in S} \gamma_i^k \cdot x_i \leq 0 \quad \forall k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, t-1\}$$

$$x \in X$$

[43]

where $\hat{CM}_i$ represents an initial estimate of the contribution margin for service line i, θ_k represents the Benders cuts from previous iterations, and η^k and γ_i^k are cut coefficients derived from dual variables in the subproblems.

The resource allocation subproblem for a fixed service-line configuration $\bar{x}$ is:

$$\max_y \sum_{f \in F} \sum_{i \in S} \bar{x}_{fi} \cdot \sum_{r \in R} \beta_{fir} \cdot y_{fir}$$

subject to:

$$\sum_{f \in F} \sum_{i \in S} \bar{x}_{fi} \cdot \alpha_{fir} \cdot y_{fir} \leq C_r \quad \forall r \in R$$

$$y_{fir} \geq 0 \quad \forall f \in F, i \in S, r \in R$$

where y_{fir} represents the allocation of resource r to service line i at facility f, β_{fir} is the contribution per unit of resource, α_{fir} is the resource consumption coefficient, and C_r is the capacity constraint for resource r.

The market share subproblem incorporates the multinomial logit model described earlier to calculate updated contribution margins based on the current service-line configuration. [44]

5.2. Homotopy Methods for Nonconvex Optimization

The market share modeling components introduce nonconvexities that challenge traditional optimization approaches. We implement homotopy continuation methods that transform the problem through a sequence of increasingly accurate approximations. [45]

Let $H(x, t)$ represent a homotopy function that continuously deforms from a tractable problem $H(x, 0)$ to our target problem $H(x, 1)$. We define:

$$H(x, t) = (1 - t) \cdot G(x) + t \cdot F(x)$$

[46]

where $G(x)$ is a simplified version of our objective function with linear market share approximations, and $F(x)$ is the full nonconvex formulation.

We trace the solution path from $t = 0$ to $t = 1$ using predictor-corrector methods [47]. For each continuation step, we:

1. Predict the next solution using the tangent direction: [48]

$$\Delta x = -\left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} \cdot \frac{\partial H}{\partial t}$$

2. Correct the prediction using Newton iterations:

$$x^{k+1} = x^k - \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} \cdot H(x^k, t_{i+1})$$

This approach proves particularly effective for healthcare markets with strong competitive interactions where convex approximations may yield suboptimal service-line configurations. [49]

5.3. Parallel Computing Architecture

To enhance computational efficiency, we implement a parallel computing architecture that distributes calculations across multiple processing units. Specifically, we parallelize: [50]

1. Monte Carlo simulations for stochastic parameter estimation 2. Subproblem solutions in the Benders decomposition 3. Pareto frontier exploration through parallel ε-constraint problems [51]

The parallel implementation follows a manager-worker paradigm, with the manager process coordinating the overall optimization strategy and worker processes handling specific computational tasks. We employ asynchronous communication protocols to minimize synchronization overhead. [52]

The computational speedup achieved through parallelization is approximated by Amdahl's law:

$$S(n) = \frac{1}{(1-p) + \frac{p}{n}}$$

where $S(n)$ is the speedup with n processors, and p is the proportion of the algorithm that can be parallelized [53]. For our framework, empirical testing indicates $p \approx 0.85$, yielding significant performance improvements for large-scale healthcare systems.

6. Empirical Validation and Case Studies

To validate our service-line rationalization framework, we conducted computational experiments using both synthetic data reflecting typical healthcare market characteristics and anonymized real-world data from a multi-hospital health system [54]. This section presents the experimental design, results, and insights derived from these validations.

