

**TRANSACTIONS OF SOCIETY OF ACTUARIES  
1967 REPORTS**

**I. GROUP WEEKLY INDEMNITY INSURANCE  
AND GROUP HOSPITAL AND SURGICAL  
EXPENSE INSURANCE**

**T**HIS is the twentieth annual report on the continuing study of the morbidity experience of Group Weekly Indemnity insurance and Group Employee and Dependent Hospital and Surgical Expense insurance.

In compiling these reports the Committee includes the available experience of employer-employee groups and excludes the experience of trusteeship and association cases insuring employees of the member employers and of union cases, whether or not insurance depends upon continued employment. Experience of insured groups outside the United States is excluded, except for experience of groups insured for Group Weekly Indemnity insurance in Canada, which is reported separately. The data for Group Weekly Indemnity insurance exclude the experience of plans written under State Cash Sickness laws.

The tables in this report show combined nonmaternity and maternity experience unless otherwise designated. Plans which contain maternity benefits other than those normally studied are designated as plans with "other" maternity benefits, and only the nonmaternity experience of these plans is shown. Exposures and actual claims are shown to the nearest thousand in this report.

Data in the report for Weekly Indemnity and Employee Hospital Expense insurance are based on the experience of groups in those industrial classifications which the contributing companies individually rate standard for premium purposes; tables covering these plans are headed "Nonrated Industries." Data for Surgical Expense insurance, Employee or Dependent, and for Dependent Hospital Expense insurance are based on the experience of groups regardless of industrial classifications; tables covering these plans are headed "All Industries." Detailed experience by industry classification, which is studied periodically, was last published in the *1965 Reports*.

The tables in this report show the experience either for all exposure size groups combined or, to minimize the effect that jumbo groups might have upon the ratio of actual to tabular claims, for all except the largest exposure size groups. To avoid shifts of groups from one size category to another solely because of changes in benefit schedules, a jumbo group has been redefined in this report as one which insures 1,000 or more employees.

This definition is reasonably consistent with those in previous reports which were based upon benefits exposed.

For the first time in this report, the tables by state have been expanded to present that portion of the hospital and surgical experience which has been identified by metropolitan area.

### *Ratios of Actual to Tabular Claims*

The results of the study are presented in the form of ratios of actual to tabular claims. The tabular factors, as described in the *1961* and *1962 Reports*, have been expanded where necessary to reflect more liberal benefits, additional plans, and separate maternity benefits.

Current unpublished data confirm earlier views regarding certain characteristics of the tabulars, namely, that the relationship between male and female tabulars is satisfactory for weekly indemnity and hospital, but the male surgical tabular is relatively low and the female surgical tabular is relatively high; that the hospital tabulars yield consistent results when the actual to tabular ratios are examined by the amounts of daily benefit provided; and that for a given surgical schedule there is a tendency for the ratios of actual to tabular claims to increase as the maximum benefit for that schedule increases.

The Committee wishes to point out that many factors affecting experience are not reflected by the tabulars. For example, the tabulars are not adjusted for variations in experience caused by the age distribution and the geographic location of employees. Also, the use of combined maternity and nonmaternity experience conceals the low ratio of actual to tabular for maternity benefits and the generally higher ratios of actual to tabular for nonmaternity benefits. These limitations, as well as other factors which may influence the results of an analysis according to a particular characteristic of the experience, would indicate that caution should be used when interpreting the data contained in these reports.

The Committee recognizes the desirability of revising the tabulars to reflect more current claim levels. It is now studying detailed group hospital and surgical claim data providing frequency of claims and charge and benefit payment information to provide a basis for developing new tabulars. In the meantime, it is hoped that continued reporting of experience on the present basis will provide a useful and stable source for reference.

### *Contributing Companies*

The Committee wishes to express its gratitude to the eleven United States and Canadian companies which generously contributed data in-

cluded in this report. The results are the composite experience of variations in company practice, in underlying administration and claim procedures, as well as variations in experience among groups. It should be recognized that many groups may have significantly different claim costs from those indicated in this report.

This report contains experience for the years 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966. The majority of the companies contribute exposures and claims based upon policy years ending in the calendar year designated; others have contributed using different periods. The central point of the exposure for each policy year is approximately January 1 of that year. The assumption was made that each company's contribution was distributed uniformly over the period of exposure, which may be improper because of a concentration of policy renewals in January and July.

The following companies contributed experience for the investigation covered in this report:

Aetna Life Insurance Company  
 Connecticut General Life Insurance Company  
 Continental Assurance Company  
 Equitable Life Assurance Society  
 John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company  
 Metropolitan Life Insurance Company  
 The Mutual Life Assurance Company of Canada  
 Occidental Life Insurance Company of California  
 Prudential Insurance Company of America  
 Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada  
 The Travelers Insurance Company

### *Analysis of Experience*

#### WEEKLY INDEMNITY

The basic results of the study of Weekly Indemnity insurance are presented in Table 1, which includes all size groups for the three latest years combined. Canadian experience is shown separately in this and in other Weekly Indemnity tables. The exposure unit is one dollar of weekly benefit.

Experience for the three latest policy years, excluding larger groups, is presented in Table 2. The basis for excluding larger groups has been changed this year from groups with \$40,000 or more of weekly indemnity exposed to groups with 1,000 or more employees. The experience of plans with six weeks' maternity benefits is shown on a combined basis and separately for nonmaternity and maternity components of a portion of this experience. The experience of plans with no maternity benefits is shown separately.

TABLE 1  
 GROUP WEEKLY INDEMNITY INSURANCE  
 WITH SIX WEEKS' MATERNITY BENEFIT  
 ALL SIZE GROUPS, NONRATED INDUSTRIES  
 COMBINED 1964-66 POLICY YEARS' EXPERIENCE, BY PLAN

Plan	No. Experience Units	Weekly Indemnity Exposed (000)	Actual Claims (000)	Ratio of Actual to 1947-49 Weekly Indemnity Tabular
United States Experience				
1-4-13 .....	1,469	7,698	5,060	94%
4-4-13 .....	354	1,727	826	74
1-8-13 .....	6,006	34,657	22,623	103
8-8-13 .....	819	8,107	5,165	98
Total, 13-week plans. . . . .	8,648	52,189	33,674	100%
1-4-26 .....	412	8,927	8,045	111%
4-4-26 .....	65	849	664	100
1-8-26 .....	2,523	35,405	28,327	108
8-8-26 .....	333	12,646	8,557	94
Total, 26-week plans. . . . .	3,333	57,827	45,593	106%
Total, all plans. . . . .	11,981	110,016	79,267	103%
Canadian Experience				
1-4-13 .....	213	1,161	864	113%
4-4-13 .....	41	263	204	109
1-8-13 .....	1,491	2,539	1,461	98
8-8-13 .....	66	253	147	102
Total, 13-week plans. . . . .	1,811	4,216	2,676	103%
1-4-26 .....	124	804	839	130%
4-4-26 .....	18	247	192	95
1-8-26 .....	338	2,770	2,617	131
8-8-26 .....	30	376	182	69
Total, 26-week plans. . . . .	510	4,197	3,830	123%
Total, all plans. . . . .	2,321	8,413	6,506	114%

TABLE 2  
 GROUP WEEKLY INDEMNITY INSURANCE  
 GROUPS WITH LESS THAN 1,000 EMPLOYEES EXPOSED, NONRATED INDUSTRIES  
 1964-66 POLICY YEARS' EXPERIENCE, BY PLAN  
 UNITED STATES EXPERIENCE

