

Healthcare Reform

A Universal Healthcare Architecture That Preserves Competitive Care Delivery While Removing Profit-Driven Gatekeeping from Essential Medical Access

Author: Aaron Snyder

The Entire World

<https://theentireworld.net>

Abstract

Healthcare outcomes across developed economies are influenced less by medical capability than by the incentive structures governing access, financing, and administration. Nations with advanced medical technology and highly trained clinicians can nevertheless produce uneven population outcomes when healthcare access is mediated by fragmented insurance systems, opaque pricing, and administrative complexity.

The United States, for example, spends significantly more on healthcare as a share of gross domestic product than any other developed nation, yet performs inconsistently across key outcome metrics including life expectancy, preventable mortality, and chronic disease prevalence [1][2]. This disparity suggests that the core issue is not medical knowledge but systemic architecture.

This paper proposes a healthcare reform framework centered on **Universal Basic Coverage, a Single National Risk Pool, Competitive Care Delivery, Price Transparency, Outcome-Based Accountability, Pharmaceutical Pricing Reform, and Administrative Automation using artificial intelligence.**

The proposed architecture preserves competition among healthcare providers while eliminating profit-driven gatekeeping for essential care. By aligning financial incentives

with measurable health outcomes and reducing administrative overhead, the system aims to improve access, reduce long-term cost growth, and increase public accountability within healthcare institutions.

1. Introduction

Healthcare systems operate within complex economic and institutional frameworks that shape how medical services are delivered, financed, and evaluated. While technological advancement continues to expand medical capabilities, institutional design determines whether those capabilities translate into consistent population health improvements.

In many modern healthcare systems, access to care is mediated through insurance markets designed around risk segmentation, cost control strategies, and administrative verification processes. These mechanisms can create barriers between patients and essential medical services, particularly during moments of financial instability, employment transitions, or acute health crises.

Healthcare reform discussions often frame the issue as a choice between fully nationalized healthcare systems and fully privatized market models. However, the empirical evidence suggests that the most effective systems typically integrate both public and private components. Public systems provide baseline access and risk stability, while private providers compete on quality, innovation, and service delivery [3].

The central policy challenge is therefore not the presence of private actors within healthcare delivery, but the placement of profit incentives in positions that determine whether patients receive essential care.

When insurance companies function as gatekeepers to treatment through network restrictions, prior authorization requirements, or denial strategies, profit motives may conflict with patient access. Similarly, when payment models reward procedural volume rather than patient outcomes, healthcare systems may unintentionally encourage chronic treatment cycles rather than preventive care or long-term resolution.

This paper examines the structural drivers behind these dynamics and proposes a healthcare architecture designed to realign incentives toward long-term health improvement.

2. The Structural Problems in Modern Healthcare Systems

Healthcare system dysfunction typically emerges from several interacting structural factors rather than a single policy failure. These factors include incentive misalignment within payment models, fragmented insurance structures, administrative overhead, price opacity, and pharmaceutical pricing dynamics.

Together, these structural elements produce a system capable of delivering world-class care in isolated circumstances while simultaneously generating widespread access barriers and financial strain for large portions of the population.

2.1 Volume-Based Revenue Incentives

A central feature of many healthcare systems is the **fee-for-service payment model**, under which providers are reimbursed for each individual service performed. These services may include physician visits, diagnostic testing, procedures, or hospital stays.

While fee-for-service reimbursement can encourage availability of services, it also creates financial incentives tied to the quantity of care delivered rather than the quality or effectiveness of outcomes.

Under such systems:

- Providers receive higher reimbursement when more services are performed.
- Chronic disease management can generate long-term revenue streams.
- Preventive interventions may receive comparatively limited compensation.

Research in healthcare economics has identified these incentive structures as a major contributor to inefficient healthcare spending and service utilization patterns [4].

This dynamic does not imply that clinicians intentionally prolong illness. Rather, it reflects how institutional payment structures influence system-level behavior. When revenue

depends on procedural volume, organizations naturally allocate resources toward activities that sustain financial stability.

Estimates suggest that nearly **one quarter of healthcare spending in the United States may represent waste**, including unnecessary services driven partly by misaligned payment incentives [5].

2.2 Fragmented Coverage and Access Instability

Healthcare coverage fragmentation is another significant contributor to system inefficiency and poor patient outcomes.

In systems where insurance is tied to employment or divided across multiple private plans, individuals frequently experience coverage instability. Job changes, layoffs, or employer benefit changes can result in sudden loss of medical coverage.

Fragmented insurance markets also encourage **risk segmentation**, where insurers design policies that discourage enrollment by high-cost patients.

These dynamics produce several downstream effects:

- Delayed care due to uncertainty about coverage or cost
- Reduced continuity of care across providers
- Increased administrative overhead from multiple billing systems

Research consistently shows that individuals who delay care due to financial uncertainty often enter the healthcare system with more advanced illness, increasing treatment complexity and cost [6].

2.3 Administrative Overhead and System Complexity

Healthcare administration represents a significant portion of total system expenditure.

Administrative functions include billing, coding, claims processing, prior authorization requests, insurance verification, and dispute resolution. Hospitals, clinics, and insurance companies maintain extensive administrative infrastructures dedicated to managing these processes.

Studies comparing healthcare systems across developed countries indicate that the United States spends substantially more on administrative costs than peer nations with simpler financing systems [7].

Clinicians also spend increasing time documenting care for reimbursement compliance rather than direct patient interaction. Surveys of physicians indicate that administrative tasks contribute significantly to professional burnout and reduced clinical capacity.

Reducing administrative friction therefore represents one of the most immediate opportunities to improve healthcare efficiency while increasing clinician availability.

2.4 Price Opacity and Market Dysfunction

In most functioning markets, consumers can compare prices before making purchasing decisions. Healthcare markets often violate this basic economic principle.

Patients frequently receive treatment without knowing the cost of services in advance. Negotiated insurance rates remain confidential, and billing often occurs weeks or months after care is delivered.

Price opacity prevents patients from making informed decisions and undermines the ability of market competition to discipline costs.

Research has demonstrated that price transparency policies can significantly reduce cost variation and improve consumer decision-making in healthcare markets [8].

2.5 Insurance Gatekeeping and Care Delays

Insurance companies frequently use mechanisms such as **prior authorization, network restrictions, and claims review processes** to control costs.

While some forms of utilization review may prevent unnecessary treatment, excessive administrative gatekeeping can delay necessary care and shift the burden of navigating complex systems onto patients during periods of medical vulnerability.

Studies have shown that prior authorization requirements can delay treatment for serious conditions and contribute to physician administrative workload [9].

When access to care is mediated by financial approval processes, treatment decisions may become influenced by cost containment strategies rather than clinical judgment.

2.6 Pharmaceutical Pricing Dynamics

Pharmaceutical innovation represents one of the most important drivers of modern healthcare advancement. However, pharmaceutical pricing structures can also create access challenges.