6.1. Synthetic Market Construction

We constructed a synthetic healthcare market comprising five competing health systems distributed across a geographic region with the following characteristics:

1. Population distribution: 1.2 million residents across 40 geographic subregions with varying demographic profiles [55] 2. Service lines: 28 distinct service lines spanning primary, secondary, and tertiary care 3. Payor mix: Four major insurance categories (Medicare, Medicaid, Commercial, Self-pay) with region-specific penetration rates [56] 4. Quality metrics: Service-line specific quality indicators following a beta distribution calibrated to national benchmarks 5. Cost structures: Fixed and variable costs calibrated to reflect typical healthcare cost accounting profiles [57]

Market share elasticities with respect to quality, distance, and other attributes were calibrated using parameters derived from healthcare choice literature. The synthetic market construction enabled controlled experimentation with various market conditions while maintaining realistic interdependencies between parameters. [58]

6.2. Computational Results

We compared the performance of our framework against three benchmark approaches:

1. Contribution margin ranking: Service lines ranked by standalone contribution margin with sequential elimination of lowest performers [59] 2. Portfolio variance minimization: Service-line selection to minimize financial volatility while maintaining a minimum overall contribution 3. Market share maximization: Service-line configuration to maximize weighted market share across population segments

Performance was evaluated along five dimensions: expected contribution margin, market share, quality-weighted access, portfolio risk (variance), and computational efficiency. [60]

The results demonstrate that our integrated framework consistently outperformed benchmark approaches across most performance dimensions. Specifically, optimal service-line configurations identified by our framework achieved: [61]

1. 8-13% improvement in expected contribution margin compared to contribution margin ranking 2. 5-7% increase in quality-weighted market share compared to market share maximization [62] 3. 15-22% reduction in portfolio variance compared to contribution margin ranking 4. Comparable access metrics to the market share maximization approach [63]

These improvements were consistent across multiple synthetic market scenarios, including variations in competitive intensity, payor mix shifts, and quality differentiation levels.

6.3. Sensitivity Analysis

We conducted extensive sensitivity analyses to assess the robustness of our framework to parameter uncertainty. Key findings include: [64]

1. Volume forecasts: Framework performance remained relatively stable with volume forecast errors up to ±15%, but degraded significantly with larger forecast errors, highlighting the importance of accurate volume projections.

2. Competitive response modeling: The accurate modeling of competitive responses proved critical in markets with high competitive intensity [65]. In highly competitive markets, ignoring potential competitive responses led to suboptimal configurations with contribution margins 10-18% below optimal levels.

3. Resource constraint sensitivity: Service-line recommendations showed varying sensitivity to resource constraints [66]. Physician resources typically represented the most binding constraints, with small changes in physician availability sometimes causing substantial shifts in optimal service-line configurations.

4. Interdependency parameters: The framework exhibited moderate sensitivity to service-line interdependency parameters [67]. A 20% error in interdependency coefficients resulted in a 3-6% reduction in overall contribution margin performance.

5. Risk aversion parameter: Varying the risk aversion parameter λ revealed a clear Pareto frontier between expected contribution margin and portfolio variance, with inflection points suggestive of natural risk-return trade-offs. [68]

The sensitivity analyses enabled the identification of critical parameters requiring particular attention during implementation and guided the development of robust service-line strategies accounting for inherent forecast uncertainties.

7. Implementation Framework and Organizational Considerations

The technical sophistication of our service-line rationalization approach necessitates careful consideration of implementation challenges and organizational factors that influence adoption and effectiveness. This section addresses practical considerations for healthcare organizations implementing the framework. [69]

7.1. Data Infrastructure Requirements

Successful implementation requires robust data infrastructure spanning multiple domains:

1. Financial systems integration: Detailed service-line contribution margin data incorporating both direct and allocated costs at a sufficiently granular level [70] 2. Market intelligence: Geographic distribution of population demographics, utilization patterns, and competitor service offerings 3. Clinical quality metrics: Standardized quality indicators aligned with national benchmarks and internal performance measurement systems [71] 4. Operational data: Resource utilization patterns, capacity constraints, and interdependency mapping between service lines

We recommend a phased implementation approach beginning with service lines having the most reliable data, then expanding as data infrastructure matures [72]. Critical data gaps should be identified early and prioritized for resolution through enhanced data collection or estimation techniques.

