

6. Cutler DM. From the Affordable Care Act to affordable care. *JAMA*. 2015;314(4):337-338.
7. Haeder SF, Weimer DL, Mukamel DB. Narrow networks and the Affordable Care Act. *JAMA*. 2015; 314(7):669-670.
8. Berwick DM. Era 3 for medicine and health care. *JAMA*. 2016;315(13):1329-1330.
9. Emanuel EJ. How well is the Affordable Care Act doing? reasons for optimism. *JAMA*. 2016;315(13): 1331-1332.
10. Blumenthal D. Better health care: a way forward. *JAMA*. 2016;315(13):1333-1334.
11. Antos J, Capretta J, Wilensky G. Replacing the Affordable Care Act and other suggested reforms. *JAMA*. 2016;315(13):1324-1325.
12. Wilensky G. Addressing social issues affecting health to improve US health outcomes. *JAMA*. 2016;315(15):1552-1553.
13. Chetty R, Stepner M, Abraham S, et al. The association between income and life expectancy in the United States, 2001-2014. *JAMA*. 2016;315(16):1750-1766.
14. Deaton A. On death and money: history, facts, and explanations. *JAMA*. 2016;315(16):1703-1705.
15. McGinnis JM. Income, life expectancy, and community health: underscoring the opportunity. *JAMA*. 2016;315(16):1709-1710.
16. Woolf SH, Purnell JQ. The good life: working together to promote opportunity and improve population health and well-being. *JAMA*. 2016;315 (16):1706-1708.

## US Health Care Reform Cost Containment and Improvement in Quality

Peter R. Orszag, PhD

**President Obama** is the only sitting president of the United States in modern history to publish an article in *JAMA*.<sup>1</sup> That seems appropriate since he is also the only re-



Editorial [page 492](#)



Related article [page 525](#)

cent president to sign comprehensive health reform legislation, the Affordable Care Act (ACA). The president adopted a dual mandate for the ACA: it needed not only to ex-

pand coverage but also to contain costs (despite the additional utilization associated with the increased coverage) and improve quality.

Numerous pundits on both the right and the left indicated that it was a mistake to tie these goals together, but other experts maintained that the president's approach was the only feasible one. In any case, it is difficult to argue with the results: fundamentally, the ACA is working. An estimated 20 million more people are insured because of the law, the increase in health care costs has declined sharply, and health care quality is improving following its enactment.

The Special Communication<sup>1</sup> by the president breaks some new ground; for example, by renewing a call for a public option on the exchanges created by the ACA. Mostly, though, the report is a compendium of the numerous positive outcomes related to the law to date and how the worst concerns (from creating massive job loss to substantial access problems) have proven almost entirely untrue. However, robust evidence demonstrating the actual health benefits of the coverage expansions is more tenuous than suggested,<sup>2,3</sup> and the article does not revisit medical malpractice reform (focused on safe harbors for evidence-based care).<sup>4</sup>

Rather than caviling over these minor points, however, this editorial will focus on what has proven surprising since the ACA was enacted and the path forward.

First, perhaps the most significant surprise since 2010 is the substantial deceleration in health care costs. The conventional wisdom at the time the ACA was enacted was that despite its ostensible dual mandate, the act largely addressed

the coverage problem while doing almost nothing to address cost trends. That perspective was flawed and frustrating at the time, but even the most optimistic forecasts were conservative relative to what has since occurred.

Imagine, for example, if anyone had been bold enough to predict in 2010 that Medicare spending per beneficiary would *decline* on an inflation-adjusted basis through 2014. Yet, as the president points out, that is precisely what has happened, and recent data suggest that the slowdown in Medicare expenditures has continued.<sup>5</sup>

The deceleration in the growth in health care spending extends well beyond Medicare, although the drivers differ. A recent Robert Wood Johnson Foundation-Urban Institute analysis reported that national health expenditures are now expected to be \$2.6 trillion (11%) lower from 2014 through 2019 than projected before the law was enacted.<sup>6</sup>

So why has this happened? For employer-sponsored insurance, the evidence points strongly to the economic downturn as the primary impetus.<sup>7</sup> That leaves little room for the much-discussed increases in cost sharing to play much role. Perhaps that is not as surprising as it may seem; as the president's article suggests, out-of-pocket spending has not increased as a share of total employer-sponsored insurance because the rise in deductibles has been offset by more protection against excessive out-of-pocket costs. There is more focus on the former because more people are affected by the upward pressure on deductibles, but given the extreme concentration of health spending, the latter matters just as much for the total dollars involved.

For Medicare, by contrast, the evidence shows little if any business cycle effect.<sup>8,9</sup> The Medicare trend thus provides the most suggestive structural evidence of "bending the cost curve." The combined effect of the various ACA cost initiatives, none of which were dominant in and of themselves, caused a crucial shift in thinking that fee-for-service payment was ending. That shift in perspective in turn changed behavior even before the payment reforms were fully implemented. After years of skepticism, even the otherwise conservative Medicare trustees are finally

“hopeful that U.S. health care practices are in the process of becoming more efficient as new payment models become more prevalent ....”<sup>10</sup>

The second surprise is the related improvement in quality. Hospital-acquired infection rates declined by 17% between 2010 and 2013, and 30-day readmission rates also declined.<sup>11</sup> The readmission declines underscore the expectation hypothesis. Although the ACA included a readmission rate penalty, avoiding hospital readmissions is still often contrary to a hospital’s immediate financial interest. Hospitals are nonetheless working hard to reduce readmissions not only because it’s the “right” thing to do but also because they recognize that in alternative payment models, their financial interest will be improved by avoiding readmissions.

