

International Comparison of Selective Contracting with Hospitals



האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים
THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM

Devorah Gold
Gabrielle Foreman
Dr. Shuli Brammli-Greenberg

Background Healthcare systems limit patients to contracted hospitals to cut costs, causing competition to focus on price rather than quality. Many countries have moved from strict contracts to broader patient choice to address this issue. Recently, Israel too has reevaluated regulation of selective contracting of hospital care.











Aims

Compare models of selective contracting, analyze impact of patient choice reforms and identify characteristics that can be adopted in Israel.

Methods

Literature review of articles from 1990-present using a search protocol on Google Scholar and PubMed. In addition, relevant reports from the OECD European-Observatory were included.

Patient Choice by Country

										
	Israel	Netherlands	Germany	Switzerland	England	Portugal	Norway	Czech Republic	Slovenia	Denmark
Hospital Choice	HMO dependent	Insurer dependent	Insurer dependent	Insurer dependent	Full choice	Full choice	Full choice	Full choice	Public providers	Public providers*
Fixed Pricing	PRG and PD	Insurer dependent	DRG	According to canton	HRG	Global budget	DRG and Block Grants	Global budget with DRG	DRG	DRG
Types of Limitations	Geographic & specialization level	Insurer dependent	None	Canton list	None	None	Specialization Level	None	Specialization level	Specialization level

*If waiting time guarantee is exceeded, patients receive full choice of hospital










Results

- Under fixed prices, increased patient choice can drive competition, improving quality of care¹ and patient trust².
- More advantaged patients choose higher quality hospitals, widening health disparities.³⁻⁶
- Tools such as hospital quality information websites and national appointment booking systems can increase transparency.

Recommendations

- Increasing patient choice can promote hospital competition and increase patient trust.
- Realistic fixed payments for performance and increased transparency can ensure this positive correlation.

Examples of tools to increase transparency

	Limitations on Patient Choice	Public Access to Quality Indicators	National Booking System
	Removed in Patient Choice Reform, 2008	NHS Choices 	E-Referral 
	Depends on Insurer	Weisse Liste 	X
	Depends on Insurer	FOPH website 	Government website
	Depends on Insurer	Zorg Domein 	X

References:

- Siciliani et al. Does provider competition improve health care quality and efficiency?. 2022; Available from: www.euro.who.int
- Gravelle et al. Does a hospital's quality depend on the quality of other hospitals? Reg Sci Urban Econ. 2014;49.
- Dixon et al. The experience of implementing choice at point of referral: A comparison of the Netherlands and England. Health Econ Policy Law. 2010;5(3).

- Reibling & Wendt. Gatekeeping and provider choice in OECD healthcare systems. Current Sociology. 2012;60(4).
- Vrangbaek et al. Choice policies in Northern European health systems. Health Econ Policy Law. 2012;7(1).
- Aggarwal et al. Patient Mobility for Elective Secondary Health Care Services. Vol. 74, Medical Care Research and Review. 2017.