PLAN	NONMATERNITY AND MATERNITY COMBINED EXPERIENCE*				NONMATERNITY AND MATERNITY SEPARATE EXPERIENCE*						
	No. Experience Units	Weekly Indemnity Exposed (000)	Actual Claims (000)	Ratio of Actual to 1947-49 Weekly Indemnity Tabular	No. Experience Units	Weekly Indemnity Exposed (000)	Actual Claims		Ratio of Actual to 1947-49 Weekly Indemnity Tabular		
							Non- maternity (000)	Maternity (000)	Non- maternity	Maternity	Combined
Plans with 6 Weeks' Maternity Benefit											
13-week:											
4th-day sickness.....	1,805	7,353	4,360	89%	1,419	5,436	3,177	167	93%	65%	91%
8th-day sickness.....	6,683	28,127	17,177	96	4,447	18,571	10,815	834	103	58	98
Total.....	8,488	35,480	21,537	94%	5,866	24,007	13,992	1,001	101%	59%	96%
26-week:											
4th-day sickness.....	425	4,283	3,393	98%	315	3,040	2,434	71	103%	58%	101%
8th-day sickness.....	2,690	20,177	15,545	104	1,646	12,160	9,239	357	110	58	106
Total.....	3,115	24,460	18,938	103%	1,961	15,200	11,673	428	109%	58%	105%
Plans with No Maternity Benefits											
13-week:											
4th-day sickness.....					519	2,337	1,497		98%		
8th-day sickness.....					6,506	22,019	12,087		95		
Total.....					7,025	24,356	13,584		95%		
26-week:											
4th-day sickness.....					304	1,602	1,153		91%		
8th-day sickness.....					3,368	14,469	9,147		90		
Total.....					3,672	16,071	10,300		90%		

\* The separate experience exposure is less than the combined experience exposure because separate experience is not available for all groups.

TABLE 2—Continued

PLAN	NONMATERNITY AND MATERNITY COMBINED EXPERIENCE*				NONMATERNITY AND MATERNITY SEPARATE EXPERIENCE*						
	No. Experience Units	Weekly Indemnity Exposed (000)	Actual Claims (000)	Ratio of Actual to 1947-49 Weekly Indemnity Tabular	No. Experience Units	Weekly Indemnity Exposed (000)	Actual Claims		Ratio of Actual to 1947-49 Weekly Indemnity Tabular		
							Non- maternity (000)	Maternity (000)	Non- maternity	Maternity	Combined
Plans with 6 Weeks' Maternity Benefit											
13-week:											
4th-day sickness.....	246	839	578	103%	206	644	443	14†	111%	53%†	108%
8th-day sickness.....	1,550	2,551	1,450	97	1,330	1,941	1,013	48†	97	53†	93
Total.....	1,796	3,390	2,028	99%	1,536	2,585	1,456	62	101%	53%	97%
26-week:											
4th-day sickness.....	139	808	764	117%	107	507	503	11†	129%	63%†	126%
8th-day sickness.....	360	1,667	1,201	96	285	1,037	598	47†	83	86†	84
Total.....	499	2,475	1,965	103%	392	1,544	1,101	58	99%	80%	98%
Plans with No Maternity Benefits											
13-week:											
4th-day sickness.....					94	329	204		95%		
8th-day sickness.....					741	1,759	1,018		104		
Total.....					835	2,088	1,222		103%		
26-week:											
4th-day sickness.....					65	274	223		106%		
8th-day sickness.....					295	1,085	727		93		
Total.....					360	1,359	950		95%		

† Less than \$50,000 of actual claims.

TABLE 3  
 GROUP WEEKLY INDEMNITY EXPERIENCE  
 GROUPS WITH LESS THAN 1,000 EMPLOYEES EXPOSED  
 NONRATED INDUSTRIES  
 1962-66 POLICY YEARS' EXPERIENCE, BY PLAN  
 UNITED STATES

PLAN	RATIOS OF ACTUAL TO 1947-49 TABULAR FOR POLICY YEAR ENDING IN:				
	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966
Plans with 6 Weeks' Maternity Benefit					
<i>Nonmaternity and maternity combined experience:</i>					
13-week:					
4th-day sickness .....	91%	94%	90%	87%	89%
8th-day sickness .....	89	95	95	95	97
Total .....	90%	95%	94%	94%	95%
26-week:					
4th-day sickness .....	92%	99%	96%	96%	101%
8th-day sickness .....	98	97	103	105	106
Total .....	97%	98%	101%	103%	105%
<i>Nonmaternity and maternity separate experience:*</i>					
Nonmaternity:					
13-week:					
4th-day sickness .....		97%	92%	92%	94%
8th-day sickness .....		102	101	104	106
Total .....		101%	99%	101%	103%
26-week:					
4th-day sickness .....		102%	102%	105%	103%
8th-day sickness .....		104	107	111	112
Total .....		103%	106%	109%	110%
Maternity (all plans) .....		64%	65%	55%	55%
Combined:					
13-week:					
4th-day sickness .....		95%	91%	90%	92%
8th-day sickness .....		97	96	98	99
Total .....		97%	95%	96%	98%
26-week:					
4th-day sickness .....		100%	100%	103%	101%
8th-day sickness .....		101	105	107	109
Total .....		101%	104%	106%	107%
Plans with No Maternity Benefits					
13-week:					
4th-day sickness .....		92%	97%	98%	102%
8th-day sickness .....		95	94	96	96
Total .....		94%	94%	96%	96%
26-week:					
4th-day sickness .....		110%	90%	91%	93%
8th-day sickness .....		93	88	91	92
Total .....		95%	88%	91%	92%

\* The nonmaternity and maternity separate experience is also included in the nonmaternity and maternity combined experience.

TABLE 3—Continued—CANADA

PLAN	RATIOS OF ACTUAL TO 1947-49 TABULAR FOR POLICY YEAR ENDING IN:				
	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966
Plans with 6 Weeks' Maternity Benefit					
<i>Nonmaternity and maternity combined experience:</i>					
13-week:					
4th-day sickness .....		114%	102%	100%	109%
8th-day sickness .....		94	96	96	99
Total .....		99%	98%	97%	102%
26-week:					
4th-day sickness .....		123%	118%	107%	123%
8th-day sickness .....		95	100	93	96
Total .....		104%	105%	98%	106%
<i>Nonmaternity and maternity separate experience:*</i>					
Nonmaternity:					
13-week:					
4th-day sickness .....		112%	112%	104%	120%
8th-day sickness .....		95	94	99	99
Total .....		99%	98%	100%	104%
26-week:					
4th-day sickness .....		140%	114%	131%	135%
8th-day sickness .....		94	87	85	79
Total .....		106%	95%	98%	103%
Maternity (all plans)		69%†	67%†	63%†	59%†
Combined:					
13-week:					
4th-day sickness .....		110%	109%	101%	116%
8th-day sickness .....		92	91	95	95
Total .....		96%	95%	97%	100%
26-week:					
4th-day sickness .....		136%	112%	127%	132%
8th-day sickness .....		93	88	85	79
Total .....		104%	95%	97%	101%
Plans with No Maternity Benefits					
13-week:					
4th-day sickness .....		117%	108%	103%	75%
8th-day sickness .....		107	109	100	105
Total .....		110%	109%	100%	100%
26-week:					
4th-day sickness .....		109%	85%	138%	109%
8th-day sickness .....		103	102	85	91
Total .....		105%	98%	94%	94%

† Less than \$50,000 of actual claims.



Ratios of actual to tabular claims are summarized in Table 3 for each of the five latest policy years with respect to United States experience and for four years with respect to Canadian experience. The same groups and plans are included in this table and in Table 2 for the three latest policy years.

Although the ratios of actual to tabular claims for all size groups in Table 1 appear to be higher for Canadian than for United States experience, a more mixed relationship is observed in Tables 2 and 3, where large groups have been excluded. A continued improvement in maternity experience is observed for Canada. However, there may be a modest upward trend in combined nonmaternity and maternity experience for the past two years in both the United States and Canada.

