
Competition and Quality in Health Care Markets

Competition and Quality in Health Care Markets

Martin Gaynor

*H. John Heinz III School of Public Policy and
Management, Carnegie Mellon University and
National Bureau of Economic Research,
Leverhulme Centre for Market and Public Organisation
University of Bristol UK
mgaynor@cmu.edu*

now

the essence of **knowledge**

Boston – Delft

Foundations and Trends[®] in Microeconomics

Published, sold and distributed by:

now Publishers Inc.
PO Box 1024
Hanover, MA 02339
USA
Tel. +1-781-985-4510
www.nowpublishers.com
sales@nowpublishers.com

Outside North America:

now Publishers Inc.
PO Box 179
2600 AD Delft
The Netherlands
Tel. +31-6-51115274

The preferred citation for this publication is M. Gaynor, Competition and Quality in Health Care Markets, Foundations and Trends[®] in Microeconomics, vol 2, no 6, pp 441–508, 2006

Printed on acid-free paper

ISBN: 978-1-60198-007-6
© 2006 M. Gaynor

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publishers.

Photocopying. In the USA: This journal is registered at the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by now Publishers Inc for users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC). The 'services' for users can be found on the internet at: www.copyright.com

For those organizations that have been granted a photocopy license, a separate system of payment has been arranged. Authorization does not extend to other kinds of copying, such as that for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for creating new collective works, or for resale. In the rest of the world: Permission to photocopy must be obtained from the copyright owner. Please apply to now Publishers Inc., PO Box 1024, Hanover, MA 02339, USA; Tel. +1 781 871 0245; www.nowpublishers.com; sales@nowpublishers.com

now Publishers Inc. has an exclusive license to publish this material worldwide. Permission to use this content must be obtained from the copyright license holder. Please apply to now Publishers, PO Box 179, 2600 AD Delft, The Netherlands, www.nowpublishers.com; e-mail: sales@nowpublishers.com

**Foundations and Trends[®] in
Microeconomics**
Volume 2 Issue 6, 2006
Editorial Board

Editor-in-Chief:

W. Kip Viscusi

Vanderbilt University

Editors

Richard Carson, UC San Diego (environmental economics)

Joseph Harrington, Johns Hopkins University (industrial organization)

Tom Kniesner, Syracuse University (labor economics)

Mark V. Pauly, University of Pennsylvania (health economics)

David Wildasin, University of Kentucky (public economics)

Peter Zweifel, University of Zurich (insurance economics)

Editorial Scope

Foundations and Trends[®] in Microeconomics will publish survey and tutorial articles in the following topics:

- Environmental Economics
- Contingent Valuation
- Environmental Health Risks
- Climate Change
- Endangered Species
- Market-based Policy Instruments
- Health Economics
- Moral Hazard
- Medical Care Markets
- Medical Malpractice
- Insurance economics
- Industrial Organization
- Theory of the Firm
- Regulatory Economics
- Market Structure
- Auctions
- Monopolies and Antitrust
- Transaction Cost Economics
- Labor Economics
- Labor Supply
- Labor Demand
- Labor Market Institutions
- Search Theory
- Wage Structure
- Income Distribution
- Race and Gender
- Law and Economics
- Models of Litigation
- Crime
- Torts, Contracts and Property
- Constitutional Law
- Public Economics
- Public Goods
- Environmental Taxation
- Social Insurance
- Public Finance
- International Taxation

Information for Librarians

Foundations and Trends[®] in Microeconomics, 2006, Volume 2, 5 issues. ISSN paper version 1547-9846. ISSN online version 1547-9854. Also available as a combined paper and online subscription.

