Published in final edited form as:

Med Care. 2013 June ; 51(6): . doi:10.1097/MLR.0b013e3182928f67.

Association between physician supply, local practice norms, and outpatient visit rates

Laura C. Yasaitis, AB¹, Julie P.W. Bynum, MD, MPH^{1,2}, and Jonathan S. Skinner, PhD^{1,3}

¹The Dartmouth Institute for Health Policy and Clinical Practice, Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth, Hanover NH

²Department of Medicine, Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth, Hanover NH

³Department of Economics, Dartmouth College, Hanover NH

Abstract

Background—There is considerable regional variation in Medicare outpatient visit rates; such variations may be the consequence of patient health, race/ethnicity differences, patient preferences, or physician supply and beliefs about the efficacy of frequently scheduled visits.

Objective—To test associations between varying regional Medicare outpatient visit rates and beneficiaries' health, race/ethnicity, preferences, and physician practice norms and supply.

Methods—We used Medicare claims from 2006 and 2007, and data from national surveys of three different groups in 2005 – Medicare beneficiaries, cardiologists, and primary care physicians. Regression analysis tested explanations for outpatient visit rates: patient health (self-reported and hierarchical condition category (HCC) score), self-reported race/ethnicity, preferences for care, and local physician practice norms and supply in beneficiaries' Hospital Referral Regions (HRRs) of residence.

Results—Beneficiaries in the highest quintile of HCC scores experienced 4.99 more visits than those in the lowest. Beneficiaries who were black experienced 2.14 fewer visits than others with similar health and preferences. Higher care-seeking preferences were marginally significantly associated with more visits, while education and poverty were insignificant. HRRs with high physician supply and high frequency practice norms were associated with 2.04 additional visits per year, while HRRs with high supply but low frequency norms were associated with 1.45 additional visits. Adjusting for all individual beneficiary covariates explained less than 20% of the original associations between visit rates and physician supply and practice norms.

Conclusion—Medicare beneficiaries' health status, race, and preferences help explain individual office visit frequency; in particular, African-American patients appear to experience lower access

Correspondence: Laura C. Yasaitis The Dartmouth Institute for Health Policy and Clinical Practice Geisel School of Medicine Dartmouth College 35 Centerra Parkway Lebanon, NH 07366 Phone: 978-500-9760 Fax: 603-653-0896 laura.c.yasaitis@dartmouth.edu.

Complete author information

Laura C. Yasaitis, AB The Dartmouth Institute for Health Policy and Clinical Practice 35 Centerra Parkway Lebanon, NH 03766 Phone: 978-500-9760 Fax: 603-653-0896 laura.yasaitis@dartmouth.edu

Julie P.W. Bynum, MD MPH 35 Centerra Parkway Lebanon, NH 03766 Phone: 603-653-0827 Fax: 603-653-0820 julie.bynum@dartmouth.edu

Jonathan S. Skinner, PhD Department of Economics, HB 6106 Dartmouth College Hanover, NH 03766 Phone: 603-646-2535 Fax: 603-646-2122 jonathan.s.skinner@dartmouth.edu

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

to care. Yet, these factors explain a small fraction of the observed regional differences associated with physician supply and beliefs about the appropriate frequency of office visits.

Keywords

healthcare utilization; physician visits; geographic variation; physician supply; patient preferences

Introduction

Physician visit rates for Medicare beneficiaries vary widely across the United States, ranging from under 3 visits per beneficiary per year in Grand Forks, North Dakota to over 12 in East Long Island, New York¹. These variations may represent inefficiency in health care utilization² yet such variations could be the consequence of several different factors. High-visit regions may be associated with greater physician supply, as would be implied by the classic “supplier-induced demand” hypothesis³. This association has not been supported by empirical evidence, with only modest associations found between physician supply and Medicare spending⁴. Alternatively, regional differences in practice norms – how often physicians feel that they should see their patients – could also help explain visit rate variations.

Yet, physician supply and practice norms could vary in response to regional differences in patient populations. There may be systematic differences in health status across regions; physician visits (and physician supply) may be appropriately higher where patients are sicker. Apparent associations between physician practice patterns and health care utilization may disappear after controlling for the demographic characteristics of patient populations⁵. Visit rates in some regions may be higher because Medicare enrollees there *prefer* to see their doctors more often, even conditional on health status. For example, physician visits could be viewed as a marker for patient demand, given how often patients initiate visits⁶. In recent studies, patients’ preferences are mentioned as a possible explanation for observed variation, but have not been explicitly included in national analyses^{7,8}.