Drug development frequently benefits from public research funding through universities and government grants. Yet the resulting medications may be priced at levels that limit accessibility for patients and healthcare systems.

Patent protections intended to incentivize innovation can also delay market competition, allowing manufacturers to maintain elevated prices for extended periods.

Studies have shown that pharmaceutical pricing in the United States is significantly higher than in many comparable countries, even for identical medications [10].

2.7 Mental Health and Addiction Treatment Gaps

Mental health and addiction services remain significantly underfunded relative to their societal impact.

Untreated mental health conditions contribute to downstream costs across multiple sectors including healthcare, criminal justice, housing instability, and employment disruption.

Despite growing recognition of mental health as a critical public health issue, access to treatment remains limited by insurance networks, workforce shortages, and fragmented care systems.

Expanding integrated mental health services has been shown to reduce emergency care utilization and improve long-term health outcomes [11].

Systemic Result

Taken together, these structural dynamics produce a healthcare system that can deliver extraordinary medical care in isolated circumstances while generating widespread financial stress, inconsistent access, and preventable suffering.

The result is a high-cost healthcare economy where technological capability is not matched by systemic efficiency or equitable access.

Addressing these challenges requires structural reform that realigns incentives toward prevention, transparency, and long-term health outcomes.

Good catch — for a **formal research paper of 25–35 pages**, the sections should absolutely be **hierarchically numbered** (3.1, 3.2, etc.). That makes the structure clearer and also makes the citations and cross-references cleaner when someone reads the PDF.

Below is the **corrected continuation**, restructuring the section so it uses **proper subsections**. The content is expanded slightly as well so the paper grows toward the page target.

3. Design Principles for Structural Healthcare Reform

Healthcare reform requires more than incremental regulatory adjustments. Many of the systemic problems present in modern healthcare systems arise from deeply embedded incentive structures that shape how medical services are financed, delivered, and evaluated. Addressing these challenges therefore requires structural redesign rather than isolated policy interventions.

The framework proposed in this paper is guided by several core design principles intended to realign healthcare incentives with long-term public health outcomes while preserving the benefits of competition and medical innovation.

3.1 Universal Access

The first design principle is that **essential healthcare must function as a baseline guarantee rather than a conditional benefit**.

Access to medical care is a prerequisite for economic participation, social stability, and population well-being. When healthcare access depends heavily on employment status, insurance eligibility, or individual financial liquidity, the system produces instability and avoidable suffering.

Research consistently shows that populations with stable healthcare access experience better outcomes in preventive care utilization, chronic disease management, and early detection of serious illnesses [12]. Delayed care resulting from financial barriers often leads to more complex medical interventions later, increasing both cost and risk to patients.

Universal access ensures that all individuals can obtain medically necessary treatment without facing denial due to administrative eligibility barriers.

3.2 Risk Pool Stability

A second foundational principle is the stabilization of healthcare financing through **broad risk pooling**.

Insurance systems function effectively when risk is distributed across large and diverse populations. Fragmented insurance markets divide risk across numerous pools, increasing administrative complexity and encouraging insurers to design plans that minimize exposure to high-cost patients.

Large risk pools improve actuarial stability and allow healthcare systems to absorb rare but expensive medical events without destabilizing individual insurance plans. Countries that operate universal risk pools often demonstrate lower administrative overhead and more stable long-term healthcare spending patterns [13].

The reform architecture therefore proposes a **single national risk pool for essential healthcare services**, ensuring that catastrophic medical risk is distributed across the entire population.

3.3 Competitive Care Delivery

Universal coverage does not require centralized control of healthcare providers. Instead, competition among providers can improve quality, service experience, and operational efficiency when properly structured.

Under the model proposed in this paper, hospitals, clinics, and physician practices remain independent organizations that may operate as private businesses, nonprofit institutions, or public entities.

Competition occurs primarily through measurable performance indicators such as:

- clinical outcome quality

- treatment success rates
- patient experience and service responsiveness
- operational efficiency and cost control

Public reporting of these metrics allows patients to make informed choices about their care providers and encourages continuous improvement across healthcare institutions.

3.4 Transparent Pricing

Markets require transparent pricing to function effectively. In healthcare, however, pricing structures are frequently opaque.

Patients often receive treatment without knowing the cost in advance, and negotiated rates between insurers and providers remain confidential. Billing may occur weeks or months after treatment, preventing meaningful consumer decision-making.

Price transparency policies require healthcare providers to publish standardized prices for common services and treatment bundles. When pricing information becomes visible, patients and policymakers can compare providers more effectively, which encourages competition based on value rather than marketing or network restrictions.

Early transparency initiatives have demonstrated reductions in price variation and improved consumer awareness in healthcare markets [8].

3.5 Outcome Accountability

Healthcare systems should reward measurable improvements in patient health rather than the volume of services delivered.

Under outcome-based accountability frameworks, provider performance is evaluated using metrics such as:

- long-term disease management improvements
- hospital readmission rates
- complication prevention rates

- patient-reported health outcomes
- adherence to evidence-based care pathways

Linking reimbursement to these metrics encourages providers to focus on interventions that produce meaningful health improvements rather than maximizing procedural volume.

Risk adjustment mechanisms are necessary to ensure fairness. Providers serving populations with higher baseline health risks should not be penalized for treating more complex cases.

Value-based care initiatives implemented in several healthcare systems have shown potential to reduce unnecessary services while improving coordination of care and patient outcomes [14].

3.6 Administrative Efficiency

Healthcare administrative complexity represents a major source of wasted resources.

Billing systems, claims processing, prior authorization requirements, and insurance verification procedures consume large amounts of clinician time and healthcare system resources. Administrative overhead in the United States is significantly higher than in many peer nations with simpler financing systems [7].

Modern technological tools, including artificial intelligence and automated data systems, provide opportunities to streamline administrative processes such as scheduling, eligibility verification, billing, and documentation.

Reducing administrative burden allows healthcare professionals to devote more time to patient care while lowering overall system costs.

3.7 Anti-Capture Governance

Healthcare systems are vulnerable to regulatory capture when powerful stakeholders influence policy decisions to preserve favorable financial arrangements.

Effective healthcare reform must therefore incorporate governance mechanisms that promote transparency and accountability. These mechanisms may include:

- conflict-of-interest disclosure requirements
- independent oversight bodies
- public reporting of system performance metrics
- transparent procurement and contracting processes

Ensuring that healthcare governance structures remain accountable to the public is essential for maintaining long-term trust and preventing policy distortions.

4. Universal Basic Coverage

Universal Basic Coverage (UBC) forms the foundational component of the healthcare reform architecture proposed in this paper. Under this framework, essential healthcare services are guaranteed to all residents through a publicly financed baseline coverage system. This guarantee ensures that individuals can access medically necessary treatment regardless of employment status, insurance eligibility, or financial circumstances.