Foundations and Trends[®] in
Microeconomics
Vol. 2, No 6 (2006) 441–508
© 2006 M. Gaynor
DOI: 10-1561/07000000024



Competition and Quality in Health Care Markets

Martin Gaynor

H. John Heinz III School of Public Policy and Management, Carnegie Mellon University and National Bureau of Economic Research, Leverhulme Centre for Market and Public Organisation, University of Bristol UK, mgaynor@cmu.edu

Abstract

The goal of this paper is to identify key issues concerning the nature of competition in health care markets and its impacts on quality and social welfare and to identify pertinent findings from the theoretical and empirical literature on this topic. The theoretical literature in economics on competition and quality, the theoretical literature in health economics on this topic, and the empirical findings on competition and quality in health care markets are surveyed and their findings assessed. Theory is clear that competition increases quality and improves consumer welfare when prices are regulated (for prices above marginal cost), although the impacts on social welfare are ambiguous. When firms set both price and quality, both the positive and normative impacts of competition are ambiguous. The body of empirical work in this area is growing rapidly. At present it consists entirely of work on hospital markets. The bulk of the empirical evidence for Medicare patients shows that quality is higher in more competitive markets. The empirical results for privately insured patients are mixed across studies.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Performance Standards	7
3	What Do We Know From Economic Theory?	9
3.1	Models	10
3.2	Prices Set by Firms	10
3.3	Regulated Prices	21
3.4	Models with both Product Quality and Variety	25
4	What Do We Know From Econometric Studies?	29
4.1	Studies with Regulated Prices	32
4.2	Studies with Prices Set by Firms	42
5	Summary and Conclusions	59
	Acknowledgements	63
	References	65

1

Introduction

One of the most important industries in the U.S. economy is health care, accounting for nearly two trillion dollars in expenditure annually (Smith *et al.*, 2006). Markets play an important role in the delivery and financing of health care in the United States. As a consequence, antitrust enforcement is a significant component of health care policy. This industry is also one in which competition is a real issue, given the extensive consolidation that has occurred in recent years (Gaynor and Haas-Wilson, 1999).

During the second half of the 1990s, a dramatic wave of hospital consolidation occurred in the United States. One source puts the total number of hospital mergers from 1994–2000 at over 900 deals (Jaklevic, 2002, and www.levinassociates.com), on a base of approximately 6,100 hospitals. Further, many local markets, including quite a few large cities such as Boston, Minneapolis, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and San Francisco (and others), have come to be dominated by two to three large hospital systems. Not surprisingly, many health plans have complained about rising prices as a result of these consolidations (Lesser and Ginsburg, 2001).

2 Introduction

Table 1.1 Hospital market concentration, 1985–2000^a

Year	Median HHI ^b	Change ^c	Mean HHI	Change
1985	3,028	–	3,483	–
1990	3,112	84	3,665	182
1995	3,353	241	3,991	326
2000	3,995	642	4,391	400

^aSource: American hospital association. Data are for all U.S. Metropolitan Statistical Areas.

^bHerfindahl–Hirschmann Index.

^cTotal change over the previous five years.

Table 1.1 provides statistics on concentration in hospital markets at five year intervals over the period 1985–2000.¹ The table shows that the Herfindahl–Hirschmann Index (HHI)² for U.S. hospitals has been steadily increasing over time. In particular, the median HHI increased from 3,028 in 1985 to 3,995 in 2000. This is an increase of almost 1,000 points on a very large base. An HHI of 3,000 indicates a very concentrated market – for example, a market with three equally sized firms will have an HHI close to this value (3,333). The FTC and DOJ consider markets with an HHI above 1,800 as highly concentrated.³ For highly concentrated markets such as these, the enforcement agencies consider any increase in the HHI of 100 points or more as presumptively anticompetitive (Federal Trade Commission and Department of Justice, 1992). The increase in median concentration from 1985 to 2000 is far greater than that threshold.

Hospital markets have been an active area of antitrust enforcement. Since 1984, the federal antitrust authorities have brought 11 suits seeking to block hospital mergers, and engaged in many other activities combating anticompetitive practices.⁴ The major emphasis in these

¹These data are for metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) only. This represents the vast majority of the population and hospitals in the United States.