TABLE 4  
EMPLOYEE AND DEPENDENT GROUP HOSPITAL EXPENSE INSURANCE  
ALL SIZE GROUPS, EMPLOYEE-RATED INDUSTRIES EXCLUDED  
COMBINED 1964-66 POLICY YEARS' EXPERIENCE, BY PLAN

Plan	No. Experience Units	Daily Benefit Exposed (000)	Actual Claims (000)	Ratio of Actual to 1957 Hospital Tabular
<i>Employee:</i>				
With maternity benefits:*				
10X:				
31-day .....	1,577	3,902	7,878	122%
70-day .....	419	936	1,902	123
120-day .....	29	72	132	116
Total .....	2,025	4,910	9,912	122%
15X:				
31-day .....	665	1,597	3,418	125%
70-day .....	366	864	1,774	124
120-day .....	57	317	488	99
Total .....	1,088	2,778	5,680	122%
20X:				
31-day .....	1,882	4,053	8,658	124%
70-day .....	2,366	4,594	10,337	128
120-day .....	339	851	1,856	129
Total .....	4,587	9,498	20,851	127%
20X + 75% of excess:				
31-day .....	491	839	2,104	136%
70-day .....	787	1,610	4,283	143
120-day .....	122	292	724	138
Total .....	1,400	2,741	7,111	140%

\* 10X or 14+\*X. Plans with "other" maternity benefits are excluded.

TABLE 4—Continued

Plan	No. Ex- perience Units	Daily Benefit Exposed (000)	Actual Claims (000)	Ratio of Actual to 1957 Hospi- tal Tabular
<i>Dependent:</i>				
With maternity benefits:†				
10×:				
31-day .....	1,447	2,298	9,168	119%
70-day .....	304	498	1,921	116
120-day .....	34	73	242	103
Total .....	1,785	2,869	11,331	118%
15×:				
31-day .....	736	1,191	5,210	126%
70-day .....	381	575	2,611	133
120-day .....	69	205	920	133
Total .....	1,186	1,971	8,741	129%
20×:				
31-day .....	2,500	3,227	14,513	130%
70-day .....	3,405	3,971	18,501	135
120-day .....	553	887	4,194	138
Total .....	6,458	8,085	37,208	133%
20×+75% of excess:				
31-day .....	592	736	3,852	140%
70-day .....	1,179	1,656	8,671	142
120-day .....	195	282	1,519	152
Total .....	1,966	2,674	14,042	142%
With no maternity benefits:				
10×:				
31-day .....	154	200	690	134%
70-day .....	36	81	278	133
Total .....	190	281	968	134%

† 10×, subject to a nine-month waiting period. Plans with "other" maternity benefits are excluded.

The Committee wishes to point out that the 1947-49 Weekly Indemnity Tabular is based upon rather old continuation data and may, therefore, be unsuitable for purposes other than the measurement of trends based on the plans studied by the Committee.

#### HOSPITAL

The basic results of the study of Hospital Expense insurance are presented in Table 4 for plans grouped according to nonmaternity room-and-board duration and ancillary benefits. The experience shown is for all size groups for the three latest policy years.

Experience for the three latest policy years presented in Table 5 is for groups with less than 1,000 employees instead of for groups with less than \$10,000 of daily benefits exposed, as in previous reports. Experience of plans with maternity benefits is shown on a combined basis and separately for the nonmaternity and maternity components of a portion of this ex-

TABLE 5  
EMPLOYEE AND DEPENDENT HOSPITAL EXPENSE INSURANCE  
GROUPS WITH LESS THAN 1,000 EMPLOYEES EXPOSED, NONRATED INDUSTRIES  
1964-66 POLICY YEARS' EXPERIENCE, BY PLAN

PLAN	NONMATERNITY AND MATERNITY COMBINED EXPERIENCE*				NONMATERNITY AND MATERNITY SEPARATE EXPERIENCE*						
	No. Experience Units	Daily Benefit Exposed (000)	Actual Claims (000)	Ratio of Actual to 1957 Hospital Tabular	No. Experience Units	Daily Benefit Exposed (000)	Actual Claims		Ratio of Actual to 1957 Hospital Tabular		
							Non-maternity (000)	Ma-ternity (000)	Non-maternity	Ma-ternity	Com-bined
Employee Plans with 10× and 14+n× Maternity Benefits											
10×:											
31-day	1,534	2,774	5,283	116%	871	1,418	2,446	143	118%	59%	112%
70-day	409	744	1,420	118	127	264	431	27†	113	76†	110
120-day	29	72	132	116	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Total	1,972	3,590	6,835	116%	1,003	1,700	2,902	172	117%	62%	112%
15×:											
31-day	650	1,149	2,312	119%	477	801	1,469	52	119%	53%	114%
70-day	360	747	1,531	124	172	352	670	36†	125	107	124
120-day	53	156	279	113	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Total	1,063	2,052	4,122	120%	657	1,165	2,164	89	121%	67%	117%
20×:											
31-day	1,853	3,254	6,834	122%	1,478	2,567	5,087	228	126%	66%	121%
70-day	2,343	3,871	8,722	129	1,605	2,557	5,497	259	135	77	131
120-day	333	641	1,324	123	182	308	598	25†	125	62†	120
Total	4,529	7,766	16,880	126%	3,265	5,432	11,182	512	130%	71%	126%
20× + 75% of excess:											
31-day	490	787	2,012	137%	395	633	1,534	60	141%	66%	135%
70-day	776	1,373	3,513	137	510	942	2,379	93	147	75	142
120-day	121	270	665	138	76	192	465	16†	144	88†	141
Total	1,387	2,430	6,190	137%	981	1,767	4,378	169	144%	72%	139%
Employee Plans with "Other" Maternity Benefits‡											
Total					589	1,089	2,174		130%		

\* The separate experience exposure is less than the combined experience exposure because separate experience is not available for all groups.

† Less than \$50,000 of actual claims.

‡ Less than \$50,000 of actual claims and less than ten experience units.

§ Nonmaternity experience only submitted for these plans.

GROUP WEEKLY INDEMNITY AND HOSPITAL AND SURGICAL 151

TABLE 5—Continued

PLAN	NONMATERNITY AND MATERNITY COMBINED EXPERIENCE*				NONMATERNITY AND MATERNITY SEPARATE EXPERIENCE*						
	No. Experience Units	Daily Benefit Exposed (000)	Actual Claims (000)	Ratio of Actual to 1957 Hospital Tabular	No. Experience Units	Daily Benefit Exposed (000)	Actual Claims		Ratio of Actual to 1957 Hospital Tabular		
							Non-maternity (000)	Maternity (000)	Non-maternity	Maternity	Combined
Dependent Plans with 10X Maternity Benefits											
10X:											
31-day	1,411	1,740	6,856	118%	932	980	3,298	595	133%	75%	119%
70-day	299	432	1,660	117	160	277	900	159	130	72	116
120-day	34	73	242	103	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Total	1,744	2,245	8,758	117%	1,098	1,269	4,236	761	132%	74%	118%
15X:											
31-day	715	815	3,616	127%	521	583	2,178	387	140%	82%	126%
70-day	379	535	2,460	134	238	323	1,244	229	148	89	134
120-day	68	176	796	135	12	38†	126	20†	132	67†	116
Total	1,162	1,526	6,872	130%	771	944	3,548	636	142%	84%	128%
20X:											
31-day	2,475	2,871	12,928	130%	1,863	2,195	8,431	1,469	145%	83%	131%
70-day	3,379	3,449	16,051	135	2,317	2,355	9,352	1,587	150	85	135
120-day	545	660	3,107	138	304	315	1,257	220	156	89	140
Total	6,399	6,980	32,086	133%	4,484	4,865	19,040	3,276	148%	84%	133%
20X + 75% of excess:											
31-day	589	660	3,443	139%	448	495	2,264	322	156%	80%	139%
70-day	1,163	1,334	7,034	143	626	785	3,513	586	157	93	143
120-day	195	282	1,519	152	101	170	851	126	177	92	158
Total	1,947	2,276	11,996	143%	1,175	1,450	6,628	1,034	159%	88%	144%
Dependent Plans with "Other" Maternity Benefits‡											
Total					857	954	3,425		140%		
Dependent Plans with No Maternity Benefit											
Total					184	214	765		140%		

\* The separate experience exposure is less than the combined experience exposure because separate experience is not available for all groups.