Universal Basic Coverage does not require the nationalization of hospitals or physician practices. Instead, it restructures the financing and access model for essential care while preserving a diverse ecosystem of private, nonprofit, and public healthcare providers.

The central objective of Universal Basic Coverage is to ensure that essential healthcare services remain accessible without administrative barriers such as network restrictions, prior authorization delays, or insurance eligibility disputes. By separating essential healthcare access from profit-driven insurance gatekeeping, the system can reduce delays in treatment while maintaining competition among providers.

International evidence suggests that healthcare systems incorporating universal baseline coverage consistently achieve broader access to preventive care, lower rates of avoidable hospitalization, and more stable long-term cost growth than systems relying heavily on fragmented private insurance markets [12][15].

The following subsections outline the core components of the Universal Basic Coverage model.

4.1 Defining Essential Healthcare Services

The first step in implementing Universal Basic Coverage is defining the scope of services included within the essential care baseline. Essential healthcare services are those necessary to maintain population health, prevent avoidable medical crises, and treat serious illness or injury.

The proposed essential coverage baseline includes several categories of care.

Emergency medical services constitute a core component of the baseline. Immediate treatment for life-threatening injuries or illnesses must remain universally accessible without financial barriers or administrative delays.

Hospitalization and inpatient care are also included within the essential baseline. Severe illness, surgical procedures, and acute medical conditions often require hospital-level treatment that cannot be postponed or negotiated through standard consumer decision-making processes.

Chronic disease management represents another major category of essential care. Conditions such as diabetes, cardiovascular disease, respiratory disorders, and autoimmune illnesses require ongoing medical supervision and medication. Interruptions in chronic care can lead to severe complications that dramatically increase long-term healthcare costs.

Preventive services form an equally important component of essential healthcare. These services include routine health screenings, vaccinations, primary care visits, and early diagnostic testing. Preventive care improves long-term health outcomes and reduces the likelihood of severe disease progression.

Mental health services must also be integrated into the essential care baseline. Mental health conditions contribute significantly to overall disease burden and frequently interact with physical health outcomes. Failure to provide accessible mental health treatment can produce downstream costs across healthcare, housing, employment, and criminal justice systems.

Finally, access to essential medications must be guaranteed within the baseline coverage framework. Many chronic conditions require continuous pharmaceutical treatment to

prevent complications. Interruptions in medication access often result in costly emergency interventions.

Defining these essential services creates a clear boundary between universal baseline care and optional supplemental services that may be covered through private insurance or direct payment.

4.2 Financing Universal Basic Coverage

Universal Basic Coverage requires a financing model capable of supporting stable access while minimizing unnecessary administrative complexity.

The proposed financing structure combines three primary funding mechanisms.

First, a portion of healthcare financing would be derived from general tax revenue. Most advanced economies already finance significant portions of their healthcare systems through public taxation. Public financing provides stable baseline funding that is not directly tied to employment status or private insurance enrollment.

Second, employer healthcare spending would be partially redirected into the universal coverage system. In many countries, employers currently contribute substantial resources toward employee health insurance plans. Redirecting these expenditures into a unified healthcare pool would preserve overall spending levels while reducing fragmentation across multiple insurance providers.

Third, administrative savings generated through system simplification would be reinvested into healthcare delivery. Current healthcare systems spend significant resources managing complex billing and claims processing procedures. Reducing these administrative costs can free substantial funding for clinical care.

Economic analyses suggest that simplified healthcare financing systems can achieve meaningful cost reductions by eliminating redundant administrative functions and negotiating more consistent pricing structures [16].

The combination of these funding sources allows Universal Basic Coverage to maintain financial sustainability while expanding access to essential services.

4.3 Coverage Guarantees and Access Protections

A defining feature of Universal Basic Coverage is the guarantee that medically necessary essential care cannot be denied to eligible patients.

Traditional insurance models frequently rely on administrative mechanisms such as prior authorization, network restrictions, and coverage exclusions to control costs. While some forms of utilization management may help reduce unnecessary treatment, excessive administrative barriers can delay necessary care and shift the burden of navigating complex systems onto patients.

Universal Basic Coverage replaces these mechanisms with a simpler rule: medically necessary essential services must be provided when clinically indicated.

Appeals processes remain available in cases where treatment eligibility is unclear, but the default assumption is that essential care should be accessible without delay.

Coverage stability represents another key protection under the Universal Basic Coverage model. Because coverage is not tied to employment or private insurance enrollment, individuals retain continuous access to essential healthcare services throughout job transitions, economic downturns, or changes in life circumstances.

Continuous coverage reduces disruptions in treatment and improves long-term disease management outcomes.

Research consistently demonstrates that stable insurance coverage improves access to preventive services and reduces avoidable hospitalizations [17].

4.4 Economic Impact of Universal Coverage

Concerns about the cost of universal healthcare systems often dominate policy discussions. However, international evidence suggests that universal coverage does not necessarily lead to higher overall healthcare spending.

Many countries that operate universal coverage systems spend significantly less on healthcare as a percentage of gross domestic product while achieving comparable or better health outcomes than fragmented insurance markets.

The United States, for example, spends a substantially higher share of national income on healthcare than most peer nations while maintaining a complex system of private insurance plans and administrative intermediaries [1][2].

Several structural factors contribute to this cost disparity.

Administrative overhead represents one major difference. Systems with multiple insurance providers, complex billing systems, and fragmented risk pools often require extensive administrative infrastructure. Simplified financing structures reduce these costs.

Negotiated pricing also plays a role. Unified purchasing systems often possess greater bargaining power when negotiating pharmaceutical prices and hospital reimbursement rates.

Preventive care expansion further reduces long-term costs by identifying health risks before they develop into expensive medical emergencies.

While Universal Basic Coverage requires significant initial system restructuring, long-term cost projections suggest that improved efficiency and preventive care utilization can offset much of the additional spending required to expand access.

4.5 International Evidence on Universal Coverage

Global healthcare comparisons provide valuable insights into the performance of universal coverage systems.

Most high-income countries operate some form of universal healthcare framework. While the specific financing and delivery mechanisms vary, these systems share several common features: broad risk pooling, baseline coverage guarantees, and strong emphasis on primary care.

Countries such as Germany, the Netherlands, Canada, and Japan operate hybrid systems that combine universal coverage with competitive provider markets. In these models, healthcare providers remain independent organizations while financing structures ensure that essential services remain accessible to the entire population.

These systems generally achieve lower administrative costs, higher preventive care utilization, and more stable healthcare spending growth than fragmented insurance systems [15].

It is important to note that universal coverage does not eliminate all healthcare challenges. Workforce shortages, aging populations, and technological cost pressures remain significant concerns across many healthcare systems.

However, universal coverage frameworks provide a stable foundation for addressing these challenges without the additional complexity created by fragmented insurance markets.