²The HHI is defined as the sum of firms' squared market shares, $HHI = \sum_{i=1}^N s_i^2$, where s_i is firm i 's market share, and N is the number of firms. The HHI increases as the number of firms decreases or asymmetry of market shares increases. It has a maximum of 10,000 for a monopoly and has a minimum at $10,000/N$, where the market is divided equally between N firms.

³Markets with an HHI below 1,000 are considered unconcentrated, and those with an HHI between 1,000 and 1,800 are designated as moderately concentrated (Federal Trade Commission and Department of Justice, 1992). In practice, concentration levels higher than the cutoffs in the Guidelines are often tolerated (see Federal Trade Commission, 2004).

⁴See <http://www.ftc.gov/> and <http://www.usdoj.gov/> for detailed information.

cases has been effects on price. A major concern in health care, however, is effects on quality.⁵

Quality is of major concern in health care for a number of reasons. First, the effect of health care quality on an individual's well-being can be very great, and often will be more important than the quality of other goods or services. Second, due to the pervasive presence of insurance against health care expenditures, health care consumers are not exposed to the full expense associated with their health care decisions. Thus, in the presence of a reduced role for price, quality looms larger in consumer choice, and serves as an important rationing device. In the case of beneficiaries of the U.S. Medicare program,⁶ price is irrelevant for choice. Medicare pays hospitals and doctors fixed prices for their services,⁷ thus a Medicare beneficiary pays the same amount regardless of where she obtains service. Thus, for Medicare in particular, we would expect quality to be salient.⁸

This is not to say that price is not important. Most people with health insurance in the United States have some form of managed care insurance (Gabel *et al.*, 2000). One of the defining features of managed care is restriction of consumer choice. Plan enrollees are allowed to choose from a pre-approved subset of doctors and hospitals in their area – not all doctors or hospitals. Managed care plans thus bargain with doctors and hospitals over prices. Hospitals or doctors with prices that are too high will be excluded. In principle, managed care plans are acting as agents for consumers. Consumers want to reduce the price of care, since higher prices result in higher premiums and lower consumption of other goods.

However, quality is obviously important as well as price. Indeed, many health care analysts have identified quality problems as a major failing of the U.S. health care system (Kohn *et al.*, 1999, Institute of Medicine, 2001). The problems identified by the Institute of Medicine

⁵Of course health care is not the only industry where effects on quality are important – it is, however, particularly salient here.

⁶Mostly those over age 65, but also some disabled individuals, notably those with end-stage renal disease (kidney failure).

⁷Prices are regulated to be the same for a given service in a given location at a particular point in time. Regulated prices for a particular service vary by location and over time.

⁸This will also be true for in many European health systems.

4 Introduction

(2001) include “overuse,” “underuse,” and “misuse” of health care. Overuse includes phenomena such as performance of major surgery (e.g., hysterectomy, heart surgery) without appropriate reasons, and the use of antibiotics where they are ineffective, such as for viral infections. Underuse is the failure of patients to receive acknowledged appropriate treatment for their conditions, such as the failure of 79% of heart attack patients to receive β -blockers within 90 days of discharge. Misuse refers to medical errors. Kohn *et al.* (1999) estimate that as many as 98,000 people per year die due to medical errors. According to the Institute of Medicine (2001) all of these kinds of problems are common in U.S. health care.

In addition, a recent study (Banks *et al.*, 2006) found that “the U.S. population in late middle age is less healthy than the equivalent British population for diabetes, hypertension, heart disease, myocardial infarction, stroke, lung disease, and cancer.” Standard risk factors, such as smoking, drinking, obesity, and socioeconomic status do little to explain the health differences between the U.S. and U.K., implying that quality of care may be a factor behind these differences.