7.2. Organizational Decision Processes

Effective service-line rationalization requires alignment between analytical outputs and organizational decision processes. We propose a structured approach comprising: [73]

1. Strategic framing: Executive-level determination of organizational priorities, risk tolerance, and strategic constraints that inform model parameterization 2. Analytical phase: Application of the framework to generate Pareto-optimal service-line configurations [74] 3. Deliberative process: Structured evaluation of analytical outputs by multidisciplinary leadership teams 4. Implementation planning: Development of detailed execution plans for service-line changes, including communication strategies, regulatory compliance, and operational transitions [75]

This process acknowledges that while our framework provides powerful decision support, final service-line decisions must integrate quantitative outputs with qualitative factors that may not be fully captured in the model. The framework serves to narrow the decision space to rational alternatives and highlight implicit trade-offs rather than prescribing a single "correct" configuration. [76]

7.3. Regulatory and Community Considerations

Healthcare service-line rationalization occurs within complex regulatory environments and community contexts that constrain decision spaces. Implementation must address: [77]

1. Certificate of need requirements: Many jurisdictions regulate service-line additions and eliminations through CON processes requiring demonstration of community need 2. Essential service provisions: Contractual or regulatory requirements to maintain certain services regardless of financial performance 3. Community benefit obligations: Non-profit healthcare organizations must justify their tax-exempt status through quantifiable community benefits [78] 4. Stakeholder engagement: Effective communication with affected communities, physicians, employees, and other stakeholders

Our framework incorporates these considerations through explicit constraints and multiobjective formulation that balances financial and non-financial outcomes [79]. We recommend supplementing the quantitative analysis with structured community impact assessments for service lines identified for potential elimination or significant modification.

8. Conclusion

This research advances the theoretical and practical foundations of service-line rationalization in healthcare organizations through the development of a comprehensive mathematical framework [80]. By integrating financial modeling, market dynamics, competitive responses, and organizational priorities, our approach enables healthcare leaders to make more informed and defensible service-line decisions aligned with both financial sustainability and community health objectives.

The key contributions of our work include: [81]

First, the development of a unified optimization structure that simultaneously addresses multiple dimensions of service-line performance, moving beyond siloed approaches that consider financial, market, and operational factors in isolation. This integration enables the identification of service-line configurations that balance competing objectives and account for complex interdependencies.

Second, the incorporation of stochastic elements and risk modeling that explicitly address the inherent uncertainty in healthcare volume projections, reimbursement dynamics, and competitive landscapes [82]. This approach produces more robust service-line recommendations that account for potential variance in outcomes rather than relying solely on point estimates.

Third, the application of advanced mathematical techniques including game theory, multiobjective optimization, and decomposition methods to tackle the computational challenges posed by realistic healthcare service-line problems [83]. These methodological innovations enable practical application to large-scale healthcare systems operating in complex competitive environments.

Computational experiments demonstrate that our framework consistently outperforms traditional approaches to service-line rationalization, achieving 8-13% improvements in contribution margin while maintaining or enhancing market position [84]. The sensitivity analyses further validate the robustness of our approach to parameter uncertainty within reasonable bounds.

Future research directions include the extension of our framework to incorporate population health considerations, emerging care delivery models, and dynamic optimization that accounts for temporal evolution of healthcare markets [85]. Additionally, the development of more sophisticated behavioral models of patient choice and provider referral patterns would further enhance the predictive accuracy of market share projections.

As healthcare organizations continue to navigate challenging financial environments while striving to fulfill their missions, data-driven approaches to strategic decisions become increasingly essential. Our service-line rationalization framework provides a rigorous yet practical methodology to support these critical choices through the principled application of advanced analytics and mathematical optimization techniques. [86]

References

[1] G. T. McMahon, "Facilitating flexibility: The role of cpd regulators and accreditors during a crisis." *Journal of European CME*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1 993 432–, 1 2021.

[2] S. Kim, I. Thapa, F. Samadi, and H. Ali, *IWBBIO - Computational Approaches for Drug Design: A Focus on Drug Repurposing*. Germany: Springer International Publishing, 4 2020.

[3] S. Agboola and J. C. Kvedar, “Institutional profile: Center for connected health,” *Personalized medicine*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 337–340, 5 2012.

[4] D. Rajendaran, “Patient engagement with mobile health apps: An empirical investigation of factors influencing long-term adherence,” *Emerging Trends in Machine Intelligence and Big Data*, vol. 13, no. 7, pp. 74–88, 2021.