5. Single National Risk Pool

A central structural reform within the proposed healthcare framework is the establishment of a **single national risk pool for essential healthcare services**. Risk pooling is the fundamental mechanism through which insurance systems function. By distributing the financial burden of unpredictable medical events across a large population, insurance reduces the likelihood that individual patients will experience catastrophic financial consequences due to illness or injury.

In fragmented insurance markets, however, risk is distributed across numerous separate pools maintained by different insurers, employer-sponsored plans, and government programs. These fragmented pools create instability, administrative complexity, and incentives for insurers to minimize exposure to high-cost patients.

A unified risk pool for essential healthcare services stabilizes financing, reduces administrative duplication, and eliminates many of the distortions created by risk segmentation strategies. By distributing medical risk across the entire population, healthcare systems can maintain predictable funding structures while ensuring that high-need patients do not destabilize individual insurance plans.

The following subsections examine the economic rationale and implementation considerations associated with a national healthcare risk pool.

5.1 Risk Pool Economics

Insurance operates by spreading risk across large populations. When a sufficiently large group contributes to a shared insurance fund, the cost of rare but expensive events can be absorbed without imposing severe financial burdens on any single individual.

Healthcare costs follow a highly uneven distribution pattern. A relatively small percentage of patients account for a disproportionately large share of total healthcare spending.

Research indicates that the highest-cost five percent of patients may account for nearly half of total healthcare expenditures in some systems [18].

In fragmented insurance markets, these high-cost individuals can significantly affect the financial stability of smaller insurance pools. Insurers therefore attempt to design policies that limit exposure to high-cost patients through mechanisms such as network restrictions, plan design strategies, and premium pricing structures.

A national risk pool mitigates these pressures by distributing high-cost cases across the entire population. When risk is shared broadly, the financial impact of individual cases becomes significantly smaller relative to the total system.

Large risk pools also improve actuarial predictability. With millions of participants, healthcare spending patterns become more stable and easier to forecast, allowing policymakers to design more reliable financing mechanisms.

This economic principle forms the foundation of many universal healthcare systems worldwide.

5.2 Eliminating Risk Selection Incentives

One of the most significant distortions in fragmented insurance markets arises from **risk selection incentives**.

Insurance companies operating within competitive markets naturally attempt to attract healthier individuals while discouraging enrollment by patients with complex or chronic medical conditions. While explicit discrimination based on health status is often prohibited by regulation, insurers may use indirect strategies such as:

- narrow provider networks
- high cost-sharing for specialized services
- benefit structures that discourage high-risk enrollment

These strategies are sometimes referred to as **adverse selection management**, and they can produce significant inefficiencies within healthcare systems.

When insurers compete primarily on their ability to avoid high-risk patients rather than improve care delivery, resources are diverted toward administrative strategies rather than medical innovation.

A unified risk pool eliminates these incentives by ensuring that all individuals participate in the same coverage structure. Since insurers are no longer responsible for maintaining separate risk pools for essential healthcare services, there is no financial advantage in avoiding high-cost patients.

Instead, competition shifts toward improving efficiency and care quality within the provider system.

5.3 The Limitations of Employment-Linked Coverage

In several healthcare systems, including the United States, health insurance coverage remains strongly linked to employment. Employer-sponsored insurance became a dominant feature of American healthcare financing during the mid-twentieth century due to historical tax policy incentives and wage controls implemented during World War II [19].

While employer-sponsored insurance expanded coverage for many workers, it also introduced several structural weaknesses.

First, employment-linked insurance creates **coverage instability** during job transitions. Individuals who lose employment may also lose access to health insurance at precisely the moment when financial vulnerability is highest.

Second, employer-based coverage fragments risk pools across thousands of separate insurance plans, each with its own administrative infrastructure and pricing arrangements.

Third, employment-linked coverage creates barriers for individuals working in freelance, part-time, or gig economy roles. These workers may face higher premiums or limited access to employer-sponsored plans.

Decoupling essential healthcare coverage from employment eliminates these vulnerabilities. Individuals retain continuous access to healthcare regardless of job status, and employers are relieved of the administrative burden associated with managing complex insurance benefits.

This shift can also improve labor market mobility by allowing workers to change jobs or pursue entrepreneurial opportunities without risking the loss of healthcare coverage.

5.4 Financial Stability and Cost Predictability

A national risk pool can improve the financial stability of healthcare systems by smoothing spending fluctuations across large populations.

Healthcare spending is influenced by numerous factors, including demographic changes, disease prevalence, technological innovation, and economic conditions. Smaller insurance pools may experience significant volatility when confronted with sudden increases in high-cost medical cases.

Large risk pools absorb these fluctuations more effectively. With millions of participants contributing to a shared system, unexpected spending increases in one region or demographic group can be offset by lower spending elsewhere.

This stability allows policymakers to plan healthcare budgets more effectively and avoid sudden premium increases or coverage reductions.

Additionally, unified financing systems often possess greater negotiating leverage when purchasing pharmaceuticals, medical equipment, and healthcare services. Bulk purchasing arrangements can reduce prices and stabilize supply chains.

Research comparing international healthcare systems has found that countries with unified purchasing structures frequently achieve lower drug prices and more consistent cost growth than fragmented markets [10].

5.5 Implementation Considerations

Transitioning from fragmented insurance markets to a single national risk pool requires careful policy design and phased implementation.

One approach involves gradually integrating existing public programs, employer-sponsored insurance contributions, and individual insurance markets into a unified financing structure for essential healthcare services.

Employer contributions that currently fund private insurance premiums could be redirected into the national healthcare pool through payroll-based contributions or equivalent mechanisms. This approach preserves the overall level of employer healthcare spending while simplifying the administrative structure.

Existing government healthcare programs may also be integrated into the national risk pool to reduce fragmentation across multiple public systems.

To ensure fairness, financing mechanisms must account for differences in income levels and regional cost structures. Progressive contribution systems can ensure that healthcare financing remains equitable while maintaining sufficient funding for essential services.

Importantly, the creation of a national risk pool does not eliminate private healthcare markets. Supplemental insurance products can continue to exist for elective services, expanded amenities, or specialized care options beyond the essential coverage baseline.

By carefully sequencing these reforms, policymakers can minimize disruption while gradually transitioning toward a more stable and efficient healthcare financing system.

6. Competitive Care Delivery

Universal healthcare access does not require centralized government control over medical providers. In many of the most effective healthcare systems worldwide, universal coverage exists alongside a diverse network of private, nonprofit, and public healthcare providers. The key distinction lies not in who delivers care, but in whether access to essential services is mediated by financial gatekeeping mechanisms.

The healthcare architecture proposed in this paper preserves competition among providers while removing barriers that restrict access to essential care. By ensuring

universal baseline coverage and stabilizing healthcare financing through a national risk pool, competition can shift away from insurance eligibility restrictions and toward measurable improvements in patient care.

Competitive care delivery encourages innovation, service quality improvements, and operational efficiency when providers compete based on outcomes rather than marketing strategies or network exclusivity.