In this paper, we consider these hypotheses for the wide variation in physician visits, focusing on outpatient physician visits for two reasons. First, physician visits are a relatively straightforward measure of utilization; the bundle of services provided in a single visit is likely to vary less than for a hospitalization. Second, outpatient visits are more likely to reflect patient demand and preferences, for example when the patient initiates an appointment⁶. Thus outpatient visits are a particularly valuable measure to better understand the roles of providers and patients in explaining regional health care variations.

We analyzed a nationally representative 2005 survey of Medicare beneficiaries, matched with outpatient visits in 2006 and 2007. Data on regional medical specialist physician supply from the Dartmouth Atlas classified regions as either high or low supply. In addition, we used companion 2005 national surveys of primary care physicians and cardiologists to capture a key behavioral factor: how long the physician would wait before scheduling a specific patient for the next visit. Thus we described two dimensions of supply: the number of practicing physicians, and physician norms as measured by beliefs about how often a given patient should be seen. We used multiple regression analysis to test possible explanations for varying visit rates: individuals’ sociodemographic factors, health status, preferences for care, and regional physician supply and practice norms. We assessed how much of the apparent effect of regional supply and practice norms may be due to differences in patient populations.

Methods

Beneficiary survey data

We conducted secondary analysis of three different surveys. The first was a national survey of Medicare beneficiaries, conducted in 2005. A national probability sample of 4000 individuals was drawn from a sampling frame of all beneficiaries in 2003. The survey was conducted by telephone, with follow-up by mail. Responses were collected between March and October 2005; 2515 beneficiaries responded, and 160 ineligible, for an overall response rate of 65%⁹.

Preferences for care seeking were elicited regarding two different hypothetical outpatient care scenarios: a lingering cough after the flu and chest pain upon walking up stairs. Other questions elicited broader preferences about specialist vs. generalist care and beneficiaries' stated avoidance of seeing a physician. Over 97% of beneficiary respondents, on average, answered these questions. Age, sex, race, educational history, self-reported financial difficulty in paying for care, and self-rated health were also assessed. Table 1 includes the text for all relevant questions.

Physician survey data

The second and third surveys consisted of two national physician surveys, whose data we used to summarize varying practice norms across regions. These two surveys – of primary care physicians and cardiologists – were part of the same survey program; they included similar questions, structure, and administration. Both of these surveys have been described in detail elsewhere^{7, 10}.

For the cardiologists, a national random sample of 1340 cardiologists was contacted and assessed for eligibility. Of those initially eligible, 999 were randomly selected to receive the survey; 5 additional physicians were found ineligible and 614 responded, for a response rate of 62%. Respondents did not differ from non-respondents in gender, practice type, or number of years in practice¹⁰. We analyzed responses to a question that asked physicians how many months they would suggest a patient with well-controlled, stable angina wait before follow-up (Table 1).

In the primary care physician survey, a national random sample of 1775 physicians self-identified as family practice, general practice, or internal medicine were contacted and assessed for eligibility. Of those initially eligible, 1333 were randomly selected to receive the survey; 38 additional physicians were found ineligible and 801 responded- an overall response rate of 63%. Respondents did not differ from non-respondents in gender, primary specialty, practice type, or number of years in practice⁷. We analyzed responses to a question that asked physicians how many months they would suggest a patient with well-controlled hypertension wait before follow-up (Table 1).

Medicare claims data

Each beneficiary's outpatient visits in 2006 and 2007 were counted from Carrier file data. We limited our count to valid physician visits, defined by an approved charge greater than \$0, with codes indicating a physician provider. We further limited the claims to identify only outpatient physician visits.

We determined beneficiaries' hierarchical condition categories (HCC) scores using claims from 2004. Designed to predict utilization based on past medical diagnoses, these scores combine patients' age and information across many diagnostic categories, and are used by Medicare to risk-adjust capitated payments to Medicare Advantage plans¹¹.

To characterize physician supply, we downloaded publicly available Dartmouth Atlas data derived from Medicare claims, aggregated to the Hospital Referral Region (HRR) level¹. These data included the number of medical specialists per 100,000 residents of each of the 306 HRRs in the US.

Outcome and Independent Variables

The dependent variable in all regression analyses was the beneficiary's annual number of outpatient Medicare physician visits, averaged across 2006 and 2007. Independent variables included sociodemographic characteristics, health status, and preferences for care, and measures of regional physician supply and practice norms.

