

HOW DO CONSUMERS RESPOND TO COMPARATIVE COST AND RESOURCE USE INFORMATION?



RESULTS FROM A FOCUS GROUP STUDY
SUPPORTED BY THE
AHRQ CHARTERED VALUE EXCHANGE

SHOSHANNA SOFAER, DR.P.H.

STUDY BACKGROUND

2

- Many hope that consumers and patients can play a more active role in keeping down health care costs
- Efforts have already begun to provide comparative information on costs and resources use to the public
- ?? Will this work ??
 - Will consumers want to look at cost and resource use information? In what context?
 - How will they respond? Will they
 - ✦ Choose an inexpensive provider to save money? OR
 - ✦ Choose an expensive provider because they equate cost and quality?

STUDY BACKGROUND

3

- Study funded by the Agency for Healthcare Research & Quality
- To support the work of the Chartered Value Exchanges (CVEs)
- Team included Judith Hibbard, Jessica Greene, Judith Hirsh and Kirsten Firminger

METHODS

4

- Phase One: Conduct focus groups with people who have employer based insurance
- Phase Two: Use findings to design randomized trial to test reactions to alternative displays of cost and resource use information
- Today we will look at the results from Phase One

FINDINGS

5

- Consumers were not interested in information about comparative costs of providers all by itself
- At least half would choose the more expensive provider if shown such information
 - Because they don't think it would affect their out of pocket costs
 - Even if it did, would be have a relatively small effect
 - Because they do believe that high cost = better quality
 - Because they do not think cost should be a factor in making health care choices – implications for reducing costs???

FINDINGS

6

- We asked people why they thought the costs were so different for the two doctors
- In addition to saying the more expensive doctor was providing a higher quality service, including the overall customer service, they suggested:
 - **Location – a more expensive neighborhood would lead to higher prices**
 - **Reputation – a physician with an excellent reputation can “get away with” charging more**
 - **Has been in practice longer**
 - **That is probably impossible to know why!**

Dr. Jones

Charges \$ 750

You Pay:

Co-Payment: \$150

Deductible: \$250

Dr. Howard

Charges \$ 400

You Pay:

Co-Payment: \$80

Deductible: \$0

FINDINGS

8

- We explored the notion of “tiering” in which plans reduce or waive co-pays and deductibles for less expensive providers
- People were uncertain why the insurance company would do that
- Some thought the insurance company was trying to save money by encouraging choice of a physician that cost them less
- No one thought this decision was based on variations in quality

Quality of Care Ratings

Dr. Jones



Average

Charges \$ 750

You Pay:

Co-Payment: \$150

Deductible: \$250

Dr. Howard



Better than Average

Charges \$ 400

You Pay:

Co-Payment: \$80

Deductible: \$0

FINDINGS

10


- Then we added quality to the display, where less expensive providers were higher quality
- People were much happier to have quality data along with the cost data
- Many were surprised that the less expensive physician had a higher rating

FINDINGS

11

- Some were then quite willing to choose the less expensive physician, but some were still nervous
 - Those said they would go with a “mid-priced” provider whose quality was okay
- When we added in quality in a tiered system, this again more people much more comfortable about taking the cost into account

Cost to get an MRI




FINDINGS

13

- We then shifted to a display showing just the costs of a particular procedure, an MRI
- People were somewhat but not entirely surprised by the wide range of prices at different facilities
- Absent quality information, some would go to the higher price facilities, while others would steer toward those in the middle tier
- Almost all, again with exceptions for people with very high deductibles, would avoid the lowest cost providers

Yearly cost of care for heart disease



FINDINGS

15

- Another kind of cost metric is the total annual cost for a patient with a specific illness
- Given only the costs, people assumed that those with a higher cost were in fact doing more for their patients
- **They assumed that doing more was a good thing**

FINDINGS

16


- So we gave them a display that added in quality
- In this case, quality and cost had an inverse relationship
- People found this pretty counter-intuitive and somewhat confusing
 - **Why would the quality be higher if you were taken care of by a physician whose costs were lower?**

FINDINGS

17

- In the final display in this series, we broke down the costs, using the approach of the Prometheus payment model, into two “buckets”
 - **The cost of recommended care**
 - **The cost of care needed because of avoidable problems**
- In this display, we were making the point that spending money on recommended care led to better quality and that money spent on care for avoidable problems was a sign of lower not higher quality

Yearly cost of care for heart disease



FINDINGS

19

- **People interpreted the cost data in this display as quality data**
- They really liked the idea of finding out which physicians' patients had avoidable complications
- The idea of “complications” really resonated with them as a sign of poor quality, although some noted that lack of patient compliance could also lead to such complications

TAKE AWAY MESSAGES

20

- Focus cost information on costs to the individual, not overall costs (except for metrics strongly tied to quality)
- Do not provide cost or resource use information by itself – link it to quality information
- Provide the data in ways that help people change their mind set about the relationship of cost and quality
- Note: In general, current presentations of cost do not use this approach!

MORE TO COME

21

- The team then did a lab study which we cannot cover today, but it basically confirmed and extended focus group findings
- In particular, not only was it important to provide quality as well as cost information
 - It was better if the “quality signal” was very strong
 - It was better if the display “interpreted” the data for people by calling out the best value providers

MORE TO COME

22

- We have more complete slides sets on both parts of the study for those who are interested
- Better still, we hope that both parts of the study will be published in an upcoming *Health Affairs* special issue, along with other papers about public reporting
- Questions?