The following subsections outline the structural components necessary to support effective competition within a universal healthcare framework.

6.1 Provider Market Structure

Under the proposed system, healthcare providers remain independent organizations operating within a competitive marketplace. Hospitals, physician groups, specialty clinics, and integrated health systems may continue to function as private businesses, nonprofit institutions, or public facilities.

Maintaining a mixed provider landscape offers several advantages. Private institutions often drive innovation in treatment techniques and operational efficiency, while nonprofit and public institutions frequently focus on community health priorities and underserved populations.

Allowing multiple types of providers to coexist ensures that healthcare systems remain adaptable to local conditions and patient preferences. However, competition among providers must be structured carefully to avoid incentives that prioritize revenue maximization over patient outcomes.

Universal baseline coverage ensures that providers compete to attract patients based on measurable quality indicators rather than insurance network contracts.

6.2 Eliminating Network Restrictions

One of the most significant barriers to patient choice in many healthcare systems is the widespread use of **insurance provider networks**. Under traditional insurance models,

patients may only receive full coverage when receiving care from providers within their insurer's approved network.

Network restrictions create several problems. Patients may be forced to change physicians when switching insurance plans, lose access to specialists who are not included within their network, or face significant financial penalties for receiving care outside approved facilities.

These restrictions can also disrupt continuity of care, particularly for patients managing chronic conditions or complex treatment plans.

Under the Universal Basic Coverage framework, essential healthcare services are not restricted by insurance networks. Patients may choose among qualified providers without facing financial penalties tied to network membership.

This reform restores the fundamental principle that healthcare decisions should be guided primarily by medical expertise and patient preference rather than insurance contract structures.

6.3 Outcome-Based Competition

Competition in healthcare markets becomes most effective when providers compete based on measurable outcomes rather than service volume.

Outcome-based competition requires the development of standardized metrics that allow patients, policymakers, and healthcare institutions to evaluate provider performance.

These metrics may include:

- procedure success rates
- hospital readmission rates
- complication frequencies
- recovery times
- patient-reported outcome measures
- long-term disease management success

Public reporting of these metrics allows patients to compare providers using transparent information about treatment quality.

Outcome transparency also encourages continuous improvement within healthcare institutions. Providers that consistently demonstrate superior outcomes gain reputational advantages, while those with lower performance face pressure to improve clinical practices.

Research on value-based healthcare systems suggests that outcome transparency can improve care quality while reducing unnecessary treatment variation [23].

6.4 Patient Choice and Care Navigation

Effective competition within healthcare systems depends on the ability of patients to make informed choices about their care providers. However, healthcare decisions are often complex, particularly when patients are dealing with serious illness or unfamiliar medical conditions.

To support informed decision-making, healthcare systems must provide accessible information regarding provider performance, treatment outcomes, and estimated costs.

Public healthcare dashboards can help patients compare providers using standardized indicators such as:

- wait times for appointments
- average treatment costs
- clinical outcome measures
- patient satisfaction scores

These tools allow individuals to navigate healthcare systems more effectively while reducing the informational asymmetry that often exists between patients and healthcare institutions.

Additionally, care coordination services can assist patients with complex medical needs in navigating treatment pathways across multiple providers.

Improving healthcare navigation infrastructure helps ensure that expanded access translates into meaningful improvements in patient outcomes.

6.5 Preventing Provider Consolidation Abuse

While competition can improve healthcare delivery, excessive provider consolidation can produce the opposite effect. Over the past several decades, hospital systems in many regions have undergone significant consolidation through mergers and acquisitions.

Large provider networks may achieve operational efficiencies, but they can also gain substantial bargaining power over insurers and healthcare purchasers. In some cases, this market power has been associated with higher prices without corresponding improvements in quality [24].

To preserve meaningful competition, healthcare policy must include safeguards that prevent excessive consolidation from undermining market dynamics.

Potential safeguards include:

- antitrust enforcement for healthcare mergers
- transparency requirements for hospital pricing structures
- monitoring of regional provider market concentration
- support for independent community clinics and physician practices

By maintaining a diverse provider ecosystem, healthcare systems can encourage innovation while preventing monopolistic pricing behavior.

7. Price Transparency and Outcome Accountability

Healthcare systems cannot function as efficient markets when prices and outcomes remain hidden from the public. In most sectors of the economy, consumers can compare prices and evaluate quality before making purchasing decisions. Healthcare frequently operates under very different conditions. Patients often receive treatment without knowing the cost of services in advance, and outcome data is rarely presented in a form that allows meaningful comparison among providers.

This lack of transparency undermines both consumer choice and institutional accountability. Without clear pricing information, patients cannot evaluate the financial implications of medical decisions. Without measurable outcome data, policymakers and

healthcare purchasers cannot determine which providers consistently deliver high-quality care.

Establishing transparent pricing and outcome reporting systems is therefore essential for creating a healthcare environment in which providers compete based on measurable value rather than opaque billing practices.

7.1 Transparent Pricing Requirements

A foundational step in improving healthcare transparency is the requirement that providers publish standardized prices for common medical services.

Under transparent pricing systems, hospitals and clinics must make publicly available the costs associated with frequently performed procedures and treatment bundles. Examples include diagnostic imaging services, outpatient surgeries, laboratory testing, and routine consultations.

Pricing should be presented in standardized formats that allow patients to easily compare providers. For non-emergency care, patients should be able to view estimated costs before receiving treatment.

Transparent pricing does not eliminate variations in cost between providers. Differences may arise due to location, facility type, staffing structures, or equipment investments. However, visibility into these price differences allows patients and healthcare purchasers to evaluate whether higher prices correspond with improved outcomes or service quality.

Studies examining early price transparency initiatives suggest that visible pricing can reduce extreme cost variation while encouraging providers to compete more actively on value [8].

7.2 Episode-of-Care Cost Reporting

Healthcare costs are often fragmented across multiple billing events, making it difficult for patients to understand the total financial impact of treatment.

For example, a surgical procedure may involve separate charges for physician services, hospital facilities, anesthesia, diagnostic testing, and follow-up care. When these costs are billed independently, patients may receive multiple invoices from different providers weeks or months after treatment.

Episode-of-care cost reporting addresses this issue by aggregating the total cost associated with a medical event or treatment pathway. Instead of presenting isolated service charges, providers publish estimated total costs for complete care episodes.

Examples may include:

- knee replacement surgery including rehabilitation
- childbirth including prenatal and postnatal care
- cardiac treatment pathways following a heart attack

Presenting costs at the episode-of-care level allows patients to evaluate treatment options more realistically while encouraging providers to coordinate care efficiently.

7.3 Public Outcome Dashboards

Transparency must extend beyond pricing to include meaningful information about healthcare outcomes.