Antitrust is important for health care quality, since health care quality is determined via markets.⁹ The courts and the antitrust enforcement agencies have not dealt with quality in a uniform manner, however. In some antitrust cases, impacts on quality have been explicitly considered. In many cases, however, it has been simply presumed that price competition will lead to beneficial effects on quality.¹⁰

In this paper, I review the state of knowledge in economics on issues relevant to the assessment of the impact of competition in health care markets on quality. This is relevant for antitrust policy in the United States, where there are well-established health care markets, and for the evaluation of market oriented reform proposals in Europe and elsewhere. I limit myself to the economics literature, or papers published outside of traditional economics journals, but nonetheless using an economics approach. I do not survey the health services research literature

⁹ See Sage *et al.* (2003) for a discussion of the role of competition policy in determining health care quality.

¹⁰ See Hammer and Sage (2002) for a comprehensive review of the treatment of health care quality by the courts in antitrust cases.

on quality, in particular the literature on outcomes research. That literature is primarily concerned with measurement, as opposed to assessing the impact of competition. Romano (2003) provides an excellent review of this literature.

In what follows, I first discuss performance standards for competition, then review relevant findings from economic theory, then consider empirical evidence on health care competition and quality. The final section of this paper contains a summary and conclusions.

References

- Abraham, J. M., M. Gaynor, and W. B. Vogt (2005), 'Entry and competition in local hospital markets'. unpublished manuscript, Carnegie Mellon University.
- Allard, M., P. T. Léger, and L. Rochaix (2005), 'Provider competition in a dynamic setting'. unpublished manuscript, HEC Montréal.
- Allen, F. (1984), 'Reputation and product quality'. *RAND Journal of Economics* **15**(3), 311–327.
- Allen, R. and P. J. Gertler (1991), 'Regulation and the provision of quality to heterogeneous consumers'. *Journal of Regulatory Economics* **3**, 60–75.
- Anderson, S., A. dePalma, and J. Thisse (1992), *Discrete choice theory of product differentiation*. MIT Press: .
- Banks, J., M. Marmot, Z. Oldfield, and J. P. Smith (2006), 'Disease and disadvantage in the United States and in England'. *JAMA: The Journal of the American Medical Association* **295**(17), 2037–2045.
- Bresnahan, T. F. (1989), 'Empirical studies of industries with market power'. In: R. Schmalensee and R. Willig (eds.): *Handbook of Industrial Organization*, Vol. 2, Chapter 17. Elsevier Science/North-Holland: Amsterdam and New York, pp. 1011–1057.

- Burns, L. R. and D. R. Wholey (1992), 'The impact of physician characteristics in conditional choice models for hospital care'. *Journal of Health Economics* **11**(1), 43–62.
- Capps, C. (2005), 'The quality effects of hospital mergers'. unpublished manuscript.
- Carlton, D. W. and J. M. Perloff (2005), *Modern industrial organization*. Addison-Wesley: Boston, MA.
- Chernew, M., D. Scanlon, and R. Hayward (1998), 'Insurance type and choice of hospital for coronary artery bypass graft surgery'. *Health Services Research* **33**(3), 447–466.
- Cutler, D. M. (1995), 'The incidence of adverse medical outcomes under prospective payment'. *Econometrica* **63**(1), 29–50.
- Dixit, A. and J. E. Stiglitz (1977), 'Monopolistic competition and optimum product diversity'. *American Economic Review* **67**, 297–308.
- Dorfman, R. and P. Steiner (1954), 'Optimal advertising and optimal quality'. *American Economic Review* **44**(5), 826–836.
- Douglas, G. W. and J. C. Miller (1974), 'Quality competition, industry equilibrium, and efficiency in the price-constrained airline market'. *American Economic Review* **64**(4), 657–669.
- Dranove, D. D. and M. A. Satterthwaite (1992), 'Monopolistic competition when price and quality are imperfectly observable'. *RAND Journal of Economics* **23**(4), 518–534.
- Dranove, D. D. and M. A. Satterthwaite (2000), 'The industrial organization of health care markets'. In: A. Culyer and J. Newhouse (eds.): *Handbook of Health Economics*, Chapter 20. Elsevier Science, North-Holland: New York and Oxford, pp. 1094–1139.
- Dranove, D. D., M. Shanley, and C. Simon (1992), 'Is hospital competition wasteful?'. *RAND Journal of Economics* **23**, 247–262.
- Eaton, B. C. and R. G. Lipsey (1989), 'Product differentiation'. In: R. Schmalensee and R. Willig (eds.): *Handbook of Industrial Organization*, Vol. 1, Chapter 12. Elsevier Science, North-Holland: Amsterdam and New York, pp. 723–768.
- Encinosa, W. E. and D. M. Bernard (2005), 'Hospital finances and patient safety outcomes'. *Inquiry* **42**(1), 60–72.