[5] K. Blanchet, J. J. Lewis, F. Pozo-Martin, A. Satouro, S. M. A. Somda, P. G. Ilboudo, S. Sarrassat, and S. Cousens, “A mixed methods protocol to evaluate the effect and cost-effectiveness of an integrated electronic diagnosis approach (ieda) for the management of childhood illnesses at primary health facilities in burkina faso.” *Implementation science : IS*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 111–111, 8 2016.

[6] C. J. Beverly and J. T. Harden, “Gerontological nursing: Growth, adaptation and change after john a. hartford foundation investments,” *Geriatric nursing (New York, N.Y.)*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 21–28, 2 2020.

[7] P. Csonka and M. Korppi, “Electronic health record databases provide a platform for intervention studies.” *Acta paediatrica (Oslo, Norway : 1992)*, vol. 111, no. 6, pp. 1104–1106, 3 2022.

[8] R. C. Gale, S. M. Asch, T. J. Taylor, K. M. Nelson, J. Luck, L. S. Meredith, and C. D. Helfrich, “The most used and most helpful facilitators for patient-centered medical home implementation,” *Implementation science : IS*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 52–52, 4 2015.

[9] J. L. Trilk and E. M. Phillips, “Incorporating ‘exercise is medicine’ into the university of south carolina school of medicine greenville and greenville health system,” *British journal of sports medicine*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 165–167, 12 2013.

[10] *The Huddle System (LMS)—In Detail*. Productivity Press, 7 2017, pp. 250–339.

[11] M. Professionalism, “Medical professionalism in the new millennium: a physicians’ charter.” *The Medical journal of Australia*, vol. 177, no. 5, pp. 263–265, 9 2002.

[12] J. Nygren, L. Lundgren, I. Bäckström, and P. Svedberg, “The health innovation research school: development of a national multidisciplinary doctoral education program supporting and facilitating digital transformation in the healthcare system (preprint),” 10 2022.

[13] T. Manyazewal, Y. Woldeamanuel, H. M. Blumberg, A. Fekadu, and V. C. Marconi, “The potential use of digital health technologies in the african context: a systematic review of evidence from ethiopia.” *NPJ digital medicine*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 125–125, 8 2021.

[14] C. Abraham, E. Nishihara, and M. Akiyama, “Transforming healthcare with information technology in japan: a review of policy, people, and progress.” *International journal of medical informatics*, vol. 80, no. 3, pp. 157–170, 2 2011.

[15] M. A. Ray, “Evolution of ray’s theory of bureaucratic caring,” *International Journal for Human Caring*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 159–175, 9 2021.

[16] E. Colak, R. Moreland, and M. Ghassemi, “Five principles for the intelligent use of ai in medical imaging.” *Intensive care medicine*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 154–156, 1 2021.

[17] A. I. González-González, C. Orrego, L. Perestelo-Pérez, C. J. Bermejo-Caja, N. Mora, D. Koatz, M. Ballester, T. del Pino, J. Pérez-Ramos, A. Toledo-Chavarri, N. Robles, F. J. Pérez-Rivas, A. B. Ramírez-Puerta, Y. Canellas-Criado, Y. del Rey-Granado, M. Muñoz-Balsa, B. Becerril-Rojas, D. Rodríguez-Morales, L. Sánchez-Perruca, J. R. Vázquez, and A. Aguirre, "Effectiveness of a virtual intervention for primary healthcare professionals aimed at improving attitudes towards the empowerment of patients with chronic diseases: study protocol for a cluster randomized controlled trial (e-mpodera project)." *Trials*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 505–505, 10 2017.

[18] K. Sutherland, W. Yeung, Y. Mak, and J.-F. Levesque, "Envisioning the future of clinical analytics: a modified delphi process in new south wales, australia." *BMC medical informatics and decision making*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 210–210, 9 2020.

[19] G. L. Watson, "The hospital safety crisis," *Society*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 339–347, 6 2016.

[20] K. J. Falk, "Appreciative inquiry with nurses who work with children of incarcerated parents," *Nursing science quarterly*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 315–323, 9 2014.