To represent health status, we included indicators for whether beneficiaries' self-rated health was either "fair" or "poor," "good," or "very good," (relative to "excellent"); self-reported measures of health are strong predictors of Medicare expenditures and mortality¹². We also included beneficiaries' HCC scores, allowing for non-linear relationships between HCC scores and utilization by including indicators for each quintile of HCC score (the lowest quintile was the reference). Some have argued that these are biased measures of health status because they are based on billing data (one needs to enter a diagnosis to bill Medicare) and would therefore tend to be higher in regions with greater physician practice intensity¹³. Thus our use of HCC scores for risk-adjustment is likely to bias downward any estimates of association between individual visits and regional physician supply and practice norms.

To represent beneficiaries' preferences for care, we created two summary measures, the first representing preferences for care seeking and the second preferences for specialist care. Several questions were asked in each category, and a summary statistic was created from the average of each set of variables. In general, a simple average is not as efficient a summary statistic as principle components analysis (PCA). Initially we performed PCA using tetrachoric correlation methods to estimate the underlying relationship between each set of dichotomous responses¹⁴. However, the results were nearly identical to the simple average, so the simple average of individual responses was used.

Respondents' preference scores were rescaled to a standard normal distribution for all summary statistics. In regression analyses, preference scores were rescaled such that the 25th percentile had a value of 0, and the 75th percentile a value of 1, allowing a more meaningful interpretation of the corresponding regression coefficients.

Physician supply and practice norms were aggregated to the HRR level. HRRs were split into groups of high or low frequency practice norms based on physicians' responses to the survey questions described above. As the mean number of months suggested before follow-up differed between the two physician populations, we standardized responses within each group nationally, and then calculated the HRR-level average of this standardized response. HRRs were divided such that roughly half the beneficiary population resided in high frequency areas, with the other half in low frequency areas. We used a similar strategy to define cut-points for high and low physician supply, yielding four mutually exclusive groups: high physician supply/high frequency practice norms, high supply/low frequency, low supply/high frequency, and low supply/low frequency.

Summary Statistics and Regression Analysis

We examined differences in respondents' health status, demographics, preferences, and socioeconomic characteristics across HRR categories using chi-square tests and analyses of variance. We also calculated summary statistics of the ranges of medical specialist supply and average physician-preferred follow-up time for each group – cardiologists and PCPs – in each regional category.

We limited our analysis to HRRs that had at least three physician respondents (either PCPs or cardiologists) to the physician surveys. We recognize that there is considerable noise in constructing HRR averages from just three observations, so we weighted all regressions by the number of physicians who answered the survey in each HRR, giving greater influence to larger HRRs (with greater numbers of physician responses). Sensitivity analyses – limiting our sample to HRRs with at least 5, or 8, physician responses – had little impact on results.

In regression analyses, we first regressed beneficiaries' annual outpatient visits (averaged across 2006 and 2007) on indicators representing the physician supply/practice norm categories. Next, we added individual characteristics to create three subsequently more complete models. The first adjusted for care preferences and sociodemographic characteristics including age, sex, race/ethnicity, and self-reported financial strain. We then added health status, as represented by both HCC quintiles and self-reported health indicators. (In this model, age was omitted, as it was included in calculating HCC scores.) We also performed a sensitivity analysis using only self-rated health levels instead of HCC quintiles to represent health status. Linear regression analysis results are reported; modeling the outcome as Poisson-distributed in a generalized linear model with a log link yielded nearly identical results. Further sensitivity analysis with regard to variable inclusion was performed, but again results were similar to those reported. Standard errors were calculated after adjusting for clustering of beneficiaries within HRRs. All analyses were performed using Stata 10.

Results

Study population and regional characteristics

A subset of the beneficiary respondents was included in our study. Of the 2,515 survey respondents, 227 died before the end of 2007 (45 in 2005, 83 in 2006, 99 in 2007), 528 were enrolled in an HMO in 2006, and 550 in 2007. Additionally, we included only those beneficiaries from HRRs with at least 3 physician survey respondents. In total, 1,229 individuals were included.

Table 2 displays the beneficiaries' characteristics across categories defined by physician supply and practice norms. Beneficiaries living in high supply/high frequency areas reported significantly higher general care seeking preferences ($p < 0.005$). Beneficiaries in these areas also tended to be slightly older ($p = 0.019$). There were marginally significant differences in the distribution of beneficiaries who said that finances were "important" or "very important" in health care decisions, with those living in low supply/low frequency areas appearing to express greater financial concerns ($p = 0.055$). There were no other significant differences.