- Federal Trade Commission (2004), 'Horizontal merger investigation data, fiscal years 1996–2003'. Washington, D.C., Report, Federal Trade Commission, February 2, Revised August 31.
- Federal Trade Commission and Department of Justice (1992), 'Horizontal merger guidelines'. Issued April 2, 1992, Revised April 8, 1997.
- Frankena, M. W. and P. A. Pautler (1984), 'An economic analysis of taxicab regulation'. Bureau of economics staff report, Washington D.C., Federal Trade Commission.
- Gabel, J., L. Levitt, J. Pickreign, H. Whitmore, E. Holve, S. Hawkins, and N. Miller (2000), 'Job-based health insurance in 2000: premiums rise sharply while coverage grows'. *Health Affairs* **19**(5), 144–151.
- Gaynor, M. (2004), 'Quality and competition in health care markets: what do we know? What don't we know?'. *Économie Publique* **15**(2), 87–124.
- Gaynor, M. and D. Haas-Wilson (1999), 'Change, consolidation, and competition in health care markets'. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **13**(1), 141–164.
- Gaynor, M., H. Seider, and W. B. Vogt (2005), 'Is there a volume-outcome effect and does it matter? Yes, and Yes'. *American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings* **95**(2), 243–247.
- Gaynor, M. and W. B. Vogt (2000), 'Antitrust and competition in health care markets'. In: A. Culyer and J. Newhouse (eds.): *Handbook of Health Economics*, Chapter 27. Elsevier Science, North-Holland: New York and Oxford, pp. 1405–1487.
- Gaynor, M. and W. B. Vogt (2003), 'Competition among hospitals'. *RAND Journal of Economics* **34**(4), 764–785.
- Gowrisankaran, G., V. Ho, and R. Town (2004), 'Causality and the volume-outcome relationship in surgery'. unpublished manuscript, University of Minnesota.
- Gowrisankaran, G. and R. Town (2003), 'Competition, payers, and hospital quality'. *Health Services Research* **38**, 1403–1422.
- Hammer, P. J. and W. M. Sage (2002), 'Antitrust, health care quality, and the courts'. *Columbia Law Review* **102**(3), 545–649.
- Held, P. J. and M. V. Pauly (1983), 'Competition and efficiency in the end stage renal disease program'. *Journal of Health Economics* **2**(2), 95–118.