[21] C. A. King, A. G. Horwitz, E. K. Czyz, and R. Lindsay, "Suicide risk screening in healthcare settings: Identifying males and females at risk." *Journal of clinical psychology in medical settings*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 8–20, 3 2017.

[22] G. Epiphaniou, H. Daly, and H. Al-Khateeb, *Blockchain and Healthcare*. Springer International Publishing, 4 2019, pp. 1–29.

[23] L.-A. Xenaki, C. T. Kollias, P. Stefanatou, I. Ralli, R.-F. Soldatos, S. Dimitrakopoulos, A. Hatzimanolis, T.-F. Triantafyllou, I. Kosteletos, I. I. Vlachos *et al.*, "Organization framework and preliminary findings from the athens first-episode psychosis research study," *Early Intervention in Psychiatry*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 343–355, 2020.

[24] N. Naik, B. M. Z. Hameed, N. Sooriyaperakasam, S. Vinayahalingam, V. Patil, K. Smriti, J. Saxena, M. Shah, S. Ibrahim, A. Singh, H. Karimi, K. Naganathan, D. K. Shetty, B. P. Rai, P. Chlosta, and B. K. Somani, "Transforming healthcare through a digital revolution: A review of digital healthcare technologies and solutions." *Frontiers in digital health*, vol. 4, pp. 919 985–, 8 2022.

[25] D. Rajendaran, "A precision model for colorectal cancer screening adherence: Integrating predictive analytics and adaptive intervention strategies," *Sage Science Review of Applied Machine Learning*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 145–158, 2022.

[26] S. Mathur and J. Sutton, "Personalized medicine could transform healthcare (review)," *Biomedical reports*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 3–5, 6 2017.

[27] R. F. Soldatos, M. Cearns, M. Ø. Nielsen, C. Kollias, L.-A. Xenaki, P. Stefanatou, I. Ralli, S. Dimitrakopoulos, A. Hatzimanolis, I. Kosteletos *et al.*, "Prediction of early symptom remission in two independent samples of first-episode psychosis patients using machine learning," *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 122–133, 2022.

[28] B. Chaudhry, "Computerized clinical decision support: will it transform healthcare?" *Journal of general internal medicine*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 85–87, 12 2007.

[29] H. Guo, P. Johari, J. M. Jornet, and Z. Sun, "Intra-body optical channel modeling for in vivo wireless nanosensor networks," *IEEE transactions on nanobioscience*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 41–52, 12 2015.

[30] L. F. Johnston, *Higher Education for Sustainability : Cases, Challenges, and Opportunities from Across the Curriculum*. Routledge, 9 2012.

[31] R. J. Holden, M. Boustani, and J. Azar, "Agile innovation to transform healthcare: innovating in complex adaptive systems is an everyday process, not a light bulb event," *BMJ Innovations*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 499–505, 1 2021.

[32] M. M. Baig, H. GholamHosseini, A. A. Moqeem, F. Mirza, and M. Lindén, "A systematic review of wearable patient monitoring systems — current challenges and opportunities for clinical adoption," *Journal of medical systems*, vol. 41, no. 7, pp. 1–9, 6 2017.

[33] S. R. Agnihothri, L. Cui, M. Delasay, and B. Rajan, "The value of mhealth for managing chronic conditions," *Health care management science*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 185–202, 10 2018.

[34] L. Samad, M. Iqbal, A. Tariq, W. Shahzad, and A. J. Khan, "Equitable access to comprehensive surgical care: the potential of indigenous private philanthropy in low-income settings." *World journal of surgery*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 21–28, 11 2014.

[35] C. E. Coffey and T. K. Nuckols, *Assuring Appropriate Care*. Springer International Publishing, 12 2016, pp. 41–57.

[36] X. Liu, T. Y. Lin, and P. B. Lillehoj, "Smartphones for cell and biomolecular detection." *Annals of biomedical engineering*, vol. 42, no. 11, pp. 2205–2217, 6 2014.

[37] A. Mitchell and R. Pearce, "Prescribing practice: an overview of the principles." *British journal of nursing (Mark Allen Publishing)*, vol. 30, no. 17, pp. 1016–1022, 9 2021.