† Less than \$50,000 of actual claims.

‡ Less than \$50,000 of actual claims and less than ten experience units.

§ Nonmaternity experience only submitted for these plans.

perience. For the employee coverage, the combined experience is a mixture of 10X and 14 + nX maternity, while the separate experience is essentially all 10X maternity. The nonmaternity experience of plans with no maternity or "other" maternity benefits is shown separately. The maternity portion of the 1957 Hospital Tabular has not been adjusted to

TABLE 6

EMPLOYEE AND DEPENDENT GROUP HOSPITAL EXPENSE EXPERIENCE  
 GROUPS WITH LESS THAN 1,000 EMPLOYEES EXPOSED  
 EMPLOYEE-RATED INDUSTRIES EXCLUDED  
 1962-66 POLICY YEARS' EXPERIENCE, BY PLAN

PLAN	RATIOS OF ACTUAL CLAIMS TO 1957 HOSPITAL TABULAR FOR POLICY YEAR ENDING IN:				
	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966
	Employee				
<i>Plans with 10X and 14+nX mater- nity benefits:</i>					
Nonmaternity and maternity com- bined experience:					
10X .....	107%	110%	116%	116%	116%
15X .....	110	117	119	119	122
20X .....	115	118	125	125	128
20X +75% of excess .....	123	128	131	141	142
Nonmaternity and maternity sepa- rate experience:*					
Nonmaternity:					
10X .....		114	116	120	116
15X .....		119	121	122	118
20X .....		119	130	129	133
20X +75% or excess .....		129	137	149	149
Maternity (all plans) .....		78	75	68	63
Combined:					
10X .....		110	112	114	109
15X .....		116	118	118	114
20X .....		117	126	124	128
20X +75% of excess .....		125	133	144	143
<i>Plans with "other" maternity benefits:</i>					
Nonmaternity .....		113	127	125	141
	Dependent				
<i>Plans with 10X maternity benefits:</i>					
Nonmaternity and maternity com- bined experience:					
10X .....	109%	111%	117%	118%	115%
15X .....	122	121	133	128	129
20X .....	127	129	133	133	133
20X +75% of excess .....	129	135	141	143	145
Nonmaternity and maternity sepa- rate experience:*					
Nonmaternity:					
10X .....		119	132	132	133
15X .....		133	142	141	144
20X .....		136	146	148	151
20X +75% of excess .....		148	153	165	161
Maternity (all plans) .....		94	89	83	76
Combined:					
10X .....		111	118	119	117
15X .....		123	131	127	126
20X .....		127	133	134	133
20X +75% of excess .....		137	140	147	144
<i>Plans with "other" maternity benefits:</i>					
Nonmaternity .....		126	137	132	149
<i>Plans with no maternity benefits:</i>					
10X .....	125	125	135	161	125

\* The nonmaternity and maternity separate experience is also included in the nonmaternity and maternity combined experience.

reflect the declining birth rate, and the maternity tabulars are too high when compared with the 1966 policy year maternity experience. This is confirmed by declines since last year's report in the ratios of actual to tabular claims for separate maternity experience.

Ratios of actual to tabular claims for each of the five latest years (for the same groups and plans included in Table 5) are summarized in Table 6. In view of the irregularities in the ratios of actual to tabular claims by years of experience, there may be an indication that the trend of annual increases has slackened. Because of the age of the data and the substantial increases in claim costs which have occurred in the past, caution should be used when projecting the data contained in these reports to estimate current or future claim costs.

The ratios in Table 6 also indicate that the use of the 1957 Hospital Tabular results in a higher ratio of actual to tabular claims as the size of the ancillary benefit increases. The 1957 Hospital Tabular is based upon an annual frequency of claim which does not vary by plan and an average ancillary benefit which does vary by plan. This average benefit is based upon an actual distribution of ancillary benefit charges. No direct evidence is available to indicate whether the variations in actual to tabular by ancillary benefit are the results of inflation, the average ancillary benefit assumed by the tabular, an increased frequency of claim under plans with larger ancillary benefits, or other factors.

Table 7 shows the results of an analysis by metropolitan area and state of employee plus dependent experience for all plans included in Table 4 for the three latest policy years combined. The experience is presented for all exposure size groups combined and for groups with less than 1,000 employees. For a substantial portion of the experience contributed, it was not possible to determine whether or not 75 per cent of the employees resided in a given metropolitan area. These groups, as well as those where 75 per cent of the employees resided within a state but without a metropolitan area, make up the state experience. Where it was not possible to assign a group to a particular state, it was assigned to a region if 75 per cent or more of the insured employees were in that region. A few metropolitan areas extended into more than one state. In these instances all the experience has been included in the total experience for the principal state, as has been done in studies of other benefits prepared by this Committee. Sufficient detail is provided so that the reader may adjust state totals to exclude only that portion of the metropolitan area not within that state, which would be consistent with previous hospital and surgical experience by state.

When interpreting the variations in experience by area, it should be

TABLE 7  
 EMPLOYEE AND DEPENDENT GROUP HOSPITAL EXPENSE INSURANCE  
 EMPLOYEE-RATED INDUSTRIES EXCLUDED  
 COMBINED 1964-66 POLICY YEARS' EXPERIENCE  
 BY REGION, STATE, AND METROPOLITAN AREA

REGION,* STATE,† OR METROPOLITAN AREA	GROUPS WITH LESS THAN 1,000 EMPLOYEES EXPOSED				ALL SIZE GROUPS, RATIO A/T‡
	No. Ex- perience Units	Daily Benefit Exposed (000)	Actual Claims (000)	Ratio A/T‡	
<i>Total, all locations</i> .....	20,387	29,079	94,504	129%	130%
New England States:					
Connecticut.....	185	226	674	122%	131%
Bridgeport-Stamford- Norwalk.....	48	64	159	99	99
Hartford-New Britain- Bristol.....	127	227	763	136	124
New Haven-Waterbury.....	49	55	130	99	99
Total.....	409	572	1,726	123%	124%
Maine.....	128	235	736	125%	125%
Massachusetts.....	327	603	1,616	119%	122%
Boston-Lowell-Lawrence.....	229	348	982	120	120
Springfield-Holyoke.....	88	124	380	134	134
Total.....	664	1,075	2,978	121%	123%
New Hampshire.....	150	378	849	103%	103%
Rhode Island.....	16	12	23§	84%§	84%§
Providence.....					
Total.....	19	24	39§	75%§	75%§
Vermont.....	170	261	698	120%	115%
Region.....	173	290	734	119%	125%
<i>Region total</i> .....	1,693	2,835	7,760	119%	121%
Middle Atlantic States:					
Delaware.....	13	15	43§	117%§	117%§
District of Columbia.....	53	85	247	119%	119%
D.C. (Md.).....					
D.C. (Va.).....	12	6	21§	139§	139§
Total.....	69	95	281	122%	122%

\* Groups not coded for a specific state or metropolitan area.  
 † Groups coded for a specific state but not for a specific metropolitan area.  
 ‡ Ratio of Actual to 1957 Hospital Tabular. Note that these ratios are not expressed as a percentage of the national average. For the distribution of experience in this table, the national average is shown in "Total, all locations."  
 § Less than \$50,000 of actual claims.  
 ¶ Less than \$50,000 of actual claims and less than ten experience units.

