

# Cost Sharing Lowers Medicare Mammogram Rates

BY DEBRA L. BECK  
Contributing Writer

TORONTO — Copayments exceeding \$10 or coinsurance of more than 10% is associated with lower rates of breast cancer screening, Dr. Amal Trivedi said at the annual meeting of the Society of General Internal Medicine.

Across all study years, rates of breast cancer screening were 77.5% in plans with full coverage, compared with 69.2% in plans with cost sharing.

Differences in screening rates between full coverage and cost-sharing plans ranged from 8% to 11% during each year.

The negative effect of cost sharing on mammography rates was significantly

**'Relatively small copayments for mammography are associated with significantly lower biennial mammography rates' in women who should be screened.**

greater for enrollees residing in less-affluent and less-educated areas and for enrollees with Medicaid eligibility (*P* less than .001).

"Cost sharing disproportionately affects vulnerable populations, and its prevalence is dra-

matically increasing in Medicare managed care," said Dr. Trivedi, of Brown University, Providence, R.I.

"Cost sharing should be tailored to the underlying value of the health service," he said. "Eliminating copayments may increase adherence to appropriate preventive care."

Asked somewhat facetiously whether he thought perhaps patients should be paid to get regular mammograms, Dr. Trivedi conceded that was unlikely to happen.

"But we do need to remove barriers to regular screening," he said. "Copayments reduce [the] moral hazard to 'overconsume' health care with full insurance, but they may also reduce use of appropriate preventive care."

Dr. Trivedi's abstract was a Hamolsky Junior Faculty Research Award finalist, a designation given to the top-rated abstracts submitted for presentation at the meeting.

The investigators reviewed mammography coverage for 366,475 women aged 65-69 years enrolled in 174 health plans in 2001-2004. They examined rates of biennial breast cancer screening in plans requiring a copayment of more than \$10 or more than 10% coinsurance for mammography, and compared them with screening rates in plans with full coverage for this service.

They also looked at whether the impact of copayments or coinsurance varied by income, education, Medicaid eligibility, or race. Finally, they looked at the change in mammography rates of seven health plans that instituted cost sharing in 2003, compared with a control group of plans with continuous participation in Medicare from 2002 through 2004 that did not institute cost sharing.

The number of Medicare plans with cost sharing for mammography increased from 3 in 2001 (representing 0.5% of women in the study) to 21 in 2004 (11.4% of women).

The median copayment was \$20 (range \$13-\$35). Five plans charged 20% coinsurance.

In multivariate analyses, the presence of cost sharing was associated with a 7.2% lower adjusted rate of screening (*P* less than .001), an effect that was greater in

magnitude than any other plan-level covariate in the model.

When they looked only at the seven plans that instituted cost sharing in 2003, adjusted rates dropped 5.5% in 2004 from 2002 levels, compared with a 3.4% increase in utilization in 14 control plans that retained full coverage.

"Relatively small copayments for mammography are associated with significantly lower biennial mammography rates among women who should receive breast

cancer screening according to accepted clinical guidelines," Dr. Trivedi concluded. "For important preventive services such as mammography, exempting the elderly from cost sharing may be warranted."

In his discussion of the study's limitations, Dr. Trivedi noted that the investigators were unable to analyze differential impacts of specific copayment amounts. They also used zip-code proxies, a fairly blunt instrument to measure socioeconomic status and education. ■

## Enter the REINVENTING YOUR PRACTICE Contest

Have you discovered new ways to improve patient care?

INTERNAL MEDICINE NEWS wants to hear from you if you've done something innovative to make your office practice more clinically effective, patient friendly, and efficient. We'll recognize up to six contestants whose ideas are selected by Dr. Bill Golden, Dr. Faith Fitzgerald, and other editorial board members. We'll feature the winning entries in future issues, and award a pocket-size, high-capacity (6- to 8-MP) digital camera to each of the winning physicians.



Here's a partial list of topics for improving patient care:

- Conducting effective patient interviews when you are pressed for time.
- Improving your diagnostic acumen by close observation of patients, noting clues such as a hoarse or deepened voice (hypothyroidism?), loose clothing (weight loss?), loss of associated movement or other subtle changes in walking (early Parkinson's disease?).
- Helping patients overcome cultural or socioeconomic barriers to treatment adherence.
- Using family, friends, and social agencies to help patients achieve therapeutic success.
- Providing effective group visits and redefining team-based care.
- Implementing effective process changes.
- Using patient survey data or patient information from other sites.
- Making effective use of information technology and quality measurement in the office.
- Using an innovative approach to managing a clinical condition.
- Making each patient feel important in a busy office.
- Communicating effectively when breaking bad news.
- Ending a short visit with an anxious patient in a positive way.
- Abandoning clinical approaches that don't work in actual practice.
- Doing something else to make patient visits truly therapeutic.

To enter the contest, write a brief description (300 words or less) of something you're doing to improve patient care. Send your entry, including telephone number, to:

**E-mail:** imnews@elsevier.com  
**Mail:** Reinventing Your Practice  
INTERNAL MEDICINE NEWS  
5635 Fishers Lane, Suite 6000  
Rockville, MD 20852  
**Fax:** 240-221-2548

Responses must be sent by July 1, 2007. Multiple submissions are permitted. The contest judges will select the most valuable ideas; all decisions are final. Starting in the fall, watch for the winning entries in **INTERNAL MEDICINE NEWS**; other submissions may appear in later issues.