

Health care
systems.

UK

Germany

Canada

U.S.


Comparative Health Care Systems. Folland *et al* Chapters 22

Chris Auld
Economics 317

March 23, 2012

- ▶ There are many different forms of health care delivery in place in different countries.
 1. **Traditional sickness.** Private insurance with state subsidies.
 2. **National health insurance.** State provides single-payer health insurance (Canada).
 3. **National health services.** State directly provides health care (e.g., U.K.)
 4. **Mixed.** Elements of any of the above (e.g., United States.)

Health Care Expenditures as a Fraction of GDP: Selected Countries



INSTITUTE
FOR HEALTH POLICY & CLINICAL PRACTICE

Where Knowledge Informs Change



Health care
systems.


UK

Germany

Canada

U.S.

Figure 2. Health expenditure as a share of GDP, 2008 (or latest year available)



- ▶ Parallel public and private systems.
- ▶ Public: health care provided directly by the state. GPs paid by capitation (lump sum per patient under their care, regardless of services actually provided).
- ▶ Spending is lower than in the U.S. or Canada because of rationing.
- ▶ (graph: price ceiling, parallel markets)

Note on rationing.

Health care
systems.

UK

Germany

Canada

U.S.

- ▶ It is NOT necessarily bad that in systems like the U.K. (or Canada) care is rationed through “gatekeeper” (GPs) and waiting lists.
- ▶ The point many commentators miss is that under ANY system care is rationed in some way (infinite demands, finite means).
- ▶ Maybe price is a better way to ration, maybe not, but we are choosing among different ways to ration, not choosing whether to ration.

- ▶ All workers are mandated to have health insurance (why?)
- ▶ Can choose state-provided (87%) private (10%) and other (e.g. military).
- ▶ “Sickness groups” (insurance pools) contract directly with providers.
- ▶ Modest, but not trivial, payments from patients for care, e.g., 10 euro to visit a dentist, 10% of prescription drug costs.

- ▶ Socialized health insurance since circa 1970.
- ▶ Universal coverage (why?), no marginal payments for care, funding through complex provincial/federal arrangements.
- ▶ For the most part, pharmaceuticals and dental services not covered.
- ▶ Physicians are mostly private for-profit “firms” paid by fee-for-service according to province-specific fee schedules, although many are now paid by salary or capitation.
- ▶ GPs act as gatekeepers (cannot see a specialist without a referral from a GP)
- ▶ Hospitals are not-for-profit firms.

Canada cont.

Health care
systems.

UK

Germany

Canada

U.S.

- ▶ Health care is nominally a provincial matter, but in order to qualify for federal funds provinces must abide by the Canada Health Act.
- ▶ CHA requires public administration of health care, comprehensive coverage for “medically necessary” services, universality (everyone nominally gets same coverage), portability, and accessibility.
- ▶ No extra billing: providers are forbidden to bill the state and also “top up” with payment from patients.
- ▶ No user charges.

U.S. system.

- ▶ Very complicated! Not (even remotely) accurate to describe as “free market,” although there are more market mechanisms in place than in other Western countries.
- ▶ Very expensive! 16% of GDP, and the U.S. has high GDP.
- ▶ **Medicare**: universal insurance for the elderly. Complex, with multiple different plans people can opt in to.
- ▶ On the order of 44 million covered.
- ▶ Medicare reimburses providers using complex formulas intended to capture how much it costs to treat a patient with given observable characteristics (DRG, diagnostic related group).

Health care
systems.

UK

Germany

Canada

U.S.

Health care
systems.

UK

Germany

Canada

U.S.

- ▶ **Medicaid:** public provision of insurance to the poor.
- ▶ On the order of 60 million people covered.
- ▶ Does not cover “poor” people generally, must meet complex requirements. In effect, poor families with small children and single-parent families likely to be covered.

Health care
systems.

UK

Germany

Canada

U.S.