Table 2 also summarizes several characteristics of physician supply across the HRRs included in our study. Of 306 HRRs in the United States, 168 had at least three physicians answering our surveys. Among these, the average number of physician respondents was just over 7 per HRR.

When asked how long they would wait before scheduling follow-up for a patient with well-controlled hypertension, primary care physicians in low frequency areas would wait nearly six months, while those in high frequency areas would wait just over four months. Similarly, cardiologists in high frequency areas would wait about five months before asking a patient with stable angina to follow-up, while those in low frequency areas would wait over seven months. The medical specialist supply in the median HRR among low supply areas was about 38 per 100,000 residents, while that of the median HRR in high supply areas was about 50 per 100,000 residents.

Explaining visit rates

Table 3 contains full regression results across all models. HCC scores were the strongest predictor of visits; those in the highest quintile experienced 4.99 more visits (95% CI 3.60 – 6.39) than those in the lowest quintile. Black respondents experienced fewer visits than otherwise similar respondents, with a point estimate of –2.14 (95% CI –3.92 – –0.37). Preferences for general care seeking were marginally significantly associated with visits; those at the 75th percentile of preferences experienced 0.91 (95% CI –0.02 – 1.84) more visits than those at the 25th percentile.

In Figure 1, we further examined the change in the number of visits associated with regional physician supply and practice norms across each model. Unadjusted results show that beneficiaries residing in high supply/high frequency areas experienced 2.48 more visits, and those in high supply/low frequency areas experienced 1.51 more visits, than those living in low supply/low frequency areas (low/low). Those residing in areas characterized by low physician supply yet high frequency practice norms had nearly identical visit rates as those in low/low areas.

Adjusting for preferences, age, sex, race, education, and financial constraints slightly decreased the initial associations to 2.37 and 1.46 additional visits for those in high supply/high frequency and high supply/low frequency areas, respectively. Including HCC quintiles and an indicator for self-rated “fair” or “poor” health reduced the corresponding associations to 2.04 and 1.45.

In a sensitivity analysis using levels of self-rated health alone rather than HCC quintiles, the additional visits associated with living in a high supply/high frequency region increased to 2.36, and additional visits associated with being in the 75th percentile of care-seeking preferences (relative to the 25th) increased to 1.08.

Discussion

In this study, we found that while individual beneficiaries’ health, race, and preferences for care affected their outpatient physician visit rates, adjusting for these factors explained little of the apparent effect of local physician supply and practice norms on visit rates. Beneficiaries from areas with both high physician supply and high frequency practice norms experienced 2.04 more physician visits per year than those from low supply/low frequency areas. Those from high supply/low frequency areas experienced 1.45 additional visits than those in low/low areas. In the fully adjusted model, beneficiary characteristics explained less than 20% of initial associations between visit rates and local physician supply and practice norms. The presence of large residual regional effects is consistent with previous research, where considerable variations in total regional spending remained after adjusting for patients’ characteristics^{8, 12}.

A second finding in this study was that beneficiaries who are black experienced 2.14 fewer visits than otherwise similar beneficiaries. Some previous work has suggested that black patients may receive fewer health care services, such as surgical intervention for osteoarthritis and renal transplantation for end stage renal disease, due to differences in preferences^{15, 16}. Yet, we controlled for individuals’ care-seeking preferences explicitly. Further study into the relationships between race, preferences, and receipt of health care services is warranted.

While outpatient visit rates vary widely across the US, previous studies have shown that demographics, health, and patients’ preferences explained little of this geographic variation^{17, 18}. Here, we combined regional medical specialist supply with data from a

national survey of physicians. While these measures of physician supply and practice norms did not explain all of the observed geographic variation, the fact that we found significant differences across areas defined by these data suggests that both physician supply and practice norms are important predictors of beneficiaries' experience.

Several possible factors may drive physicians' practice norms. First, norms may be related to local physician supply. Previous work has suggested that physicians in high supply areas may see patients more often to maintain a full schedule (and the accompanying income)⁷. The overall costs to patients of seeing specialists may be lower in regions with more specialists because they are closer, thus reducing travel time, or because specialists are more easily available¹⁹. Recall that we divided our study population evenly based on local physician supply, and then by physician practice norms. If physician behavior were uncorrelated with physician supply, each group should contain roughly one quarter of the study population. However, over two-thirds of the beneficiaries were in areas defined as high supply/high frequency or low/low, with the remaining split between areas classified as high/low or low/high.