TABLE 7—Continued

REGION,* STATE, † OR METROPOLITAN AREA	GROUPS WITH LESS THAN 1,000 EMPLOYEES EXPOSED				ALL SIZE GROUPS, RATIO A/T ‡
	No. Ex- perience Units	Daily Benefit Exposed (000)	Actual Claims (000)	Ratio A/T ‡	
New Jersey.....	237	280	764	116%	113%
New York.....	955	1,268	3,221	110%	110%
Albany-Schenectady-Troy.....	10	6	21§	139§	139§
Buffalo.....	70	70	203	123	123
New York-Northeastern New Jersey (N.Y.).....	289	367	969	112	110
New York-Northeastern New Jersey (N.J.).....	224	236	570	94	109
Rochester.....					
Syracuse.....	22	28	65	105	105
Total.....	1,579	1,991	5,074	109%	110%
Pennsylvania.....	1,583	2,172	6,456	122%	120%
Allentown-Bethlehem- Easton (Pa.).....	11	11	31§	129§	129§
Allentown-Bethlehem- Easton (N.J.).....					
Philadelphia (Pa.).....	170	342	954	119	115
Philadelphia (N.J.).....	16	13	39§	104§	104§
Pittsburgh.....	73	39	148	138	148
Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton.....	24	55	142	101	101
Total.....	1,878	2,632	7,771	121%	121%
Region.....	86	128	362	116%	116%
<i>Region total</i> .....	<i>3,862</i>	<i>5,141</i>	<i>14,295</i>	<i>116%</i>	<i>116%</i>
North Central States:					
Illinois.....	1,158	1,522	5,338	135%	135%
Chicago (Ill.).....	435	694	2,367	135	134
Chicago (Ind.).....	18	17	54	112	112
Total.....	1,611	2,233	7,759	135%	134%
Indiana.....	813	1,361	4,068	120%	119%
Indianapolis.....	66	133	369	111	111
Total.....	879	1,494	4,437	119%	119%
Kentucky.....	147	192	612	125%	133%
Louisville (Ky.).....	16	10	27§	107§	107§
Louisville (Ind.).....					
Total.....	163	202	639	124%	132%
Michigan.....	945	1,640	5,340	135%	135%
Detroit.....	161	206	683	135	133
Total.....	1,106	1,846	6,023	135%	135%



TABLE 7—Continued††

REGION,* STATE, † OR METROPOLITAN AREA	GROUPS WITH LESS THAN 1,000 EMPLOYEES EXPOSED				ALL SIZE GROUPS, RATIO A/T ‡
	No. Ex- perience Units	Daily Benefit Exposed (000)	Actual Claims (000)	Ratio A/T ‡	
Ohio.....	962	1,674	5,613	135%	137%
Akron.....	26	13	43§	125§	125§
Cincinnati (Ohio).....	55	42	150	132	132
Cincinnati (Ky.).....					
Cleveland.....	28	24	96	153	153
Columbus.....	57	76	197	109	109
Dayton.....					
Toledo.....	41	32	101	129	129
Youngstown (Ohio).....	27	58	260	182	182
Youngstown (Pa.).....	13	18	65	132	132
Total.....	1,218	1,945	6,546	136%	137%
West Virginia.....	261	260	1,059	143%	143%
Wheeling-Steubenville (W. Va.).....					
Wheeling-Steubenville (Ohio).....					
Total.....	265	264	1,093	146%	146%
Wisconsin.....	401	753	2,955	151%	151%
Milwaukee.....	79	185	635	139	139
Total.....	480	938	3,590	149%	149%
Region.....	362	597	1,908	130%	129%
<i>Region total</i> .....	<i>6,084</i>	<i>9,519</i>	<i>31,995</i>	<i>134%</i>	<i>134%</i>
Plains States:					
Iowa.....	343	357	1,263	125%	122%
Kansas.....	260	294	1,065	139%	151%
Minnesota.....	165	161	636	148%	148%
Minneapolis-St. Paul.....	71	69	294	148	148
Total.....	236	230	930	148%	148%
Missouri.....	371	321	1,167	130%	132%
Kansas City (Mo.).....	60	43	155	133	133
Kansas City (Kan.).....	24	39	114	118	118
St. Louis (Mo.).....	66	62	231	138	138
St. Louis (Ill.).....					
Total.....	522	466	1,674	130%	132%
Nebraska.....	184	217	683	120%	120%
Omaha.....	54	66	280	169	169
Total.....	238	283	963	131%	131%
North Dakota.....	41	32	100	125%	125%
South Dakota.....	49	48	209	155%	155%
Region.....	63	138	419	119%	119%
<i>Region total</i> .....	<i>1,752</i>	<i>1,848</i>	<i>6,623</i>	<i>133%</i>	<i>135%</i>

†† See notes to Table 7 on p. 154.

TABLE 7—Continued

REGION, * STATE, † OR METROPOLITAN AREA	GROUPS WITH LESS THAN 1,000 EMPLOYEES EXPOSED				ALL SIZE GROUPS, RATIO A/T‡
	No. Ex- perience Units	Daily Benefit Exposed (000)	Actual Claims (000)	Ratio A/T‡	
Mountain States:					
Colorado.....	60	65	247	148%	154%
Denver.....	17	17	68	147	147
Total.....	77	82	315	148%	153%
Idaho.....	20	18	55	119%	119%
Montana.....	15	69	196	105%	105%
Nevada.....	12	16	94	199%	149%
Utah.....	59	98	257	116%	131%
Wyoming.....					
Region.....	18	61	162	99%	107%
Region total.....	206	346	1,092	124%	134%
Pacific States:					
California.....	91	162	499	123%	123%
Los Angeles—Long Beach.....	61	107	261	113	121
San Diego.....					
San Francisco—Oakland.....	14	18	55	117	117
Total#.....	171	291	834	120%	122%
Oregon.....	13	13	47	117%§	117%§
Portland.....					
Total.....	17	15	52	117%	117%
Washington.....	20	20	61	109%	109%
Seattle.....	5	46	97	96	96
Total.....	25	66	158	101%	101%
Region.....	3	12	56	141%	141%
Region total.....	216	384	1,100	117%	119%
Gulf States:					
Arizona.....	73	98	398	157%	157%
Arkansas.....	217	258	945	127%	127%
Louisiana.....	405	324	1,463	165%	167%
New Orleans.....	38	16	54	127	127
Total.....	443	340	1,517	164%	165%
New Mexico.....	62	70	276	144%	144%
Oklahoma.....	233	179	711	137%	138%
Texas.....	683	621	2,693	157%	162%
Dallas.....	38	33	132	143	143
Fort Worth.....	21	12	62	167	167

\* The California experience above excludes plans integrated with UCD benefits. The corresponding California experience including plans integrated with UCD is as follows: 297 units, 547 exposed, 1,311 claims, 134 per cent A/T, and 135 per cent A/T.