- ▶ Medicare/Medicaid are very expensive. At exchange rates which held a few years ago U.S. *public* expenditures per person were higher than Canadian!
- ▶ Effective? Difficult to measure.
- ▶ RAND Health Insurance Experiment should lead us to question effect on health.
- ▶ Some studies suggest that these programs have improved health through improved access to care, at least in some dimensions (e.g., infant mortality), but often not cost-effective.

Comparing Canada and the U.S.

Chapter 22.

Health care
systems.

UK

Germany

Canada

U.S.

- ▶ Both countries have mixed public/private provision of care. The U.S. system is substantially more expensive, but Canada's system looks cheap only relative to the U.S., not most other countries.
- ▶ Why is the U.S. system more expensive?

Why is the U.S. more expensive?

Health care
systems.

UK

Germany

Canada

U.S.

- ▶ We can always write: $\text{total costs} = (\text{average cost per service}) * (\# \text{ services})$
- ▶ What primarily drives differences, number of services or cost per service?
- ▶ Overwhelmingly, the data tell us that it is cost per service differences which drive total cost differences. U.S. residents consume slightly fewer services on average than Canadians.

- ▶ Why is the average cost of a service higher in the U.S.?
- ▶ A small part of the difference can be attributed to lower administrative costs in Canada. We don't have the mess of insurance companies, HMOs, and patchwork legislation.
- ▶ “It’s the price, stupid.” Simply, the U.S. system is more expensive because everything costs more.

Health care
systems.

UK

Germany

Canada

U.S.

EXHIBIT 4**Physician Capacity, Earnings, And Spending In Six Countries, 2008**

Country	Density per 10,000	Density relative to US	Pretax earnings net of expenses (US\$ 2008)	Earnings relative to US	Payments to MDs per 1,000 (\$)	Payments to MDs relative to US	Primary care MD earnings relative to orthopedic surgeons (%)
PRIMARY CARE PHYSICIANS							
Australia	14	1.4	92,844	0.50	129,982	0.70	49
Canada	10	1.0	125,104	0.67	125,104	0.67	60
France	17	1.7	95,585	0.51	162,494	0.87	62
Germany	10	1.0	131,809	0.71	131,809	0.71	65
United Kingdom	7	0.7	159,532	0.86	111,672	0.60	49
United States	10	1.0	186,582	1.00	186,582	1.00	42
ORTHOPEDIC SURGEONS							
Australia	0.45	0.68	187,609	0.42	8,442	0.29	— ^a
Canada	0.32	0.48	208,634	0.47	6,676	0.23	— ^a
France	0.34	0.52	154,380	0.35	5,249	0.18	— ^a
Germany	0.44	0.67	202,771	0.46	8,922	0.31	— ^a
United Kingdom	0.28	0.42	324,138	0.73	9,076	0.31	— ^a
United States	0.66	1.00	442,450	1.00	29,202	1.00	— ^a

SOURCE See the Appendix. To access the Appendix, click on the Appendix link in the box to the right of the article online. **NOTES** Physician income per 1,000 people was calculated as density multiplied by earnings ÷ (column 2)(column 4)/10. All earnings figures were converted to US dollars and adjusted for purchasing power parity and then converted to 2008 dollars using the US Consumer Price Index. Data on the density of primary care physicians are from the 2008 Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development database. ^aNot applicable.

Health care
systems.

UK

Germany

Canada

U.S.

- ▶ Why does stuff cost more? It could be because Americans get higher-tech care. That does explain part of the difference, e.g, several times as many MRI machines in the U.S. than Canada.
- ▶ Most of the difference is at the end of the day due to differences in wages. Health care providers, particularly physicians, are paid much more in the U.S. than in Canada.
- ▶ Monopoly power again?

“Obamacare.”

- ▶ *Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, 2010.*
- ▶ Provisions implemented over time, many are currently under legal challenge.
- ▶ Restricts insurers ability to vary premiums with apparent risk, e.g., pre-existing conditions.
- ▶ Requires people to buy coverage if they don't get it from employers or Medicaid/Medicare.
- ▶ Expands Medicaid (subsidies for poorer people) coverage.
- ▶ Implements new taxes on higher earners and insurance firms.