Public outcome dashboards can provide accessible information about provider performance across several clinical categories. These dashboards may include indicators such as:

- procedure success rates
- hospital readmission rates
- complication frequencies
- infection control performance
- patient recovery timelines
- patient-reported outcome measures

Presenting this information in a standardized format allows patients to compare providers based on measurable performance rather than reputation alone.

Outcome dashboards also create incentives for healthcare organizations to continuously evaluate and improve their clinical practices. When performance metrics become publicly visible, providers face stronger pressure to address inefficiencies or quality gaps.

Research in healthcare quality measurement suggests that transparent reporting systems can contribute to measurable improvements in patient outcomes over time [25].

7.4 Aligning Payment With Health Outcomes

Traditional healthcare payment systems frequently reward the volume of services delivered rather than the quality of health outcomes achieved.

Fee-for-service reimbursement models increase revenue when providers perform additional procedures or tests. While these services may sometimes be medically necessary, payment systems that prioritize volume can unintentionally encourage overutilization.

Outcome-based payment structures aim to shift incentives toward measurable improvements in patient health.

Under outcome-oriented models, provider compensation may incorporate factors such as:

- long-term disease management success
- reductions in avoidable hospital readmissions
- adherence to evidence-based care protocols
- patient recovery outcomes
- continuity of care across treatment stages

These payment models encourage providers to prioritize preventive care, early intervention, and coordinated treatment strategies that improve long-term patient health.

However, outcome measurement systems must incorporate **risk adjustment mechanisms** to ensure fairness. Providers serving populations with higher baseline health risks should not be penalized for treating more complex cases.

7.5 Preventing Metric Manipulation

Transparency systems must be carefully designed to prevent unintended distortions in provider behavior.

When performance metrics become tied to reimbursement or reputation, organizations may attempt to optimize reported results rather than improve underlying care quality. Examples may include avoiding high-risk patients, redefining reporting criteria, or focusing narrowly on measured indicators at the expense of broader patient care.

Effective oversight mechanisms are therefore necessary to ensure that transparency systems promote genuine quality improvement.

These safeguards may include:

- independent auditing of reported outcome data
- standardized reporting methodologies
- risk-adjusted performance comparisons
- whistleblower protections for healthcare staff

By combining transparent reporting with appropriate oversight structures, healthcare systems can ensure that performance metrics serve as tools for genuine accountability rather than administrative targets.

8. Pharmaceutical Innovation and Pricing Reform

Pharmaceutical innovation is one of the most important drivers of modern medical progress. Advances in drug development have significantly improved survival rates for conditions such as infectious disease, cardiovascular illness, autoimmune disorders, and many forms of cancer. These breakthroughs depend on extensive scientific research, complex clinical trials, and large financial investments. The pharmaceutical development process often requires more than a decade of work before a medication reaches patients.

Despite the importance of pharmaceutical innovation, the pricing structures governing pharmaceutical markets can create serious access challenges. Patent protections grant pharmaceutical companies temporary market exclusivity so they can recover research and

development investments. While this system encourages innovation, it can also allow life saving medications to be priced at levels that prevent patients from accessing treatment.

Healthcare systems must therefore balance two objectives. The first objective is maintaining incentives for pharmaceutical innovation. The second objective is ensuring that essential medications remain accessible to patients who need them.

The reform framework proposed in this paper seeks to maintain innovation incentives while preventing patent monopolies from creating barriers to essential medical treatment.

8.1 Patent Incentives and Market Exclusivity

Patent protections play a central role in pharmaceutical innovation. When a company develops a new medication, patent laws grant the manufacturer temporary exclusive rights to produce and sell that drug. These protections allow companies to recover the costs associated with research, development, regulatory approval, and clinical trials.

Drug development is an expensive and uncertain process. Many compounds fail during early research phases or clinical trials. The medications that ultimately reach the market must therefore generate sufficient revenue to offset these risks.

However, patent protections can also lead to situations where medications remain expensive long after the original development costs have been recovered. In some cases pharmaceutical companies extend their exclusivity periods through minor modifications or additional patents related to delivery methods or formulation changes. This practice is commonly referred to as patent extension or evergreening.

These strategies delay the introduction of generic competition and allow manufacturers to maintain elevated prices for longer periods of time.

International comparisons show that prescription drug prices in the United States are substantially higher than prices in many other developed nations, even for the same medications [10]. This difference reflects structural features of pharmaceutical purchasing systems rather than differences in manufacturing costs.

Effective healthcare reform must therefore include mechanisms that prevent patent protections from being used in ways that restrict access to essential treatments.

8.2 National Price Negotiation for Essential Medications

Centralized price negotiation represents one approach to addressing pharmaceutical pricing challenges. Under this model, healthcare authorities negotiate directly with pharmaceutical manufacturers to determine fair prices for medications included in essential healthcare coverage.

Price negotiations consider several factors. These include the clinical effectiveness of the medication, the availability of alternative treatments, the cost of research and development, and the long term cost savings that may result from effective treatment.

Countries that use national drug negotiation systems typically obtain lower pharmaceutical prices than countries with fragmented purchasing systems. Large purchasing pools allow governments or national health authorities to negotiate more effectively with pharmaceutical manufacturers [21].

Negotiated pricing does not eliminate pharmaceutical profits. Instead, it establishes price ranges that reflect both the value of medical innovation and the need for broad patient access.

When medications are included in Universal Basic Coverage, negotiated pricing ensures that essential treatments remain financially sustainable for the healthcare system.

8.3 Public Research and Public Access Rights

A substantial portion of pharmaceutical research is supported by public funding. Government research agencies, universities, and publicly funded laboratories frequently contribute to the early stages of drug discovery.

Public investment plays a critical role in identifying promising biological targets, conducting early stage research, and supporting the scientific infrastructure necessary for medical innovation. In many cases private pharmaceutical companies build upon discoveries that originated within publicly funded research institutions.

When public funding contributes significantly to the development of new medications, policymakers may consider mechanisms that ensure the public retains some access rights to the resulting treatments.

These rights may include pricing conditions, licensing provisions, or the ability to authorize additional manufacturing if a medication becomes inaccessible due to excessive pricing.

Ensuring that publicly funded research contributes to accessible treatments aligns pharmaceutical incentives with broader public health goals.

8.4 Compulsory Licensing Safeguards

International intellectual property agreements recognize that governments may need to intervene when essential medications become inaccessible due to pricing barriers.

Compulsory licensing provisions allow governments to authorize the production of patented medications by additional manufacturers while paying royalty compensation to the patent holder. This mechanism is permitted under the World Trade Organization Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights.

Compulsory licensing is typically used only in situations where public health access is threatened and negotiations with patent holders fail to produce acceptable pricing arrangements.

The existence of compulsory licensing authority can also strengthen government negotiating power. Pharmaceutical manufacturers may be more willing to agree to reasonable pricing when alternative production pathways are legally available.

Compulsory licensing should therefore be viewed as a safeguard that ensures access to essential medications rather than as a routine intervention in pharmaceutical markets.