TABLE 7—Continued††

REGION,* STATE,† OR METROPOLITAN AREA	GROUPS WITH LESS THAN 1,000 EMPLOYEES EXPOSED				ALL SIZE GROUPS, RATIO A/T‡
	No. Experience Units	Daily Benefit Exposed (000)	Actual Claims (000)	Ratio A/T‡	
Houston.....	71	52	229	174%	197%
San Antonio.....	35	109	323	118	118
Total.....	848	827	3,439	153%	160%
Region.....	49	42	188	163%	163%
<i>Region total</i> .....	<i>1,925</i>	<i>1,814</i>	<i>7,474</i>	<i>149%</i>	<i>154%</i>
Southeastern States:					
Alabama.....	148	158	648	156%	156%
Birmingham.....	12	10	34§	125§	125§
Total.....	160	168	682	154%	154%
Florida.....	338	485	1,796	137%	144%
Miami.....	56	62	240	162	162
Tampa-St. Petersburg.....	22	28	87	126	126
Total.....	416	575	2,123	139%	145%
Georgia.....	438	409	1,522	141%	133%
Atlanta.....	121	134	395	122	117
Total.....	559	543	1,917	136%	129%
Maryland.....	183	226	657	111%	111%
Baltimore.....	67	89	267	124	124
Total.....	250	315	924	115%	115%
Mississippi.....	135	111	462	147%	147%
North Carolina.....	678	695	2,228	118%	119%
South Carolina.....	157	237	924	145%	145%
Tennessee.....	275	245	876	133%	133%
Knoxville.....					
Memphis.....	33	56	199	140	140
Total.....	317	312	1,117	136%	136%
Virginia.....	554	603	1,994	126%	124%
Norfolk-Portsmouth.....	69	90	299	135	135
Total.....	623	693	2,293	127%	125%
Region.....	229	484	1,478	124%	120%
<i>Region total</i> .....	<i>3,524</i>	<i>4,133</i>	<i>14,148</i>	<i>131%</i>	<i>129%</i>
Hawaii.....					
Alaska.....					
<i>Total, states and regions</i> .....	<i>19,270</i>	<i>26,031</i>	<i>84,542</i>	<i>129%</i>	<i>130%</i>
<i>All other**</i> .....	<i>1,117</i>	<i>3,048</i>	<i>9,962</i>	<i>130%</i>	<i>132%</i>

\*\* Less than 75 per cent of employees in one region, state, or metropolitan area.

†† See notes to Table 7 on p. 154.

borne in mind that the hospital tabulars do not include an adjustment for the expected variation in costs by area. On the other hand, the tabulars do recognize that for any given dollar maximum ancillary benefit the average benefit payable will increase as the dollar amount of daily benefit increases. For the 1957 Hospital Tabular to produce reasonably accurate ancillary claim costs, it is necessary that the amount of daily benefit provided be reasonably related to the level of hospital room-and-board charges. The area variations in experience shown in Table 7 may be due to variations in the relationship of ancillary charges to room-and-board charges in an area, variations in frequency or average duration of hospital confinement, or a combination of these factors. However, since the daily room-and-board benefit provided is limited to a dollar amount and the ancillary benefits provided have aggregate dollar maximums, it is possible that a substantial part of the variations in experience for area shown in Table 7 is due to the frequency of hospital confinement.

The volume of hospital experience shown for California is relatively small and may be atypical because of the exclusion of Employee Hospital plans which are integrated with California UCD Hospital benefits. The experience of these plans is included in a footnote to Table 7. To reflect the UCD Hospital benefit of \$12 for the first 20 days of confinement, the 1957 Hospital Tabulars were reduced by \$8.28 per male employee and by \$9.24 per female employee.

The results of the area analysis can be presented only as a composite experience of groups having various industry classifications, distributions of exposure by age, and different types of claim administration. Moreover, it should be understood that the experience of any particular area is affected by various social and economic factors and that variations in experience may be chance fluctuations resulting from an insufficient volume of experience. The analysis indicates the highest claim level in the Gulf States and the lowest claim level in the Middle Atlantic, Pacific, and New England states. The experience of some states within a given region varies considerably from the region average. There are also marked variations within a given state.

#### SURGICAL

The basic results of the study of Surgical Expense insurance are presented in Table 8 for all size groups for the latest policy years combined.

Experience for the three latest policy years presented in Table 9 is for groups with less than 1,000 employees instead of groups with less than 2,000 surgical units exposed, as in previous reports. Separate obstetrical and nonobstetrical experience is shown, as in Tables 2 and 5 for weekly

indemnity and hospital. As was noted with respect to the weekly indemnity and hospital maternity experience, the obstetrical portion of the 1957 Surgical Tabular is too high when compared with the 1966 policy year obstetrical experience.

Ratios of actual to tabular claims for each of the five latest policy years are summarized in Table 10.

TABLE 8  
EMPLOYEE AND DEPENDENT GROUP SURGICAL EXPENSE INSURANCE  
ALL SIZE GROUPS, ALL INDUSTRIES  
COMBINED 1964-66 POLICY YEARS' EXPERIENCE, BY PLAN

Plan	No. Experience Units	Maximum Indemnity Exposed per \$150, \$200, or \$300 Basic Units (000)	Actual Claims (000)	Ratio of Actual to 1957 Surgical Tabular
<i>Employee:</i>				
With obstetrical benefits:*				
\$150 schedule .....	2,432	758	3,613	118%
\$200 schedule .....	12,309	3,680	23,667	117
\$300 schedule .....	3,455	834	6,874	112
Total .....	18,196	5,272	34,154	116%
<i>Dependent:</i>				
With obstetrical benefits:*				
\$150 schedule .....	1,549	434	5,653	105%
\$200 schedule .....	14,583	2,670	43,361	108
\$300 schedule .....	5,589	695	15,514	110
Total .....	21,721	3,799	64,528	108%
No obstetrical benefits:				
\$150 schedule .....	163	34	314	122%
\$200 schedule .....	1,981	267	3,567	130
\$300 schedule .....	1,205	88	1,677	145
Total .....	3,349	389	5,558	134%

\* Plans with "other" obstetrical benefits are excluded. Dependent obstetrical benefits are subject to a nine-month waiting period.

Table 11 contains an analysis by metropolitan area and state of employee and dependent surgical experience for all plans included in Table 8 for the latest policy years combined. The experience is presented for all exposure size groups and for groups with less than 1,000 employees. Some of the warnings given with respect to the interpretation of hospital experience by area also apply to the surgical experience. The Committee would like to point out that the tabulars do not include a factor for

GROUP WEEKLY INDEMNITY AND HOSPITAL AND SURGICAL 161

variations in claim costs by area or by amount of schedule maximum.

The surgical analysis by area indicates the highest claim level in the Mountain States and the lowest level in the Middle Atlantic States. The experience of some states within a given region varies considerably from the region average. There are also marked variations within a given state.

TABLE 9  
EMPLOYEE AND DEPENDENT SURGICAL EXPENSE INSURANCE  
GROUPS WITH LESS THAN 1,000 EMPLOYEES EXPOSED, ALL INDUSTRIES  
1964-66 POLICY YEARS' EXPERIENCE, BY PLAN

PLAN	NONOBSTETRICAL AND OBSTETRICAL COMBINED EXPERIENCE*				NONOBSTETRICAL AND OBSTETRICAL SEPARATE EXPERIENCE						
	No. Experience Units	Maximum Surgical Indemnity Exposed (000)	Actual Claims (000)	Ratio of Actual to 1957 Surgical Tabular	No. Experience Units	Maximum Surgical Indemnity Exposed (000)	Actual Claims		Ratio of Actual to 1957 Surgical Tabular		
							Non-obstetrical (000)	Obstetrical (000)	Non-obstetrical	Obstetrical	Combined
Employee Plans with Standard Obstetrical Benefits											
\$150 .....	2,354	484	2,222	112%	1,412	232	938	88	121%	51%	108%
\$200 .....	11,869	2,200	13,754	113	7,369	1,351	7,793	612	120	67	113
\$300 .....	3,358	541	4,337	110	2,347	413	3,030	271	117	67	110
Total .....	17,581	3,225	20,313	113%	11,128	1,996	11,761	971	119%	65%	112%
Employee Plans with "Other" Obstetrical Benefits†											
Total .....					404	88	527		122%		
Dependent Plans with Standard Obstetrical Benefits											
\$150 .....	1,491	257	3,231	101%	898	120	1,061	458	115%	80%	101%
\$200 .....	14,189	1,754	28,089	107	8,847	1,059	13,361	3,671	123	73	107
\$300 .....	5,486	434	10,864	108	3,030	343	5,537	1,918	123	78	107
Total .....	21,166	2,505	42,184	107%	12,775	1,522	19,959	6,047	122%	75%	107%
Dependent Plans with "Other" Obstetrical Benefits†											
Total .....					618	85	1,074		121%		
Dependent Plans with No Obstetrical Benefits											
\$150 .....					154	20	187		125%		
\$200 .....					1,946	188	2,412		125		
\$300 .....					1,201	66	1,248		144		
Total .....					3,301	274	3,847		130%		

\* The separate experience exposure is less than the combined experience exposure because separate experience is not available for all groups.