Still, there was not a perfect correlation between physician supply and practice norms. Across regions with lower supply, beneficiaries in areas where doctors reported high frequency practice norms experienced no more visits than those in areas with low frequency practice norms. In areas with lower supply, it seems that practice norms have less impact on patients' experiences. There appears to be an interactive effect between norms and supply that leads to disproportionately higher utilization of visits when both measures are above the median.

Regional variations in malpractice concerns may also influence physicians' decisions. Previous study of our cardiologist survey data documented that differences in self-reported propensity to test and treat were significantly related to concerns about malpractice charges¹⁰. Yet, other studies linking information about physicians' malpractice risk to their actual practice suggest that malpractice concerns are responsible for a small proportion of practice variations²⁰⁻²².

This study has several limitations. First, some illnesses may best be cared for by specialists, and would therefore necessitate greater physician visits²³. A single health status measure may not capture such information. To address this concern, we used HCC scores, which were designed to predict utilization based on previous diagnoses, but even with the use of HCCs, we still found large and statistically significant associations between physician supply/norms and utilization. Second, physician beliefs leading to more intensive treatment and diagnosis norms may result in elevated HCC measures¹³. This would tend to bias downward estimates of provider norms on patient visits when conditioning on HCC measures. Thus we view the fully specified model as providing a conservative estimate of how provider norms affect the frequency of physician visits. Third, the study was limited to beneficiaries in fee-for-service Medicare living in relatively large HRRs. However, the patient sample did not differ notably between fee-for-service and managed care patients, nor between those in larger and smaller HRRs.

Fourth, the beneficiary surveys only included a few preference questions, which did not match perfectly with the physician survey questions. Still, these questions all captured beliefs by both patients and physicians about the efficacy of more frequent office visits. As well, the patient preference questions were highly predictive of utilization at the individual level, even controlling for health status, suggesting that they captured important dimensions of patient demand.

Fifth, we did not survey the Medicare beneficiaries' own physicians, but random physicians practicing within their HRRs. Therefore, we were limited to comparing regional variables based on a small number of physician respondents per region. In general, poorly measured independent measures lead to coefficient estimates that are biased towards the null hypothesis. Yet our estimates suggest that regional practice norms do differ, with measurable consequences. Greater study of differences in physicians' practice norms and their effects may help further elucidate these relationships.

Lastly, our evidence does not allow us to draw conclusions regarding the most appropriate level of physician supply or visit frequency. For example, then-current AHA/ACC guidelines for chronic stable angina treatment state no clear evidence on the optimal follow-up for such patients, with a consensus estimate suggesting 4 – 12 months as reasonable²⁴. If anything, the range of mean physician-reported follow-up times across high- and low-frequency practice norm regions – from five to seven months – falls on the more frequent end of these guidelines. Without detailed health outcome data, we were unable to assess whether beneficiaries in low rate areas may be missing out on needed care, or if those in high rate areas may be receiving unnecessarily fragmented care.

In summary, after controlling for preferences, health status, and sociodemographics, regional physician supply and practice norms still significantly predict beneficiaries' outpatient physician visit rates. Differences in practice patterns appear to have more of an effect in areas with higher physician supply. As well, we found strong evidence that black Medicare beneficiaries experienced access challenges, even after controlling for patient preferences. These factors provide at least a first step in better understanding possible explanations for the wide variation in physician visits across regions of the U.S.

Acknowledgments

Funding: The work of all three authors on this study was supported by a grant from the National Institute on Aging (NIH).

References

1. The Dartmouth Atlas Project. The Dartmouth Atlas of Health Care. Available at: www.dartmouthatlas.org
2. Wennberg JE. Unwarranted variations in healthcare delivery: implications for academic medical centres. *BMJ*. 2002; 325:961–964. [serial online]. Available from: *BMJ*. [PubMed: 12399352]
3. Hemenway D, Fallon D. Testing for physician-induced demand with hypothetical cases. *Med Care*. 1985;344–349. [serial online]. Available from: *JSTOR*. [PubMed: 3990389]
4. Chang CH, Stukel TA, Flood AB, et al. Primary Care Physician Workforce and Medicare Beneficiaries' Health Outcomes. *JAMA*. 2011; 305:2096. [PubMed: 21610242]
5. Komaromy M, Lurie N, Osmond D, et al. Physician practice style and rates of hospitalization for chronic medical conditions. *Med Care*. 1996; 34:594. [serial online]. [PubMed: 8656725]
6. Escarce JJ. Would eliminating differences in physician practice style reduce geographic variations in cataract surgery rates? *Med Care*. 1993;1106–1118. [serial online]. Available from: *JSTOR*. [PubMed: 8246640]
7. Sirovich B, Gallagher PM, Wennberg DE, et al. Discretionary decision making by primary care physicians and the cost of US health care. *Health Aff*. 2008; 27:813–823. [serial online]. Available from: *Health Affairs*.
8. Zuckerman S, Waidmann T, Berenson R, et al. Clarifying sources of geographic differences in Medicare spending. *N Engl J Med*. 2010; 363:54–62. [serial online]. Available from: *Massachusetts Medical Society*. [PubMed: 20463333]