70 *References*

- Ho, V. (2002), 'Learning and the evolution of medical technologies: the diffusion of coronary angioplasty'. *Journal of Health Economics* **21**(5), 873–885.
- Ho, V. and H. B. Hamilton (2000), 'Hospital mergers and acquisitions: Does market consolidation harm patients?'. *Journal of Health Economics* **19**(5), 767–791.
- Hotelling, H. (1929), 'Stability in competition'. *Economic Journal* **39**(153), 41–57.
- Howard, D. H. (2005), 'Quality and consumer choice in healthcare: evidence from kidney transplantation'. *Topics in Economic Analysis and Policy* **5**(1), 1–20. <http://www.bepress.com/bejeap/topics/vol5/iss1/art24>.
- Institute of Medicine (2001), *Crossing the quality chasm: a new health system for the twenty-first century*. National Academy Press: Washington, D.C.
- Jaklevic, M. (2002), 'Tired trend'. *Modern Healthcare* **32**(26), 10.
- Joskow, P. L. (1980), 'The effects of competition and regulation on hospital bed supply and the reservation quality of the hospital'. *Bell Journal of Economics* **11**, 421–447.
- Kahn, K. L., E. B. Keeler, M. J. Sherwood, W. H. Rogers, D. Draper, S. S. Bentow, E. J. Reinisch, L. V. Rubenstein, J. Kosecoff, and R. H. Brook (1990), 'Comparing outcomes of care before and after implementation of the DRG-based prospective payment system'. *Journal of the American Medical Association* **264**(15), 1984–1988.
- Kamien, M. I. and D. R. Vincent (1991), 'Price regulation and the quality of service'. *Discussion Paper No. 920*, Center for Mathematical Studies in Economics and Management Science, Northwestern University.
- Kessler, D. and M. McClellan (2000), 'Is hospital competition socially wasteful?'. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* **115**(2), 577–615.
- Kessler, D. P. and J. J. Geppert (2005), 'The effects of competition on variation in the quality and cost of medical care'. *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy* **14**(3), 575–589.
- Klein, B. and K. Leffler (1981), 'The role of market forces in assuring contractual performance'. *Journal of Political Economy* **89**(4), 615–641.

- Kohn, L., J. Corrigan, and M. Donaldson (eds.) (1999), *To err is human: building a safer health system*. National Academy Press: Washington DC.
- Kranton, R. E. (2003), 'Competition and the incentive to produce high quality'. *Economica* **70**(279), 385–404.
- Lakdawalla, D. and T. Philipson (1998), 'Nonprofit production and competition'. *Working Paper #6377*, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Lee, M. (1971), 'A conspicuous production theory of hospital production'. *Southern Economic Journal* **38**(1), 48–58.
- Lesser, C. and P. Ginsburg (2001), 'Back to the future? New cost and access challenges emerge: initial findings from HSC's recent site visits'. Issue Brief #35, Washington D.C., Center for Studying Health Systems Change.
- Luft, H. S., D. W. Garnick, D. H. Mark, D. J. Peltzman, C. S. Phibbs, E. Lichtenberg, and S. J. McPhee (1990), 'Does quality influence choice of hospital?'. *JAMA* **263**(21), 2899–2906.
- Lyon, T. P. (1999), 'Quality competition, insurance, and consumer choice in health care markets'. *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy* **8**(4), 545–580.
- Ma, C. t. A. and J. F. Burgess Jr. (1993), 'Quality competition, welfare, and regulation'. *Journal of Economics* **58**(2), 153–173.
- Mankiw, N. G. and M. Whinston (1986), 'Free entry and social inefficiency'. *RAND Journal of Economics* **17**(1), 48–58.
- Mukamel, D., J. Zwanziger, and A. Bamezai (2002), 'Hospital competition, resource allocation and quality of care'. *BMC Health Services Research* **2**(1), 10–18.
- Mukamel, D., J. Zwanziger, and K. J. Tomaszewski (2001), 'HMO penetration, competition and risk-adjusted hospital mortality'. *Health Services Research* **36**(6), 1019–1035.
- Mussa, M. and S. Rosen (1978), 'Monopoly and product quality'. *Journal of Economic Theory* **18**, 301–317.
- Newhouse, J. (1970), 'Toward a theory of nonprofit institutions: An economic model of a hospital'. *American Economic Review* **60**(1), 64–74.
- Noether, M. (1988), 'Competition among Hospitals'. *Journal of Health Economics* **7**(3), 259–284.