† Nonmaternity experience only submitted for these plans.

TABLE 10

EMPLOYEE AND DEPENDENT SURGICAL EXPENSE INSURANCE  
 GROUPS WITH LESS THAN 1,000 EMPLOYEES EXPOSED, ALL INDUSTRIES  
 1962-66 POLICY YEARS' EXPERIENCE, BY PLAN

PLAN	RATIOS OF ACTUAL CLAIMS TO 1957 SURGICAL TABULAR FOR POLICY YEAR ENDING IN:				
	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966
	Employee				
<i>Plans with standard obstetrical benefits:*</i>					
Nonobstetrical and obstetrical combined experience:					
\$150 schedule.....	105%	108%	112%	111%	113%
\$200 schedule.....	108	111	115	111	113
\$300 schedule.....	108	107	111	110	110
Nonobstetrical and obstetrical separate experience:†					
Nonobstetrical:					
\$150 schedule.....		116	119	123	121
\$200 schedule.....		114	121	118	121
\$300 schedule.....		108	116	116	118
Obstetrical (all plans).....		78	71	65	59
Combined:					
\$150 schedule.....		107	108	109	108
\$200 schedule.....		110	115	111	113
\$300 schedule.....		104	110	109	110
<i>Plans with "other" obstetrical benefits:</i>					
Nonobstetrical.....		103	126	116	123
	Dependent				
<i>Plans with standard obstetrical benefits:*</i>					
Nonobstetrical and obstetrical combined experience:					
\$150 schedule.....	104%	102%	102%	99%	102%
\$200 schedule.....	106	108	109	106	104
\$300 schedule.....	111	112	114	108	104
Nonobstetrical and obstetrical separate experience:†					
Nonobstetrical:					
\$150 schedule.....		119	123	121	97
\$200 schedule.....		118	122	125	122
\$300 schedule.....		125	126	120	123
Obstetrical (all plans).....		83	80	73	71
Combined:					
\$150 schedule.....		100	102	98	104
\$200 schedule.....		107	108	108	105
\$300 schedule.....		111	111	106	105
<i>Plans with "other" obstetrical benefits:</i>					
Nonobstetrical.....		111	122	114	124
<i>Plans with no obstetrical benefits:</i>					
\$150 schedule.....	117	119	115	124	143‡
\$200 schedule.....	126	124	124	131	119
\$300 schedule.....	135	133	143	151	136

\* Standard obstetrical benefits: benefit for normal delivery is \$50 under the \$150 and \$200 schedules; benefit is \$75 under the \$300 schedule.

† The nonobstetrical and obstetrical separate experience is also included in the nonobstetrical and obstetrical combined experience.

‡ Less than \$50,000 of actual claims.

TABLE 11  
 EMPLOYEE AND DEPENDENT GROUP SURGICAL EXPENSE INSURANCE  
 ALL INDUSTRIES  
 COMBINED 1964-66 POLICY YEARS' EXPERIENCE  
 BY REGION, STATE, AND METROPOLITAN AREA

REGION,* STATE,† OR METROPOLITAN AREA	GROUPS WITH LESS THAN 1,000 EMPLOYEES EXPOSED				ALL SIZE GROUPS, RATIO A/T‡
	No. Ex- perience Units	Maximum Surgical Indemnity Exposed (000)	Actual Claims (000)	Ratio A/T‡	
<i>Total, all locations</i> .....	42,048	6,004	66,344	110%	112%
New England States:					
Connecticut.....	481	79	877	104%	105%
Bridgeport-Stamford-Nor- walk.....	92	20	199	106	106
Hartford-New Britain- Bristol.....	189	31	359	115	118
New Haven-Waterbury....	109	21	222	100	103
Total.....	871	151	1,657	106%	108%
Maine.....	191	30	357	105%	105%
Massachusetts.....	869	136	1,490	111%	111%
Boston-Lowell-Lawrence..	288	41	425	102	102
Springfield-Holyoke.....	138	22	255	122	116
Total.....	1,295	199	2,170	110%	110%
New Hampshire.....	201	35	343	98%	101%
Rhode Island.....	54	6	34§	117%§	117%§
Providence.....	12	3	20§	103§	103§
Total.....	66	9	54	112%	112%
Vermont.....	300	42	431	103%	102%
Region.....	316	43	443	101%	98%
<i>Region total</i> .....	3,240	509	5,455	106%	107%
Middle Atlantic States:					
Delaware.....	27	6	74	114%	114%
District of Columbia.....	131	19	174	96%	94%
D.C. (Md.).....	21	1	17§	131§	131§
D.C. (Va.).....	21	1	14§	104§	104§
Total.....	173	21	205	98%	96%

\* Groups not coded for a specific state or metropolitan area.

† Groups coded for a specific state but not for a specific metropolitan area.

‡ Ratio of Actual to 1957 Surgical Tabular. Note that these ratios are not expressed as a percentage of the national average. For the distribution of experience in this table, the national average is shown in "Total, all locations."

§ Less than \$50,000 of actual claims.



TABLE 11—Continued\*\*

REGION,* STATE,† OR METROPOLITAN AREA	GROUPS WITH LESS THAN 1,000 EMPLOYEES EXPOSED				ALL SIZE GROUPS, RATIO A/T‡
	No. Experience Units	Maximum Surgical Indemnity Exposed (000)	Actual Claims (000)	Ratio A/T‡	
New Jersey .....	540	70	741	101%	103%
New York .....	1,962	231	2,237	95%	98%
Albany-Schenectady-Troy .....	47	6	74	104	104
Buffalo .....	120	9	104	104	101
New York-Northeastern					
New Jersey (N.Y.) .....	556	67	695	101	98
New York-Northeastern					
New Jersey (N.J.) .....	307	31	233	76	94
Rochester .....	32	8	87	98	98
Syracuse .....	64	6	63	89	89
Total .....	3,088	358	3,493	98%	98%
Pennsylvania .....	2,692	392	3,966	104%	107%
Allentown-Bethlehem-					
Easton (Pa.) .....	24	6	42§	92§	92§
Allentown-Bethlehem-					
Easton (N.J.) .....					
Philadelphia (Pa.) .....	276	45	434	100	99
Philadelphia (N.J.) .....	25	3	30§	98§	98§
Pittsburgh .....	183	26	269	103	117
Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton .....	50	10	76	85	85
Total .....	3,256	482	4,819	103%	106%
Region .....	146	26	266	103%	107%
Region total .....	7,230	963	9,598	100%	102%
North Central States:					
Illinois .....	2,497	325	3,230	98%	103%
Chicago (Ill.) .....	919	139	1,272	97	99
Chicago (Ind.) .....	47	8	91	107	107
Total .....	3,463	472	4,593	98%	102%
Indiana .....	1,286	219	2,378	109%	115%
Indianapolis .....	114	18	193	108	108
Total .....	1,400	237	2,571	109%	115%
Kentucky .....	263	33	357	107%	115%
Louisville (Ky.) .....	22	2	12§	95§	95§
Louisville (Ind.) .....					
Total .....	286	34	369	106%	114%
Michigan .....	1,922	276	3,520	119%	121%
Detroit .....	488	65	823	121	123
Total .....	2,410	341	4,343	120%	122%

|| Less than \$50,000 of actual claims and less than ten experience units.

