Website: http: jebhpme.ssu.ac.ir
EBHPME 2025; 9(1): 1-4
EISSN: 2538-4716

Evidence Based Health Policy, Management & Economics

LETTER TO EDITOR

Value-Based Payment Models in Healthcare: Challenges and Opportunities

Fereshte Karimi[1*]

[1] Research Center for Emergency and Disaster Resilience, Red Crescent Society of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Tehran, Iran

ABSTRACT

Payment models for health services are crucial for strategic purchasing, influencing both healthcare delivery and financing. These models vary in complexity depending on the services provided. Value-based payment (VBP) models represent a significant advancement, aiming to enhance quality and reduce costs in inpatient and outpatient settings, as well as for new technologies and medications. VBP incentivizes providers to prioritize patient outcomes over the volume of services, leading to improved care quality, cost savings, and increased stakeholder engagement. However, implementing VBP presents challenges, such as difficulties in accessing integrated health information, defining "value," and managing administrative complexities. Overcoming these obstacles is essential for realizing the transformative potential of value-based payment systems in healthcare delivery.

Keywords: Payment Models , Reimbursement, Value-Based payment models, Healthcare

Strategic purchasing is a vital aspect of healthcare financing, involving the allocation of funds to healthcare providers based on their performance and the health needs of the population they serve. This approach is critical for achieving Universal Health Coverage (UHC) by improving health system performance through efficient resource utilization and quality service delivery, ensuring access to high-quality care while effectively managing costs. The strategic purchasing process encompasses key decisions regarding which services to procure from which providers, and which payment models to use in order to incentivize the delivery of high-quality, cost-effective care.

Payment models are the mechanisms used to reimburse providers for delivering health services. Ideally, payment rates should be established to cover costs while also aligning with broader policy objectives. Once these rates are determined, payments are made to providers accordingly. Payment models vary significantly depending on the type of provider (e.g., hospitals, physicians) and the services they offer. Common models include fee-for-service, capitation, and case-based payments, each designed to incentivize different provider behaviors. For example, fee-for-service compensates providers for each service rendered, while capitation provides a fixed payment per patient over a specific period, regardless of how many services the patient uses. Some payment models, such as Diagnosis-Related Groups (DRGs) and Healthcare Resource Groups (HRGs), require sophisticated information systems to accurately track service costs. These systems help ensure that payments reflect the actual costs of care, while also promoting efficiency and accountability in healthcare delivery.

Value-based payment (VBP) models in healthcare represent a significant shift from traditional payment systems, focusing on the quality of care rather than the quantity of services provided. This approach applies to both inpatient and outpatient services, including innovative drugs and technologies. To ensure new treatments are reimbursed according to

Corresponding Author: Fereshte Karimi
Email: Fereshtek69@gmail.com
Tel: +98 918 7464104
Research Center for Emergency and Disaster Resilience, Red Crescent Society of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Tehran, Iran

[DOI: 10.18502/jebhpme.v9i1.19413]

their effectiveness and impact on patient outcomes, VBP models are gaining popularity, particularly in the realm of medications and innovative technologies. For example, outcomes-based funding ties payments for medications to the achievement of specific health outcomes; if a medication fails to produce the anticipated results, the payment may be adjusted accordingly(1)

There are several examples of VBP models implemented across various healthcare settings. The Medicare Shared Savings Program (MSSP) allows healthcare providers to create Accountable Care Organizations (ACOs) that earn financial incentives for improving care coordination and health outcomes for Medicare beneficiaries, sharing in savings from reduced unnecessary spending while maintaining care quality(6). Shared savings programs encourage providers to realize cost savings while ensuring that the quality of care is maintained or enhanced. Under these programs, providers benefit from the savings generated through reduced hospitalizations or improved health outcomes resulting from effective medication management. Additionally, innovative technologies, including digital health solutions and telemedicine, are increasingly incorporated into value-based models. These technologies can improve patient engagement and monitoring, ultimately leading to better health outcomes and reduced costs (5).

The Hospital Value-Based Purchasing (HVBP) Program incentivizes hospitals by linking a portion of their Medicare reimbursements to performance on quality metrics, such as patient safety and clinical outcomes, allowing high-performing hospitals to recover withheld payments or earn bonuses (7). This program encourages acute care hospitals to improve the quality of care for inpatient services. Under this approach, hospitals receive incentive bonuses based on their performance on specific quality measures, including mortality, hospital-acquired infections, patient safety, patient experience and satisfaction, efficiency, and cost (8). Payments are determined by a hospital's Total Performance Score (TPS), which reflects its performance compared to other hospitals and tracks improvements over time. Under this program, a percentage of Medicare payments is withheld from participating hospitals. This withheld amount is subsequently redistributed as bonuses based on specific performance metrics. The primary objective is to enhance the quality and safety of patient care while simultaneously lowering the costs associated with hospital stays (3).

The End-Stage Renal Disease Quality Incentive Program (ESRD QIP) enhances the quality of care for patients with end-stage renal disease by linking incentive payments to clinical outcomes and patient satisfaction. This program is the first of its kind in Medicare and changes how the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) pays for dialysis treatments by connecting a portion of the payment directly to a facility's performance on quality-of-care measures. Facilities that do not meet certain performance standards may have their payments reduced (9).

