

Why Healthcare Public-Data Startups Win on the Adjudicated Entity Graph and Not the Thousand Scrapers: Ownership, Fraud, Rollup, and Distress Intelligence for Hospice, Behavioral Health & Post-Acute

JUN 26, 2026 • PAID



 **Podcast episode for paid subscriber only. Also available on Spotify.**



Thoughts on Healthcare Markets & Technology

 Why Healthcare Public-Data Startups Win on the Adjudicated Entity Graph & Not the Thousand Scrapers: Ownership, Fraud, Rollup, and Distress Intelligence for Hospice, Behavioral Health, and Post-Acute

The 'we aggregate a thousand public sources' pitch is dead. AI coding tools just made ingestion cheap. Here's what that means for every healthcare data startup building right now...

 Listen now

a day ago · Thoughts on Healthcare

To listen to paid episodes in Apple or Spotify, link your Substack subscription via the settings on those platforms (instructions inside the Substack app under Subscriptions →

Podcast).

Abstract

Cheap code generation has quietly nuked the part of healthcare data work that used to feel hard. Writing source-specific crawlers, reverse-engineering undocumented schemas, parsing ugly PDF tables, and babysitting connectors when a state website redesigns itself is now mostly a tooling problem, not a team problem. So the old “we aggregate a thousand public sources,” is no longer a moat. Anyone can aggregate a thousand sources by next Tuesday. What stays expensive, and therefore defensible, is the adjudicated temporal entity graph sitting underneath: durable internal IDs for people, organizations, facilities, enrollments, locations, legal entities, owners, and products, all stitched across NPIs, CCNs, TINs, CLIA numbers, and state licenses with valid-from and valid-to dates, source-document provenance, confidence scores, and a growing pile of human corrections. This essay walks through the dozen public data product ideas worth building (ownership graphs, fraud and integrity intel, site-of-care radar, distress prediction, ghost-network truth, site-of-care migration, trial-site feasibility, device early warning, regulatory catalysts, workforce capacity, post-acute counterparty scoring, and environmental demand), ranks them by buyer urgency versus legal blast radius, and argues for one specific opening move. Pick a single opaque, fragmented sector such as hospice, behavioral health, home health, or skilled nursing. Answer four narrow questions about ownership, affiliation, risk, and momentum. Sell the workflow, not the dashboard. Let one buyer’s revenue fund the graph that every later buyer rents.

Thoughts on Healthcare Markets &
Technology is a reader-supported
publication. To receive new posts and
support my work, consider becoming a
free or paid subscriber.

Table of Contents

One. The bet hiding inside “we aggregate a thousand public sources”

Two. What cheap code actually changes, and what it does not

Three. The ownership and control graph, or who really signs the checks

Four. Fraud and integrity, where willingness to pay meets the lawyers

Five. Rollup radar and distress prediction, calling transactions before the banks

Six. Ghost networks and the rest of the public-data menu

Seven. How a moat actually forms out of deeply boring infrastructure

Eight. A build that does not collapse under its own ambition

Nine. The narrow wedge, and the order in which to ship

One. The bet hiding inside “we aggregate a thousand public sources”

There is a whole category of healthcare analytics companies whose entire reason existing is that nobody can answer a simple-sounding question without doing two weeks of forensic accounting. Who actually owns this hospice. Is this nursing home about to fail. Has the guy applying for enrollment ever been attached to an exclusive provider under a slightly different name. None of these has a single dataset that tells you the answer, which is exactly why somebody will pay real money for the answer. The good opportunities all rhyme. The buyer is making a high-dollar deal wrapped in risk, revenue, an acquisition, a contract, or regulatory exposure. No public file closes the loop. The underlying entities are a nightmare to reconcile because the same real-world thing shows up as a dozen NPIs, three DBAs, two legal names, a management company, and a real-estate LLC that exists only to hold the building. And the useful output is a narrow operational answer, not yet another general-purpose healthcare data lake nobody asked for.

The trap, and it is a comfortable trap, is to believe the work is the aggregation. I like work. It produces impressive slide counts. CMS alone will keep a team busy quarter just normalizing what it already publishes, and the published hospital ownership file runs to roughly one hundred fifty thousand rows before anyone to a county clerk's office. But aggregation is the part that just got cheap, and cheap things do not protect margins. The defensible asset is what happens after the raw records land: the resolved identities, the longitudinal graph with dates on every the derived scores, and the accumulated record of every time a human looked at records and decided whether they were the same thing. That correction history is part a competitor cannot clone by pointing the same crawler at the same website



Continue reading this post for free, courtesy of Thoughts of
Healthcare.

Claim my free post

Or purchase a paid subscription.

← Previous

Next →