\*\* See notes to Table 11 on p. 163.

TABLE 11—Continued

REGION,* STATE,† OR METROPOLITAN AREA	GROUPS WITH LESS THAN 1,000 EMPLOYEES EXPOSED				ALL SIZE GROUPS, RATIO A/T‡
	No. Experience Units	Maximum Surgical Indemnity Exposed (000)	Actual Claims (000)	Ratio A/T‡	
Ohio.....	1,930	347	3,796	109%	112%
Akron.....	69	9	97	99	99
Cincinnati (Ohio).....	80	7	83	109	109
Cincinnati (Ky.).....					
Cleveland.....	94	15	159	100	111
Columbus.....	92	15	145	105	103
Dayton.....	38	21	275	125	126
Toledo.....	80	6	71	108	108
Youngstown (Ohio).....	40	8	99	119	126
Youngstown (Pa.).....	17	9	22§	103§	119§
Total.....	2,444	438	4,751	110%	112%
West Virginia.....	463	51	601	112%	112%
Wheeling-Steubenville (W.Va.).....					
Wheeling-Steubenville (Ohio).....					
Total.....	478	53	635	113%	113%
Wisconsin.....	734	147	1,870	123%	123%
Milwaukee.....	187	42	561	112	106
Total.....	921	189	2,431	120%	117%
Region.....	856	138	1,514	108%	115%
Region total.....	12,258	1,902	21,207	110%	113%
Plains States:					
Iowa.....	674	94	1,096	110%	110%
Kansas.....	519	54	604	107%	112%
Minnesota.....	517	62	859	113%	113%
Minneapolis-St. Paul.....	145	17	194	117	119
Total.....	662	79	1,052	114%	115%
Missouri.....	617	68	688	100%	103%
Kansas City (Mo.).....	114	17	184	109	112
Kansas City (Kan.).....	43	5	54	116	124
St. Louis (Mo.).....	115	15	147	99	101
St. Louis (Ill.).....					
Total.....	895	107	1,089	102%	106%
Nebraska.....	272	26	297	107%	107%
Omaha.....	74	7	111	118	118
Total.....	346	33	408	110%	110%
North Dakota.....	98	9	95	110%	110%
South Dakota.....	100	11	118	103%	103%
Region.....	118	22	233	96%	131%
Region total.....	3,412	400	4,695	107%	112%

TABLE 11—Continued\*\*

REGION,* STATE,† OR METROPOLITAN AREA	GROUPS WITH LESS THAN 1,000 EMPLOYEES EXPOSED				ALL SIZE GROUPS, RATIO A/T‡
	No. Ex- perience Units	Maximum Surgical Indemnity Exposed (000)	Actual Claims (000)	Ratio A/T‡	
<b>Mountain States:</b>					
Colorado.....	150	13	196	138%	140%
Denver.....	26	2	37§	145§	145§
Total.....	176	15	233	139%	141%
Idaho.....	50	4	48§	132%§	132%§
Montana.....	26	8	99	133%	158%
Nevada.....	33	3	48§	149%§	130%§
Utah.....	156	18	256	141%	140%
Wyoming.....	24	4	58	106%	106%
Region.....	27	9	124	141%	147%
<i>Region total</i> .....	<i>492</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>866</i>	<i>136%</i>	<i>139%</i>
<b>Pacific States:</b>					
California.....	1,517	186	2,269	127%	122%
Los Angeles-Long Beach.....	463	59	723	130	130
San Diego.....	49	4	78	188	188
San Francisco-Oakland.....	91	10	110	118	118
Total.....	2,120	259	3,180	128%	124%
Oregon.....	77	9	127	123%	120%
Portland.....	30	4	31§	91§	91§
Total.....	107	13	158	115%	113%
Washington.....	113	12	132	119%	106%
Seattle.....	20	3	36§	120§	120§
Total.....	133	15	168	119%	107%
Region.....	28	9	113	122%	134%
<i>Region total</i> .....	<i>2,388</i>	<i>296</i>	<i>3,619</i>	<i>127%</i>	<i>123%</i>
<b>Gulf States:</b>					
Arizona.....	252	39	566	131%	135%
Arkansas.....	408	59	591	105%	106%
Louisiana.....	828	78	958	125%	125%
New Orleans.....	87	12	142	112	112
Total.....	915	90	1,100	123%	123%
New Mexico.....	123	16	205	125%	119%
Oklahoma.....	412	38	463	120%	121%
Texas.....	1,770	187	2,204	122%	123%
Dallas.....	75	8	110	121	108
Fort Worth.....	40	4	62	137	142
Houston.....	194	24	248	142	144
San Antonio.....	52	19	180	123	123
Total.....	2,131	242	2,804	124%	125%

\*\* See notes to Table 11 on page 163.

TABLE 11—Continued

REGION,* STATE,† OR METROPOLITAN AREA	GROUPS WITH LESS THAN 1,000 EMPLOYEES EXPOSED				ALL SIZE GROUPS, RATIO A/T‡
	No. Experience Units	Maximum Surgical Indemnity Exposed (000)	Actual Claims (000)	Ratio A/T‡	
Region .....	83	15	155	132%	138%
<i>Region total</i> .....	<i>4,324</i>	<i>499</i>	<i>5,884</i>	<i>122%</i>	<i>124%</i>
Southeastern States:					
Alabama .....	323	30	354	113%	111%
Birmingham .....	16	1	18§	112§	112§
Total .....	339	31	372	113%	114%
Florida .....	710	77	910	113%	121%
Miami .....	173	14	157	116	121
Tampa-St. Petersburg .....	31	3	33§	113§	113§
Total .....	914	94	1,100	113%	121%
Georgia .....	702	68	799	108%	105%
Atlanta .....	149	15	163	111	112
Total .....	851	83	962	108%	106%
Maryland .....	403	54	607	104%	104%
Baltimore .....	122	18	160	82	85
Total .....	525	72	767	99%	99%
Mississippi .....	341	36	430	112%	113%
North Carolina .....	1,030	121	1,224	100%	101%
South Carolina .....	315	50	526	108%	111%
Tennessee .....	262	33	384	107%	110%
Knoxville .....					
Memphis .....	43	8	108	128	130
Total .....	307	42	497	112%	114%
Virginia .....	1,027	93	959	103%	112%
Norfolk-Portsmouth .....	105	12	146	126	126
Total .....	1,132	105	1,105	106%	112%
Region .....	334	60	621	103%	100%
<i>Region total</i> .....	<i>6,088</i>	<i>694</i>	<i>7,604</i>	<i>106%</i>	<i>109%</i>
Hawaii .....	26	5	56	103%	112%
Alaska .....	28	3	35§	121%§	121%§
<i>Total, states and regions</i> .....	<i>39,486</i>	<i>5,341</i>	<i>59,019</i>	<i>109%</i>	<i>111%</i>
<i>All other#</i> .....	<i>2,562</i>	<i>663</i>	<i>7,325</i>	<i>112%</i>	<i>114%</i>

# Less than 75 per cent of employees in one region, state, or metropolitan area.

The surgical variations in ratios of actual to tabular claims by area are probably due primarily to the variations in claim frequencies, since nearly all claim payments are for the maximum amount allowed by the procedure performed. If frequencies are the same, minor variations in the ratios by area may still occur because of differing frequency distributions of procedures performed, provided such distributions result in different average benefits.