72 *References*

- Nuscheler, R. (2003), 'Physician reimbursement, time consistency, and the quality of care'. *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics* **159**(2), 302–322.
- Pauly, M. and M. Redisch (1973), 'The not-for-profit hospital as a physicians' cooperative'. *American Economic Review* **63**(1), 87–99.
- Pepall, L., D. J. Richards, and G. Norman (2005), *Industrial organization: contemporary theory and practice*. South-Western: Mason, OH.
- Pope, G. C. (1989), 'Hospital nonprice competition and medicare reimbursement policy'. *Journal of Health Economics* **8**(2), 147–172.
- Propper, C., S. Burgess, and D. Gossage (2003), 'Competition and quality: Evidence from the NHS internal market 1991–1999'. Unpublished paper, University of Bristol.
- Propper, C., S. Burgess, and K. Green (2004), 'Does competition between hospitals improve the quality of care? Hospital death rates and the NHS internal market'. *Journal of Public Economics* **88**(7 and 8), 1247–1272.
- Robinson, J. C. and H. S. Luft (1985), 'The impact of hospital market structure on patient volume, average length of stay, and the cost of care'. *Journal of Health Economics* **4**, 333–356.
- Romano, P. (2003), 'Evolving science of quality measurement for hospitals and physicians: promise and cautions'. *Presented at AHRQ/FTC Conference on Provider Quality and Competition*, May 28.
- Sage, W. M., D. A. Hyman, and W. Greenberg (2003), 'Why competition matters to health care quality'. *Health Affairs* **22**(2), 31–44.
- Sari, N. (2002), 'Do competition and managed care improve quality?'. *Health Economics* **11**, 571–584.
- Schmalensee, R. (1977), 'Comparative static properties of regulated airline oligopolies'. *Bell Journal of Economics* **8**(2), 565–576.
- Schmalensee, R. (1989), 'Inter-industry studies of structure and performance'. In: R. Schmalensee and R. Willig (eds.): *Handbook of Industrial Organization*, Vol. 2, Chapter 16. Elsevier Science, North-Holland: Amsterdam and New York, pp. 951–1009.
- Seider, H., M. Gaynor, and W. B. Vogt (2000), 'Volume-outcome and antitrust in US health care markets'. unpublished manuscript, Universitaet Augsburg.
- Shapiro, C. (1983), 'Premiums for high quality products as returns on reputation'. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* **98**(4), 659–680.

- Shen, Y.-S. (2003), 'The effect of financial pressure on the quality of care in hospitals'. *Journal of Health Economics* **22**(2), 243–269.
- Shortell, S. M. and E. F. Hughes (1988), 'The effects of regulation, competition, and ownership on mortality rates among hospital inpatients'. *New England Journal of Medicine* **318**, 1100–1107.
- Smith, C., C. Cowan, S. Heffler, A. Catlin, and the National Health Accounts Team (2006), 'National health spending in 2004: recent slowdown led by prescription drug spending'. *Health Affairs* **25**(1), 186–196.
- Sohn, M.-W. and P. J. Rathouz (2003), 'Competition among hospitals and quality of care: Hospital-level analysis'. unpublished paper, University of Chicago.
- Spence, A. M. (1975), 'Monopoly, quality and regulation'. *Bell Journal of Economics* **6**(2), 417–429.
- Spence, A. M. (1976), 'Product selection, fixed costs, and monopolistic competition'. *Review of Economic Studies* **43**(2), 217–235.
- Tay, A. (2003), 'Assessing competition in hospital care markets: the importance of accounting for quality differentiation'. *RAND Journal of Economics* **34**(4), 786–814.
- Tirole, J. (1988), *The theory of industrial organization*. MIT Press: Cambridge, MA.
- Vander Weide, J. H. and J. H. Zalkind (1981), 'Deregulation and oligopolistic price-quality rivalry'. *American Economic Review* **71**(1), 144–154.
- Volpp, K. G., S. V. Williams, J. Waldfogel, J. H. Silber, J. S. Schwartz, and M. V. Pauly (2003), 'Market reform in New Jersey and the effect on mortality from acute myocardial infarction'. *Health Services Research* **38**(2), 515–533.
- White, L. J. (1972), 'Quality variation when prices are regulated'. *Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science* **3**(2), 425–436.