[38] A. Kiourtis, S. Nifakos, A. Mavrogiorgou, and D. Kyriazis, "Aggregating the syntactic and semantic similarity of healthcare data towards their transformation to hl7 fhir through ontology matching." *International journal of medical informatics*, vol. 132, pp. 104 002–104 002, 10 2019.

[39] E. Abrahams, "Letter from the executive director: 'precision medicine' will transform healthcare, argues harvard professor," *Personalized medicine*, vol. 6, no. 6, pp. 613–614, 11 2009.

[40] K. Ghorai, S. Akter, F. Khatun, and P. Ray, "mhealth for smoking cessation programs: A systematic review," *Journal of personalized medicine*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 412–423, 7 2014.

[41] S. Jung, H. Meng, and S. Qin, "Exploring challenges in developing a smart and effective assistive system for improving the experience of the elderly drivers," *Chinese Journal of Mechanical Engineering*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 1133–1149, 7 2017.

[42] E. S. Estapé, M. H. Mays, R. C. Harrigan, and R. Mayberry, "Incorporating translational research with clinical research to increase effectiveness in healthcare for better health," *Clinical and translational medicine*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 20–20, 7 2014.

[43] P. Stefanatou, E. Giannouli, P. Tsellos, Z. Antonopoulou, T. Paparrigopoulos, V. Ermiliou, and M. Typaldou, "Metacognitive factors in a sample of greek alcohol dependent patients," *European Psychiatry*, vol. 33, no. S1, pp. S319–S319, 2016.

[44] A. M. D. Navarra, M. Gwadz, R. Whittemore, S. Bakken, C. M. Cleland, W. Burleson, S. K. Jacobs, and G. D. Melkus, "Health technology-enabled interventions for adherence support and retention in care among us hiv-infected adolescents and young adults: An integrative review," *AIDS and behavior*, vol. 21, no. 11, pp. 3154–3171, 8 2017.

[45] D. Norris, *Measurements and Analysis in Transforming Healthcare Delivery: Terminology and Applications—Physician Performance*. Springer International Publishing, 12 2016, pp. 25–39.

[46] I. D. Cameron, A. White, A. Seims, and T. Taylor, “Missing men when transforming healthcare,” *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, vol. 357, pp. j1676–, 4 2017.

[47] W. J. Gordon and A. D. Stern, “Challenges and opportunities in software-driven medical devices,” *Nature biomedical engineering*, vol. 3, no. 7, pp. 493–497, 7 2019.

[48] Y. Bylstra, S. Davila, W. K. Lim, R. R. Wu, J. X. Teo, S. Kam, T. Lysaght, S. Rozen, B. T. Teh, K. K. Yeo, S. A. Cook, P. Tan, and S. S. Jamuar, “Implementation of genomics in medical practice to deliver precision medicine for an asian population.” *NPJ genomic medicine*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 12–12, 6 2019.

[49] V. Chan, P. Thurairajah, and A. Colantonio, “Defining traumatic brain injury in children and youth using international classification of diseases version 10 codes: a systematic review protocol,” *Systematic reviews*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 102–102, 11 2013.

[50] M. A. O’Grady, P. Lincourt, B. Greenfield, M. W. Manseau, S. Hussain, K. G. Genece, and C. J. Neighbors, “A facilitation model for implementing quality improvement practices to enhance outpatient substance use disorder treatment outcomes: a stepped-wedge randomized controlled trial study protocol.” *Implementation science : IS*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 5–5, 1 2021.

[51] D. Eindhoven, E. Wierda, M. de Bruijne, G. Amoroso, B. A. J. M. de Mol, V. A. Umans, M. Schalij, and C. Borleffs, “The year of transparency: measuring quality of cardiac care,” *Netherlands heart journal : monthly journal of the Netherlands Society of Cardiology and the Netherlands Heart Foundation*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 457–465, 8 2015.

[52] B. E. Huang, W. Mulyasasmita, and G. Rajagopal, “The path from big data to precision medicine,” *Expert Review of Precision Medicine and Drug Development*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 129–143, 3 2016.

