



Leak or Lag

CASE STUDY · INSURANCE COLLECTIONS

A single-provider Florida practice · 1 June – 30 July 2026 · pulled 31 July and 2 September 2026

\$127

of new money in 34 days. The gap fell \$4,071 over the same period — the rest was the software changing its mind.

\$16,633	\$12,563	\$3,944	\$127	+6.2 pts
GAP AT FIRST PULL	GAP 34 DAYS LATER	OWED RESTATED DOWN	ACTUAL NEW MONEY	APPARENT RATE GAIN

We ran the same report twice. A practice asked us to look at two months of insurance collections. We pulled the standard Insurance Collections report on 31 July, the day after the window closed: insurers recorded as owing **\$47,720**, only **\$31,087** collected — a 65.1% rate and a 35% gap. That is the number most billing reviews put in front of a doctor, usually annualised into something alarming. **We didn't. We pulled the identical report again about five weeks later and set the two side by side.**

THE SAME REPORT, ABOUT FIVE WEEKS APART

Pull date	Owed	Collected	Gap	Rate
31 July 2026 — day after window closed	\$47,720.48	\$31,087.03	\$16,633.45	65.1%
2 September 2026 — 34 days later	\$43,776.80	\$31,214.05	\$12,562.75	71.3%
Change	-\$3,943.68	+\$127.02	-\$4,070.70	+6.2 pts

Same report. Same date range. About five weeks apart. **Only \$127 of the \$4,071 improvement was money arriving** — the other \$3,944 was the expected amount being revised downward as claims adjudicated.

WHAT THE SECOND PULL SHOWED

1 “Amount owed” is an estimate, not a contract

The insurance-responsibility field is an expectation the system rewrites as claims adjudicate. A collection rate measured on a fresh window is measuring **the software's guess**, not the payer's obligation.

2 Medicare proved it

Part B moved from **\$12,315.78 owed at 83.0% collected** to **\$10,097.78 owed at 102.2% collected**. A rate above 100% is impossible — the expected amount was restated below what had already been paid. The entire **\$2,098 “Medicare gap” was an artifact**.

3 42% of the “chronic” leak evaporated

Payers collecting under 50% fell from **\$3,015 to \$1,760** with no one lifting a phone. Had we acted on the first pull, most of that work would have chased money that was never missing.

4 The rate rose because the denominator fell

Six points of apparent improvement, of which **\$127 was cash**. Any practice benchmarking itself on a same-day pull is grading against a moving number.

The point is not that the first number was wrong. It is that a single pull cannot tell you which part of it is real — and acting on the whole of it spends the practice's scarcest resource chasing money that was never missing.

Belle Curve Insights · Big-Firm Analytics for Chiropractic Practices | sandra@bellecurveinsights.com · 239-469-4021 · bellecurveinsights.com

Real analysis from a live pilot engagement, published with the practice's written permission. No patient-level information appears. Figures are the practice's own unaudited system output. Per the source report's definitions the window covers charges initially billed in the range, primary policy only; secondary billings and payments are excluded, so true collection performance is somewhat better than shown.

WHAT DIDN'T MOVE AT ALL

Personal injury — identical in both pulls, to the cent. Across all nine auto carriers: **\$20,675.60** owed, **\$11,219.32** paid, **\$9,456.28** outstanding — the same figures in both pulls, about five weeks apart. Not one dollar moved.

WHERE THE REMAINING GAP ACTUALLY SITS

Segment	Share of units	Share of billed \$	Owed / unit	Share of gap
Auto / Personal injury	28.3%	47.2%	\$55.13	75.3%
Medicare & MA	31.1%	28.3%	\$30.06	2.5%
Commercial	39.0%	23.2%	\$19.64	22.2%

PI was not a side item here. It carried **28% of billed units but 47% of every insurance dollar billed** — two and a half times the value per unit of commercial work, from just over a quarter of the volume. After the second pull it accounted for **three quarters of the entire remaining gap**.

That is not a leak. **PI pays on settlement, not on a claims cycle.** A practice working it on the same 30/60/90 rhythm as commercial is applying the wrong instrument to its single largest exposure — and will read the resulting aging as a collections failure when it is nothing of the kind.

THE ONE REAL LEAK

A single commercial payer survived both pulls untouched: **17 units, \$1,025 in insurance responsibility, zero dollars collected**, unchanged after three months. Two others sat at 42% and 24% on small volume. **Under \$1,800 in total** — not a headline, but real, recoverable, and completely invisible underneath a \$16,633 number that was mostly noise.

1 The second pull is the control

It separates **money that is late** from **money that is gone**. Nothing else in a practice management system distinguishes the two, and no single snapshot can.

2 It costs nothing but patience

Same report, same date range, run again. The delta between the two does the analytical work that a bigger, scarier number only pretends to.

3 What survives is small enough to act on

And defensible enough to act on with confidence. Every practice has been shown an alarming figure by someone selling billing services. Most are **inflated by measurement, not mismanagement** — and doctors can feel that, which is why the pitch usually fails.

4 The finding that mattered wasn't a number

It was that this practice's **largest payer exposure runs on a different clock** than the rest of its book — and needs a different follow-up discipline. No collections report says that on its own.

Belle Curve Insights · Big-Firm Analytics for Chiropractic Practices | sandra@bellecurveinsights.com · 239-469-4021 · bellecurveinsights.com

Real analysis from a live pilot engagement, published with the practice's written permission. No patient-level information appears. Figures are the practice's own unaudited system output. Per the source report's definitions the window covers charges initially billed in the range, primary policy only; secondary billings and payments are excluded, so true collection performance is somewhat better than shown.