

# Physician Agency and Incentive Alignment

Evidence from Afendulis and Kessler (2007)

# Overview

- Question: What are the effects of integration of diagnosis and treatment?
- Contribution: Quantify the impact of integration on both financial and health outcomes and make welfare conclusions.

# Environment

- Three types of cardiac doctors:
  - Noninterventional cardiologists- diagnose patients and offer nonsurgical treatment
  - Cardiac surgeons- do not diagnose patients and offer bypass surgery
  - Interventional (integrated) cardiologists- both diagnose patients and offer angioplasty

# Models

$$\Pr(A_j=1)=\frac{e^{\alpha+\beta_A I_j+\delta_A X_j+\gamma_A Z_j}}{1+\sum_{\tau=A,B,C} e^{\alpha+\beta_\tau I_j+\delta_\tau X_j+\gamma_\tau Z_j}},$$

$$\Pr(B_j=1)=\frac{e^{\alpha+\beta_B I_j+\delta_B X_j+\gamma_B Z_j}}{1+\sum_{\tau=A,B,C} e^{\alpha+\beta_\tau I_j+\delta_\tau X_j+\gamma_\tau Z_j}},$$

$$\text{and } \Pr(C_j=1)=\frac{1}{1+\sum_{\tau=A,B,C} e^{\alpha+\beta_\tau I_j+\delta_\tau X_j+\gamma_\tau Z_j}}.$$

- $X_j$  = patient characteristics
- $Z_j$  = hospital and diagnosing cardiologist characteristics
- $I_j$  = indicator for diagnosed by interventional cardiologist
- Treatment recommendation indicators:
  - $A_j$ : angioplasty
  - $B_j$ : bypass surgery
  - $C_j$ : nonsurgical care

# Models

$$Y_j = \varphi + \theta X_j + \lambda I_j + \pi Z_j + \sigma^A A_j + \sigma^B B_j + \sigma^C C_j + \omega^A A_j * I_j + \omega^B B_j * I_j + \omega^C C_j * I_j + \zeta^A A_j * Z_j + \zeta^B B_j * Z_j + \zeta^C C_j * Z_j + \epsilon_j,$$

- $Y_j$  = total spending or health outcome in year after diagnosis

# Data

- 20 percent random sample of all patients who received a diagnostic catheterization in 1998
- Link doctors to patient catheterization with physician claims data
- Doctor classifications:
  - Interventional – billed for any angioplasties in 1998 or 1999
  - Noninterventional – billed for neither angioplasty nor bypass in 1998 or 1999

# Validation of Identifying Assumption

**Table 2**

Diagnosing Cardiologist, Health Status at diagnosis, and Subsequent Spending of Patients in Areas with High and Low Numbers of Interventional Cardiologists

	Patients from areas with ...		
	Above-median density of interventional cardiologists	Below-median density of interventional cardiologists	Difference (standard errors in parentheses)
Probability of diagnosis by interventional cardiologist	0.872	0.655	0.217** (0.003)
Number of days in hospital in year before diagnosis	2.94	2.98	−0.04 (0.04)
Hospital spending in year before diagnosis	\$3,926	\$3,987	−\$61 (52)
Total spending in year after diagnosis	\$28,264	\$28,842	−\$578** (171)
Number of patients	53113	53103	

\*\*  
Significant at the 5 percent level.

**Table 3**

Effect of Diagnosis by Interventional Versus Noninterventional Cardiologist on Health Spending and Health Outcomes in the Year after Diagnosis  
(Standard errors in parentheses)

Raw differences between patients diagnosed by interventional versus noninterventional cardiologists				Differences controlling for patient, doctor, hospital, and selection			
Spending	AMI readmit	HF readmit	Mortality	Spending	AMI readmit	HF readmit	Mortality
<i>Total effect</i>							
1. $E(Y I = 1) - E(Y I = 0)$							
\$216	0.166%	0.219%	0.910%	\$2,847 (\$747)	0.393% (0.428%)	0.584% (0.840%)	-0.463% (0.861%)
<i>Portion due to type of treatment</i>							
2. Portion due to the redirection of bypass patients to angioplasty							
$[\Pr(B I = 0) - \Pr(B I = 1)] * [E(Y I = 1, A) - E(Y I = 1, B)]$							
-\$445	0.041%	-0.032%	-0.052%	-\$1,024 (\$172)	0.175% (0.069%)	0.060% (0.115%)	-0.057% (0.118%)
3. Portion due to the redirection of non-surgical patients to angioplasty							
$[\Pr(C I = 0) - \Pr(C I = 1)] * [E(Y I = 1, A) - E(Y I = 1, C)]$							
\$577	0.107%	-0.032%	-0.112%	\$ 535 (\$173)	0.123% (0.049%)	0.018% (0.043%)	-0.040% (0.045%)
<i>Portion conditional on type of treatment</i>							
4. Angioplasty							
$\Pr(A I = 0) * [E(Y I = 1, A) - E(Y I = 0, A)]$							
-\$398	0.035%	-0.040%	0.371%	\$1,179 (\$327)	0.259% (0.255%)	-0.173% (0.392%)	-0.059% (0.392%)
5. Bypass surgery							
$\Pr(B I = 0) * [E(Y I = 1, B) - E(Y I = 0, B)]$							
-\$27	0.000%	-0.046%	0.009%	\$1,744 (\$461)	-0.047% (0.232%)	0.600% (0.500%)	-1.195% (0.517%)
6. Nonsurgical treatment							
$\Pr(C I = 0) * [E(Y I = 1, C) - E(Y I = 0, C)]$							
\$510	-0.017%	0.369%	0.694%	\$ 414 (\$415)	-0.116% (0.269%)	0.079% (0.527%)	0.889% (0.560%)

# Conclusions

- Diagnosis by an interventional cardiologist leads to increases in spending, but no improvements in health outcomes.
- Integration can have the same effects on incentives and behavior as banned “kickback” payments from treating to diagnosing doctors.
- Suggested solution:
  - Paying integrated doctors differently or allowing doctors more freedom to make and receive payments for referrals, could reduce costs and improve quality.

# Discussion

- In what ways could the pay structure of integrated doctors be changed to address this issue?
- What might be causing the difference in effects of diagnosis by an interventional cardiologist on mortality for bypass patients versus nonsurgical patients?
  - How might one test these mechanisms?