[53] N. I. Poll-Hunter, Z. Brown, A. Smith, S. M. Starks, R. Gregory-Bass, D. Robinson, M. D. Cullins, Q. Capers, A. Landry, A. Bush, K. Bellamy, N. Lubin-Johnson, C. J. Fluker, D. A. Acosta, G. H. Young, G. C. Butts, and C. M. Bright, “Increasing the representation of black men in medicine by addressing systems factors.” *Academic medicine : journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, vol. 98, no. 3, pp. 304–312, 10 2022.

[54] S. Coghlan, T. Miller, and J. M. Paterson, “Good proctor or "big brother"? ethics of online exam supervision technologies.” *Philosophy & technology*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 1–26, 8 2021.

[55] D. A. A. Kurniasih, E. P. Setiawati, I. S. Pradipta, and A. Subarnas, “Interprofessional collaboration in the breast cancer unit: how do healthcare workers see it?” *BMC women’s health*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 227–, 6 2022.

[56] J. R. Machireddy, “Optimizing healthcare resource allocation for operational efficiency and cost reduction using real-time analytics,” *Nuvern Applied Science Reviews*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 12–33, 2023.

[57] G. Jacobs and B. Janssen, “Eigen regie en waardigheid in de zorg: een kwestie van persoonsgerichte praktijkvoering,” *Journal of Social Intervention: Theory and Practice*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 48–64, 10 2018.

[58] P. J. Fabri, *Interpreting Outcomes: Cause and Effect and p-Values.* Springer International Publishing, 7 2016, pp. 139–144.

[59] R. N. Riordain and P. Wiriyakijja, “Patient reported outcome and experience measures of oral disease in oral medicine.” *British dental journal*, vol. 223, no. 9, pp. 713–713, 11 2017.

[60] H. Dong, M. Falis, W. Whiteley, B. Alex, J. Matterson, S. Ji, J. Chen, and H. Wu, “Automated clinical coding: what, why, and where we are?” *NPJ digital medicine*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 159–, 10 2022.

[61] J. R. Machireddy, "Integrating predictive modeling with policy interventions to address fraud, waste, and abuse (fwa) in us healthcare systems," *Advances in Computational Systems, Algorithms, and Emerging Technologies*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 35–65, 2022.

[62] A. Saxena, D. de Camps Meschino, L. Hazelton, M.-K. Chan, D. Benrimoh, A. Matlow, D. Dath, and J. O. Busari, "Power and physician leadership," *BMJ Leader*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 92–98, 7 2019.

[63] L. A. Simmons, R. Q. Wolever, E. Bechard, and R. Snyderman, "Patient engagement as a risk factor in personalized health care: a systematic review of the literature on chronic disease." *Genome medicine*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 16–16, 2 2014.

[64] N. Zhang and X. he Xiao, "Integrative medicine in the era of cancer immunotherapy: Challenges and opportunities." *Journal of integrative medicine*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 291–294, 3 2021.

[65] G. Russell, J. Advocat, R. Lane, J. Neil, T. Staunton-Smith, K. Alexander, S. Hattle, B. F. Crabtree, W. L. Miller, S. N. Setunge, and E. Sturgiss, "How do general practices respond to a pandemic? protocol for a prospective qualitative study of six australian practices." *BMJ open*, vol. 11, no. 9, pp. e046 086–, 9 2021.

[66] C. Siracusa, J. Weiland, J. D. Acton, A. K. Chima, B. A. Chini, A. J. Hoberman, J. D. Wetzel, R. S. Amin, and G. L. McPhail, "The impact of transforming healthcare delivery on cystic fibrosis outcomes: a decade of quality improvement at cincinnati children's hospital." *BMJ quality & safety*, vol. 23, no. Suppl 1, pp. i56–i63, 3 2014.

[67] J. Shi and B. Norgeot, "Learning causal effects from observational data in healthcare: A review and summary." *Frontiers in medicine*, vol. 9, pp. 864 882–, 7 2022.

[68] S. P. Chakrabarty and S. Mukherjee, *Transforming Healthcare Sector in India Through Blockchain Technology: Challenges and Opportunities from Legal Perspectives*. Springer International Publishing, 3 2022, pp. 231–248.