9. Fowler FJ Jr, Gallagher PM, Anthony DL, et al. Relationship Between Regional Per Capita Medicare Expenditures and Patient Perceptions of Quality of Care. *JAMA*. 2008; 299:2406. [PubMed: 18505950]
10. Lucas FL, Sirovich BE, Gallagher PM, et al. Variation in cardiologists' propensity to test and treat. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes*. 2010; 3:253–260. [serial online]. Available from: Am Heart Assoc. [PubMed: 20388874]
11. Pope GC, Kautter J, Ellis RP, et al. Risk adjustment of Medicare capitation payments using the CMS-HCC model. *Health Care Financ Rev*. 2004; 25:119–142. [serial online]. Available from: SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS-GPO. [PubMed: 15493448]
12. Sutherland JM, Fisher ES, Skinner JS. Getting Past Denial- The High Cost of Health Care in the United States. *N Engl J Med*. 2009; 361:1227. [serial online]. Available from: Mass Med Soc. [PubMed: 19741220]
13. Song Y, Skinner J, Bynum J, et al. Regional variations in diagnostic practices. *N Engl J Med*. 2010; 363:45–53. [serial online]. Available from: Mass Medical Soc. [PubMed: 20463332]
14. Edwards J, Edwards A. Approximating the tetrachoric correlation coefficient. *Biometrics*. 1984; 40:563–563. [serial online]. Available from: JSTOR.
15. Ayanian JZ, Cleary PD, Weissman JS, et al. The effect of patients' preferences on racial differences in access to renal transplantation. *N Engl J Med*. 1999; 341:1661–1669. [serial online]. Available from: Mass Medical Soc. [PubMed: 10572155]
16. Ibrahim SA, Siminoff LA, Burant CJ, et al. Understanding ethnic differences in the utilization of joint replacement for osteoarthritis: the role of patient-level factors. *Med Care*. 2002; 40:I. [serial online].
17. Anthony DL, Herndon MB, Gallagher PM, et al. How Much Do Patients' Preferences Contribute To Resource Use? *Health Aff*. 2009; 28:864. [serial online]. Available from: Health Affairs.
18. Wennberg, JE.; Fisher, ES. The care of patients with severe chronic illness: an online report on the Medicare program by the Dartmouth Atlas Project; p. 121a. e
19. Sirovich BE, Gottlieb DJ, Welch HG, et al. Regional variations in health care intensity and physician perceptions of quality of care. *Ann Intern Med*. 2006; 144:641–649. [PubMed: 16670133]
20. Baicker, K.; Chandra, A. **The effect of malpractice** liability on the delivery of health care; 2004. p. 10709The effect of malpractice liability on the delivery of health care [serial online]Available from: National Bureau of Economic Research
21. Elmore JG, Taplin SH, Barlow WE, et al. Does Litigation Influence Medical Practice? The Influence of Community Radiologists' Medical Malpractice Perceptions and Experience on Screening Mammography1. *Radiology*. 2005; 236:37–46. [serial online]. Available from: Radiological Society of North America. [PubMed: 15987961]
22. Baldwin LM, Hart LG, Lloyd M, et al. Defensive medicine and obstetrics. *JAMA: the journal of the American Medical Association*. 1995; 274:1606–1610. [serial online]. Available from: Am Med Assoc. [PubMed: 7474245]
23. Fendrick AM, Hirth RA, Chernew ME. Differences between generalist and specialist physicians regarding *Helicobacter pylori* and peptic ulcer disease. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 1996; 91:1544. [serial online]. [PubMed: 8759658]
24. Gibbons RJ, Abrams J, Chatterjee K, et al. ACC/AHA 2002 guideline update for the management of patients with chronic stable angina--summary article: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on practice guidelines (Committee on the Management of Patients With Chronic Stable Angina). *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2003; 41:159. [serial online]. Available from: Am Coll Cardio Found. [PubMed: 12570960]