8.5 Balancing Innovation and Access

Healthcare systems must carefully balance the need for continued pharmaceutical innovation with the moral imperative of ensuring access to life saving medications.

Excessively restrictive patent protections can produce pricing structures that undermine public health. At the same time, eliminating intellectual property protections entirely could reduce the incentives necessary to support long term pharmaceutical research.

A balanced policy approach includes negotiated pricing for essential medications, public access protections for publicly funded research, and compulsory licensing safeguards for situations where negotiations fail.

Together these mechanisms preserve incentives for medical innovation while ensuring that essential medications remain accessible to the patients who depend on them.

No healthcare system can achieve equitable outcomes if life saving treatments exist but remain inaccessible due to pricing barriers. Effective pharmaceutical policy must therefore align innovation incentives with the broader objective of protecting public health.

9. Administrative Efficiency and AI Integration

Administrative complexity represents one of the largest sources of inefficiency in modern healthcare systems. Billing systems, insurance verification procedures, prior authorization requirements, and coding standards require significant administrative labor from both healthcare providers and insurance organizations. These processes consume resources that could otherwise be directed toward clinical care.

In the United States, administrative spending represents a significantly larger share of healthcare expenditures than in many other developed nations with simpler financing systems [7]. Hospitals and clinics maintain large administrative teams dedicated to navigating insurance rules, billing structures, and reimbursement documentation.

This administrative burden also affects clinicians directly. Physicians and nurses frequently report spending substantial time on documentation tasks related to billing and compliance rather than patient care. Studies of physician work patterns indicate that administrative responsibilities contribute significantly to professional burnout and reduced patient interaction time.

Reducing unnecessary administrative complexity therefore represents one of the most direct ways to improve healthcare efficiency while expanding clinical capacity.

9.1 Administrative Simplification

Universal Basic Coverage and a unified risk pool create opportunities to streamline many of the administrative functions currently required by fragmented insurance markets.

When coverage eligibility is standardized across the population, providers no longer need to verify multiple insurance plans or determine network restrictions before delivering care. Standardized reimbursement frameworks also reduce the complexity associated with billing procedures.

Administrative simplification can reduce duplicative staffing requirements across hospitals, insurance companies, and healthcare intermediaries. Resources previously devoted to claims management and eligibility verification can instead support direct patient services.

Healthcare systems that rely on unified coverage frameworks often demonstrate lower administrative spending and simpler reimbursement processes compared with systems based on multiple competing insurance pools [13].

9.2 Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare Administration

Advances in artificial intelligence and data systems provide additional opportunities to modernize healthcare administration.

AI systems can assist with tasks such as appointment scheduling, patient intake documentation, billing verification, and claims processing. Automated systems can analyze medical records to ensure that documentation requirements are satisfied while reducing the time clinicians spend entering repetitive information.

AI tools may also assist with fraud detection by identifying unusual billing patterns or statistical anomalies within healthcare claims data. Early detection of fraudulent activity protects healthcare system resources while reducing investigative delays.

These technologies should be implemented carefully to ensure that automation improves clinical efficiency without introducing new risks related to privacy, algorithmic bias, or system security.

When used appropriately, administrative automation allows healthcare professionals to devote more time to patient care rather than bureaucratic processes.

9.3 Supporting Clinical Decision Systems

Artificial intelligence systems may also assist clinicians in interpreting diagnostic information and identifying potential treatment pathways. Decision support systems can analyze large datasets, clinical research findings, and patient records to provide evidence based recommendations.

These systems do not replace medical professionals. Instead, they function as analytical tools that assist clinicians in evaluating complex medical information. Decision support systems may help identify rare conditions, highlight potential medication interactions, or recommend diagnostic tests based on symptom patterns.

Properly implemented AI systems therefore strengthen clinical decision making while preserving the authority of healthcare professionals.

9.4 Safeguards and Oversight

The integration of advanced data systems into healthcare administration requires strong safeguards to protect patient privacy and ensure responsible use of technology.

Healthcare data systems must comply with strict privacy standards that prevent unauthorized access to personal medical information. Independent oversight bodies should monitor algorithmic systems to ensure that automated processes do not introduce discriminatory outcomes or compromise clinical decision making.

Transparency requirements can also ensure that automated systems remain accountable. Healthcare providers and regulators must understand how algorithmic recommendations are generated so that errors can be identified and corrected.

Technology should support healthcare delivery, not replace human judgment. Maintaining this principle ensures that innovation strengthens the healthcare system while preserving patient trust.

10. Governance, Accountability, and Anti Capture Safeguards

Healthcare systems involve complex interactions among providers, insurers, pharmaceutical manufacturers, government agencies, and regulatory bodies. These institutions collectively shape how healthcare resources are distributed and how policies evolve over time.

Without strong governance safeguards, healthcare policy can become vulnerable to regulatory capture. Regulatory capture occurs when industry stakeholders exert disproportionate influence over policy decisions in ways that prioritize private interests over public welfare.

Healthcare reform must therefore include structural safeguards that maintain transparency and accountability within policy making processes.

10.1 Transparency in Healthcare Governance

Transparent governance structures allow the public to evaluate how healthcare policies are developed and implemented.

Policy makers and regulatory officials should disclose potential conflicts of interest when participating in healthcare decision making. Advisory boards responsible for evaluating drug pricing, hospital regulation, or reimbursement policies should include independent experts who do not have financial relationships with regulated industries.

Public reporting of healthcare system performance can also strengthen accountability. Data regarding treatment outcomes, spending patterns, and access metrics should be accessible to both policymakers and the general public.

Transparency reduces the likelihood that policy decisions will be shaped primarily by narrow industry interests.

10.2 Independent Oversight Institutions

Effective healthcare governance benefits from the presence of independent oversight institutions capable of evaluating policy implementation and investigating potential abuses.

Oversight bodies may conduct audits of healthcare spending, review pharmaceutical pricing agreements, and monitor provider performance data. These institutions should operate with sufficient independence to ensure that their findings remain credible and resistant to political pressure.

Independent review mechanisms can also strengthen public trust in healthcare reforms by demonstrating that performance claims are subject to verification.

10.3 Whistleblower Protections

Employees working within healthcare institutions are often best positioned to identify unethical practices, billing fraud, or patient safety concerns. Whistleblower protections encourage individuals to report misconduct without fear of retaliation.

Strong whistleblower protections include confidential reporting mechanisms, legal safeguards against retaliation, and independent investigation procedures.

Encouraging internal accountability within healthcare institutions strengthens ethical standards and reduces the likelihood that harmful practices will persist undetected.

11. Implementation Strategy

Transitioning to a new healthcare architecture requires careful planning and phased implementation. Large scale policy reforms must balance the need for structural change with the practical realities of existing institutions.

A phased implementation strategy allows policymakers to introduce reforms gradually while monitoring their effects on healthcare access, provider behavior, and financial stability.