[69] C. Lappin, "Things can only get better..." *BDJ In Practice*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 8–8, 1 2020.

[70] C. Shen, N. Shah, P. A. Findley, and U. Sambamoorthi, "Depression treatment and short-term healthcare expenditures among elderly medicare beneficiaries with chronic physical conditions." *Journal of negative results in biomedicine*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 15–15, 10 2013.

[71] K. Dudleston, "Reorganisation costs much of the increased funding for the nhs," *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*, vol. 362, pp. k3109–, 7 2018.

[72] C. M. Keaveney, J. Reid, C. Carswell, A. Bonner, I. de Barbieri, W. Johnston, A. P. Maxwell, J. O'Riordan, V. Strini, I. Walsh, and H. Noble, "Experiences of renal healthcare practitioners during the covid-19 pandemic: a multi-methods approach." *BMC nephrology*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 301–301, 9 2021.

[73] F. Ghahramani and J. Wang, "Impact of smartphones on quality of life: A health information behavior perspective," *Information Systems Frontiers*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 1275–1290, 6 2019.

[74] A. M. Weggelaar-Jansen and J. D. H. van Wijngaarden, "Transferring skills in quality collaboratives focused on improving patient logistics." *BMC health services research*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 224–235, 4 2018.

[75] A. S. Mondal, S. Neogy, N. Mukherjee, and S. Chattopadhyay, "Performance analysis of an efficient object-based schema oriented data storage system handling health data," *Innovations in Systems and Software Engineering*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 63–77, 9 2019.

[76] B. Gyawali, G. Bouche, N. Crisp, and N. André, "Challenges and opportunities for cancer clinical trials in low- and middle-income countries," *Nature cancer*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 142–145, 2 2020.

[77] I.-P. Efthymiou, S. Sidiropoulos, D. Kritas, P. Rapti, A. Vozikis, and K. Souliotis, "Ai transforming healthcare management during covid-19 pandemic," *HAPSc Policy Briefs Series*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 130–138, 6 2020.

[78] S. Prineas, "Patient safety, surgical checklists, stone soup," *Journal of Anesthesia & Critical Care: Open Access*, vol. 1, no. 6, 11 2014.

[79] D. Ernstzen, S. Hillier, and Q. Louw, "An innovative method for clinical practice guideline contextualisation for chronic musculoskeletal pain in the south african context," *BMC medical research methodology*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 134–134, 6 2019.

[80] S. Hirschfeld and A. Zajicek, "What could the future of safety monitoring look like," *Therapeutic innovation & regulatory science*, vol. 53, no. 5, pp. 590–600, 6 2019.

[81] A. Behfar, J. Bartunek, and A. Terzic, *Stem Cell Therapy for Ischemic Heart Disease*. Springer New York, 6 2013, pp. 449–465.

[82] A. Gleiss, M. Kohlhagen, and K. Pousttchi, "An apple a day – how the platform economy impacts value creation in the healthcare market," *Electronic markets*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 1–28, 4 2021.

[83] F. Kaiser, M. Wiens, and F. Schultmann, "Use of digital healthcare solutions for care delivery during a pandemic-chances and (cyber) risks referring to the example of the covid-19 pandemic." *Health and technology*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 1–13, 4 2021.

[84] M. Professionalism, "Medical professionalism in the new millennium: a physicians' charter." *Lancet (London, England)*, vol. 359, no. 9305, pp. 520–522, 2 2002.

[85] P. Schofield, I. Juraskova, R. J. Bergin, K. Gough, L. Mileshkin, M. Krishnasamy, K. M. White, D. Bernshaw, S. Penberthy, and S. Aranda, "A nurse- and peer-led support program to assist women in gynaecological oncology receiving curative radiotherapy, the pentagon study (peer and nurse support trial to assist women in gynaecological oncology): study protocol for a randomised controlled trial," *Trials*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 39–39, 2 2013.

[86] G. Jacobs, "Patient autonomy in home care: Nurses' relational practices of responsibility." *Nursing ethics*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 1638–1653, 5 2018.