Figure 1.
 Additional Visits Associated With Regional Physician Supply and Practice Norms, Before
 and After Adjusting for Patients' Individual Characteristics

Table 1**Questions Used In Our Survey Instruments**

Patient Survey Questions:	
In general, do you think it is better for a patient to have one general doctor who manages most of their medical problems, or to have each problem cared for by a specialist?	Preference for specialists
Are you someone who tries to avoid going to the doctor?	Care seeking preferences
Suppose you noticed a mild but definite chest pain when walking up stairs. Do you think you'd be more likely to try to see a doctor right away or wait to see if the pain would go away?	Care seeking preferences
Suppose you noticed this pain for a week. Would you be more likely to go to see a doctor or wait to see if the pain would go away?	Care seeking preferences
Suppose you went to your regular doctor for that chest pain and your doctor did not think you needed any special tests but said you could have some tests if you wanted. If the tests did not have any health risks, do you think you would probably have the tests or probably not have them?	Preference for specialists
Suppose your doctor told you he or she did not think you needed to see a heart specialist, but you could see one if you wanted. Do you think you would probably ask to see a specialist, or probably not see a specialist?	Preference for specialists
Suppose you had had the flu and after the other symptoms were gone, you still had a severe cough. If the cough lasted 2 days after your flu seemed to be over, would you be more likely to go see a doctor or wait longer to see if the cough went away?	Care seeking preferences
If the cough lasted a week, do you think you'd be more likely to go see a doctor or wait longer to see if it went away?	Care seeking preferences
Suppose you went to your regular doctor for that cough. If he or she said you probably did not need a chest xray, but you could have one if you wanted, would you be more likely to have the xray or not have the x-ray?	Preference for specialists
If your regular doctor said you probably did not need to see a lung specialist, but you could if you wanted to, would you be more likely to go see a specialist or not to see the specialist?	Preference for specialists
How important are financial issues for you when you decide whether or not to get any medical care?	SES/demographic
In general, how would you rate your overall health?	SES/demographic
Are you male or female?	SES/demographic
What is the highest grade or level of school that you have completed?	SES/demographic
Are you of Hispanic or Latino origin or descent?	SES/demographic
(In addition to being Hispanic or Latino) What is your race? Please choose one or more of the following... White? Black? Asian? Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander? American Indian/Alaskan Indian/Alaska Native? Other (specify)?	SES/demographic
How old were you on your last birthday?	SES/demographic
Physician Survey Questions:	
For this question, think about a patient with stable angina whose symptoms and cardiac risk factors are now well controlled on current medical therapy. In general, how frequently do you schedule routine follow-up visits for a patient like this?	Cardiologists
In general, how frequently do you schedule routine follow-up visits for a patient with well-controlled hypertension?	Primary Care Physicians

Questions included in each preference factor are indicated in the second column; those used to characterize individual respondents socioeconomic status (SES) or demographic features are also indicated as such in this column. For the physician survey questions, this column indicates which physician population was asked each question.

Table 2

Characteristics of Patient Survey Respondents and Hospital Referral Region (HRR) Exposure Variables Across Categories Defined by Physician Supply and Practice Norms