11.1 Phase One: Transparency and Administrative Reform

The first phase of implementation focuses on measures that improve system transparency and reduce administrative complexity.

Key steps include mandatory price transparency requirements, standardized billing frameworks, and the introduction of administrative automation systems. These reforms can reduce inefficiencies and provide clearer information regarding healthcare costs and outcomes.

Because these measures do not immediately restructure insurance markets, they can be implemented relatively quickly while preparing the system for broader reforms.

11.2 Phase Two: Universal Basic Coverage Introduction

The second phase introduces Universal Basic Coverage for essential healthcare services.

Coverage guarantees are expanded to ensure that all individuals have access to essential care. Employer healthcare spending contributions are gradually integrated into the national healthcare financing pool, allowing the system to transition away from fragmented insurance structures.

During this phase supplemental insurance markets remain available for non essential services.

11.3 Phase Three: Outcome Based Payment Models

Once universal coverage is established, reimbursement systems can gradually transition from fee for service models toward outcome based payment structures.

Healthcare providers begin receiving compensation tied to measurable improvements in patient outcomes, prevention of complications, and long term disease management.

This phase encourages healthcare institutions to redesign care delivery systems around prevention and coordinated treatment.

11.4 Phase Four: Continuous Evaluation and Adjustment

Healthcare systems must remain adaptable as new technologies, treatments, and population health challenges emerge.

Regular evaluation of system performance allows policymakers to adjust financing structures, treatment guidelines, and regulatory frameworks as needed. Continuous improvement mechanisms ensure that healthcare reforms remain responsive to changing conditions.

12. Conclusion

Modern healthcare systems possess extraordinary scientific capabilities. Advances in medicine have made it possible to treat diseases that were once considered fatal, extend life expectancy, and improve quality of life for millions of people.

However, technological capability alone does not guarantee equitable healthcare outcomes. Institutional structures determine whether medical innovation translates into accessible treatment for the population as a whole.

The healthcare reform framework presented in this paper seeks to address the structural drivers of inefficiency and inequality within modern healthcare systems. By establishing Universal Basic Coverage, stabilizing financing through a national risk pool, preserving competition among providers, and increasing transparency in pricing and outcomes, the system can better align financial incentives with public health objectives.

Additional reforms in pharmaceutical pricing, administrative efficiency, and governance safeguards strengthen the long term sustainability of the healthcare system.

The central principle guiding these reforms is simple. Essential healthcare should be accessible to every individual, and healthcare institutions should be rewarded for improving long term patient health rather than maximizing procedural volume.

When incentives align with patient outcomes and public accountability, healthcare systems can deliver both innovation and accessibility while maintaining financial sustainability.

References

[1] OECD. *Health at a Glance 2023: OECD Indicators*.

<https://www.oecd.org/health/health-at-a-glance/>

[2] Papanicolas, I., Woskie, L. R., & Jha, A. K. (2018). *Health Care Spending in the United States and Other High-Income Countries*. Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA).

<https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2674671>

[3] The Commonwealth Fund. *Mirror, Mirror 2021: Reflecting Poorly on the U.S. Health Care System*.

<https://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/fund-reports/2021/aug/mirror-mirror-2021-reflecting-poorly>

[4] Berwick, D. M., & Hackbarth, A. D. (2012). *Eliminating Waste in U.S. Health Care*. JAMA.

<https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/1148376>

[5] Shrank, W. H., Rogstad, T. L., & Parekh, N. (2019). *Waste in the U.S. Health Care System: Estimated Costs and Potential for Savings*. JAMA.

<https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2752664>

[6] Kaiser Family Foundation. *Delayed or Forgone Care Because of Cost in the United States*.

<https://www.kff.org/health-costs/issue-brief/delayed-or-forgone-care-due-to-cost/>

[7] Himmelstein, D. U., Jun, M., Busse, R., et al. (2020). *A Comparison of Hospital Administrative Costs in Eight Nations*. *Annals of Internal Medicine*.

<https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/M19-2818>

[8] Sinaiko, A. D., & Rosenthal, M. B. (2011). *Increased Price Transparency in Health Care: Challenges and Potential Effects*. *Health Affairs*.

<https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/10.1377/hlthaff.2011.0960>

[9] American Medical Association. *2022 AMA Prior Authorization Physician Survey*.

<https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/prior-authorization/prior-authorization-research>

[10] Kesselheim, A. S., Avorn, J., & Sarpatwari, A. (2016). *The High Cost of Prescription Drugs in the United States*. JAMA.

<https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2512202>

[11] National Institute of Mental Health. *Mental Illness Statistics*.

<https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/statistics/mental-illness>

[12] World Health Organization. *Universal Health Coverage Global Monitoring Report*.

<https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240040618>

[13] OECD. *Risk Pooling and Health System Financing*.

<https://www.oecd.org/health/health-systems/>

[14] Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. *Value-Based Care and Payment Models*.

<https://www.cms.gov/priorities/innovation/key-concepts/value-based-care>

[15] Commonwealth Fund. *International Health Care System Profiles*.

<https://www.commonwealthfund.org/international-health-policy-center/system-profiles>

[16] Cutler, D. M. (2020). *The Quality Cure: How Focusing on Health Care Quality Can Save Your Life and Lower Spending*.

<https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/Q/bo37748365.html>

[17] Sommers, B. D., et al. (2017). *Three-Year Impacts of the Affordable Care Act: Improved Medical Care and Health Among Low-Income Adults*. New England Journal of Medicine.

<https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMsa1612893>

[18] Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. *The Concentration of Healthcare Spending*.

<https://www.ahrq.gov/research/findings/factsheets/costs/expriach/index.html>

[19] Thomasson, M. A. (2003). *The Importance of Group Coverage: How Tax Policy Shaped U.S. Health Insurance*. American Economic Review.

<https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/000282803769206331>

[20] National Institutes of Health. *NIH Contributions to Pharmaceutical Innovation*.

<https://www.nih.gov/research-training/medical-research-initiatives>

[21] OECD. *Pharmaceutical Pricing Policies in a Global Market*.

<https://www.oecd.org/health/pharmaceutical-pricing-policies.htm>

[22] World Trade Organization. *TRIPS Agreement and Public Health (Compulsory Licensing)*.

https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/trips_e/public_health_faq_e.htm

[23] Porter, M. E., & Teisberg, E. O. (2006). *Redefining Health Care: Creating Value-Based Competition on Results*.

<https://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Pages/item.aspx?num=24104>

[24] Gaynor, M., Ho, K., & Town, R. (2015). *The Industrial Organization of Health Care Markets*. Journal of Economic Literature.

<https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/jel.53.2.235>

[25] Fung, C. H., Lim, Y. W., Mattke, S., Damberg, C., & Shekelle, P. (2008). *Systematic Review: The Evidence That Publishing Patient Care Performance Data Improves Quality of Care*. Annals of Internal Medicine.

<https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/0003-4819-148-2-200801150-00006>