However, VBP models in healthcare encounter several significant challenges that can impede their successful implementation. One major issue is data interoperability, which refers to the ability of different computer systems and software to exchange and use health information. When these systems cannot communicate effectively, it leads to fragmented data and incomplete patient records. In healthcare, different entities such as physician offices, laboratories, and specialists often utilize disparate data systems. The lack of standardized communication protocols between these systems can impede the comprehensive understanding of a patient's medical condition (10,11)

Furthermore, VBP models transfer financial risk from payers to providers, introducing uncertainty for healthcare organizations that need to manage both patient health outcomes and expenditures. Providers may face financial penalties if they do not meet established performance metrics, which can strain their resources and complicate budgeting efforts. Additionally, resistance from providers who are used to traditional fee-for-service models presents a challenge, as they may be reluctant to shift to value-based care due to concerns about

[DOI: 10.18502/jebhpme.v9i1.19413]

changes in workflows and performance metrics.

The complexity of quality metrics utilized in VBP models can also overwhelm providers, making it difficult to accurately track progress. With numerous performance targets that often change, maintaining compliance can be a significant challenge. Effective patient engagement is crucial for the success of value-based care, as it requires patients to actively participate in managing their health—a departure from traditional passive roles that can be hard to achieve. Moreover, the implementation of VBP models frequently leads to increased administrative burdens related to data collection and reporting, which can take time away from direct patient care. Finally, many providers voice concerns about the inadequacy of financial incentives tied to value-based payments, arguing that these rewards may not sufficiently cover the resources necessary to deliver high-quality care. Addressing these challenges is vital for unlocking the full potential of value-based care in enhancing healthcare outcomes and efficiency.

Conclusion

The transition to advanced payment models in healthcare marks a significant shift toward enhancing health outcomes through value-based care. This approach prioritizes value creation over the quantity of services rendered, offering promising potential for improving healthcare delivery. However, realizing this potential comes with substantial challenges, including the need for financial investment, comprehensive training for healthcare professionals, and the development of robust information systems that support data-driven decision-making. Cultivating an organizational culture that embraces change is crucial for overcoming resistance from providers accustomed to traditional fee-for-service models.

By actively involving the workforce in the transition and equipping them with the necessary skills, healthcare systems can better adapt to new payment models. For developing countries, establishing the necessary infrastructure is vital for successfully implementing these advanced models. This includes creating reliable health information systems that enable data sharing and interoperability among stakeholders, which are essential for tracking performance metrics and aligning payment with quality outcomes. As the healthcare landscape continues to evolve globally, collaboration among policymakers, providers, and technology developers will be critical in addressing barriers to these innovative payment models. By prioritizing education, infrastructure development, and stakeholder engagement, health systems can enhance their capacity to deliver high-quality care while effectively managing costs. Ultimately, this comprehensive approach will lead to improved health outcomes and greater efficiency within healthcare systems.

References

1. Leao DLL, Cremers HP, van Veghel D, Pavlova M, Groot W. The Impact of Value-Based Payment Models for Networks of Care and Transmural Care: A Systematic Literature Review. Appl Health Econ Health Policy. 2023 May;21(3):441-466. doi: 10.1007/s40258-023-00790-z. Epub 2023 Feb 1. PMID: 36723777; PMCID: PMC10119264.
2. Blumenthal D, Jena AB. Hospital value-based purchasing. J Hosp Med. 2013 May;8(5):271-7. doi: 10.1002/jhm.2045. Epub 2013 Apr 16. PMID: 23589485.
3. Revere L, Langland-Orban B, Large J, Yang Y. Evaluating the robustness of the CMS Hospital Value-Based Purchasing measurement system. Health Serv Res. 2021 Jun;56(3):464-473. doi: 10.1111/1475-6773.13608. Epub 2021 Jan 4. PMID: 33393668; PMCID: PMC8143689.
4. Developing a Path to Value-Based Payment for Medical Products. Value-Based Payment Advisory Group Kick-Off Meeting. Duke-Margolis Center for Health Policy Conference Center, Washington DC. April 28, 2017.
5. Ouayogodé MH, Colla CH, Lewis VA, editors. Determinants of success in Shared Savings Programs: An analysis of ACO and market characteristics. Healthcare; 2017: Elsevier.
6. Corinne Lewis et al., “Value-Based Care: What It Is, and Why It’s Needed” (explainer), Commonwealth Fund, Feb. 7, 2023. https://doi.org/10.26099/fw31-3463.

[DOI: 10.18502/jebhpme.v9i1.19413]

7. Kim H, Mahmood A, Hammarlund NE, Chang CF. Hospital value-based payment programs and disparity in the United States: A review of current evidence and future perspectives. Front Public Health. 2022 Oct 10;10:882715. doi: 10.3389/fpubh. 2022.882715. PMID: 36299751; PMCID: PMC9589294.
8. Lindner, Luca, and Luca Lorenzoni. "Innovative providers' payment models for promoting value-based health systems: start small, prove value, and scale up." (2023): 20230156129.
9. Nissenson AR. Improving outcomes for ESRD patients: shifting the quality paradigm. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol. 2014 Feb;9(2):430-4. doi: 10.2215/CJN. 05980613. Epub 2013 Nov 7. PMID: 24202130; PMCID: PMC3913244.
10. Pine KH. The qualculative dimension of healthcare data interoperability. Health informatics journal. 2019;25(3):536-48.
11. Bhartiya S, Mehrotra D. Challenges and recommendations to healthcare data exchange in an interoperable environment. Electronic Journal of Health Informatics. 2014;8(2):16.

[DOI: 10.18502/jebhpme.v9i1.19413]