HRR categorization based on medical specialist supply and physicians' self-reported practice norms						
	Low Supply/ Low Frequency	Low Supply/ High Frequency	High Supply/ Low Frequency	High Supply/ High Frequency	Overall	P-value
Number of respondents	444	171	176	438	1229	
Number of HRRs	64	31	27	46	168	
MD respondents/HRR	7.72	5.61	7.22	12.24	7.19	
Age (mean)	75.62	75.40	74.63	76.37	75.71	0.019
Male (%)	40.77	42.69	40.91	38.58	40.28	0.799
Race						
Black (%)	3.38	5.26	6.25	6.85	5.29	
Hispanic (%)	2.03	5.26	3.41	4.11	3.42	
Other (%)	3.41	3.53	4.02	4.81	4.01	
NH white (%)	91.14	85.88	86.21	84.21	87.22	0.184
HS grad (%)	78.83	80.12	78.98	80.82	79.74	0.891
Finances important*	55.18	48.54	47.73	46.35	50.04	0.055
Hierarchical Condition Category (HCC) quintile (%)						
1	22.8	23.4	19.9	18.3	20.8	
2	19.1	18.7	22.7	18.0	19.2	
3	21.2	17.0	19.9	21.0	20.3	
4	20.1	18.7	20.5	19.4	19.7	
5	16.9	22.2	17.1	23.3	19.9	0.497
Self-rated health (%)						
Poor	3.83	4.68	2.84	2.97	3.5	
Fair	24.32	22.22	24.43	24.43	24.08	
Good	41.22	41.52	41.48	38.58	40.36	
Very Good	22.52	22.22	25.57	25.8	24.08	
Excellent	8.11	9.36	5.68	8.22	7.97	0.95
Preferences for Health Care **						
General Care-Seeking Preferences**	-0.093	0.025	0.0032	0.083	0.00	0.0063
Preferences for Specialists**	-0.046	0.037	0.022	0.023	0.00	0.4265
Number of Months Before Physicians Would Suggest Follow-Up***						
Primary Care Physicians	5.87	4.34	5.99	4.17	5.07	
Cardiologists	7.52	5.17	7.11	4.87	6.02	
Medical Specialist Physician Supply (physicians per 100,000 residents)						
Median	38.8	38.4	49.5	50.2	42.85	
Range	26.6-44.5	29.5 - 44.6	44.9 - 71.2	44.7 - 79.9	26.6 - 79.9	

*"Finances important" includes all those individuals who answered that financial considerations were either "important" or "very important" in decisions about medical care

^{**} Survey responses to several different questions in each category were averaged, and then re-scaled to a standard normal distribution for interpretation.

^{***} These variables indicate the mean response to a survey question in which physicians were asked how many months they would wait before scheduling a follow-up visit for a relatively common medical condition: either well-controlled hypertension (PCPs) or stable angina (Cardiologists).

Table 3

Regression Results Across Different Models to Predict Individuals' Total Outpatient Visits

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Category of Physician Supply/Practice Patterns				
High Supply/ High Frequency	2.48*** (0.67)	2.37*** (0.72)	2.36*** (0.68)	2.04** (0.63)
Low Supply/ High Frequency	0.26 (0.64)	0.26 (0.70)	0.26 (0.65)	0.22 (0.69)
High Supply/ Low Frequency	1.51* (0.61)	1.46* (0.70)	1.44* (0.65)	1.45* (0.67)
Individual Sociodemographic Characteristics				
Male		-0.07 (0.37)	0.05 (0.37)	-0.17 (0.34)
Black		-1.75 (1.13)	-2.22* (1.05)	-2.14* (0.90)
Hispanic		-0.22 (1.27)	-0.48 (1.08)	-0.44 (1.23)
Age (10 years)		0.12 (0.38)	-0.02 (0.40)	
High School Graduate		0.02 (0.77)	0.53 (0.71)	0.66 (0.69)
Finances Important ⁺		-0.25 (0.48)	-0.34 (0.47)	-0.49 (0.45)
Preferences for Health Care ⁺⁺				
General Care-Seeking		0.96 (0.58)	1.04 (0.56)	0.91 (0.47)
Preferences for Specialists		0.46 (0.43)	0.54 (0.46)	0.49 (0.44)
Hierarchical Condition Category (HCC) Quintile				
2				0.67 (0.60)
3				1.59** (0.57)
4				3.47*** (0.67)
5				4.99*** (0.71)
Self-Rated Health				
Poor/Fair			3.03** (1.09)	1.22 (1.04)
Good			1.92** (0.58)	0.61 (0.54)
Very Good			0.31 (0.85)	-0.22 (0.80)
Intercept	6.77*** (0.32)	6.31*** (0.60)	4.19** (1.25)	3.40*** (1.26)
R-squared	0.032	0.047	0.075	0.150
Number of Observations	1229	1229	1229	1229

* Standard errors in parentheses; $p < 0.05$,

** $p < 0.01$,

*** $p < 0.001$

All results reflect linear regression analyses, adjusted for clustering of beneficiaries within Hospital Referral Regions (HRR).

In Model 3, self-rated health indicators represent health; in Model 4, beneficiaries' HCC scores, derived from diagnoses recorded in the previous year, are used to adjust for differences in health. The self-rated health categories are also retained in this model to fully account for potential differences in care-seeking behavior.

All regressions are adjusted for clustering of beneficiaries at the Hospital Referral Region level.

⁺ Respondent answered that finances were either "important" or "very important" in decisions about medical care

⁺⁺ Responses across several questions in each category of health care preferences were averaged, and the scores re-scaled; estimate reflects the difference between those at the 75th and 25th percentile of preferences