The third surprise involves Medicare Advantage. When the ACA was enacted, the Congressional Budget Office and others anticipated that its payment reductions would cause a decline in Medicare Advantage enrollment.<sup>12</sup> Instead, Medicare Advantage has increased to roughly a third of all Medicare beneficiaries, and it seems plausible that its penetration rate will continue increasing.<sup>13</sup>

The fourth surprise has been that employer-sponsored plans have proven more resilient than expected. Such insurance has been stable since implementation of the ACA.<sup>14</sup> That is one of the challenges for the public exchanges: fewer than expected employers have discontinued their health insurance plans, so the public exchanges have lower enrollment.

So what is the path forward from here? On the exchanges, the administration has recently taken steps to restrict special enrollment periods and to limit nonexchange temporary coverage. Those are useful, as is the ongoing experience payers are gaining with the exchange populations. Ultimately, the exchanges require broad participation by both payers and beneficiaries. The movement toward private exchanges, which has also proceeded more sluggishly than some expected but could accelerate in the future, may ultimately provide a pathway toward more public exchange enrollment, as employers and employees become more comfortable with exchange-mediated insurance.

Continued progress on cost containment and value improvement requires correctly identifying the specific opportunities. In employer-sponsored insurance, the evi-

dence shows substantial variation in prices,<sup>15</sup> and to date, transparency tools have proven relatively ineffective at reducing this variation.<sup>16</sup> Employers have to push for better pricing, and as the president notes in his Special Communication, the so-called Cadillac tax on high-cost employer plans should be reformed, not ended. That tax was useful in keeping pressure on employers to move toward a focus on value. The initial stage of that process often involved higher cost sharing for employees, but ultimately it would have required employers to become more active in helping to reduce total spending, rather than just shifting that spending between the firm and the employee.

For Medicare, by contrast, most variation involves utilization, not price. Care following acute episodes of disease accounts for almost three-quarters of that variation,<sup>17</sup> and preliminary results suggest that cost and quality are most negatively correlated with such care.<sup>18</sup> The postacute care sector thus looms large in the path forward to higher-value Medicare utilization patterns.

On Medicare policy, the administration has set a goal that 50% of traditional Medicare payments should be value based by 2018. To get there, reliance on purely voluntary measures will not be sufficient—and in any case, that would require the type of relatively weak incentives producing mediocre results to date with accountable care organizations.

As a group of health care experts recently wrote,<sup>19</sup> a better alternative is more mandatory bundled payments, similar to the joint replacement bundle that is being rolled out in almost 70 local areas. Such mandatory bundles should be expanded over more episodes until health care organizations and health care professionals gain sufficient experience and can handle the risks associated with moving to fully capitated payment structures. The most promising next mandatory bundles include episodes surrounding coronary artery bypass grafting, maternity care, other forms of orthopedic surgery, and certain types of oncology. Given the disproportionate role played by postacute care, all of these bundles should include 90-day postdischarge periods.

In sum, the US health care reform glass is more than half full. Despite ongoing and legitimate concerns about the public exchanges, the ACA has proven remarkably successful at boosting coverage and reforming the delivery system.

#### ARTICLE INFORMATION

**Author Affiliation:** Lazard, New York, New York.

**Corresponding Author:** Peter R. Orszag, PhD, Lazard, New York, NY 10112 ([peter.orszag@lazard.com](mailto:peter.orszag@lazard.com)).

**Published Online:** July 11, 2016.  
doi:10.1001/jama.2016.9876.

**Conflict of Interest Disclosures:** The author has completed and submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest. Dr Orszag served as the director of the Office of Management and Budget under President Obama and had also served as the director of the Congressional Budget Office.

**Disclaimer:** The views expressed herein are those of the author alone.

#### REFERENCES

1. Obama B. United States health care reform: progress to date and next steps. *JAMA*. doi:10.1001/jama.2016.9797.
2. Baicker K, Taubman SL, Allen HL, et al; Oregon Health Study Group. The Oregon experiment—effects of Medicaid on clinical outcomes. *N Engl J Med*. 2013;368(18):1713-1722.
3. Finkelstein A, Taubman S, Wright B, et al. *The Oregon Health Insurance Experiment: Evidence From the First Year*. July 2011. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w17190>. Accessed June 21, 2016.
4. Orszag P. A better fix for medical malpractice. *Bloomberg View*. February 25, 2014. <https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2014-02-25/a-better-fix-for-medical-malpractice>. Accessed June 22, 2016.
5. Congressional Budget Office. Monthly budget review for May 2016. June 7, 2016. <https://www.cbo.gov/publication/51665>. Accessed June 22, 2016.
6. McMorrow S, Holahan J. The widespread slowdown in health spending growth: implications for future spending projections and the cost of the Affordable Care Act. Urban Institute. June 20, 2016. <http://www.urban.org/research/publication/widespread-slowdown-health-spending-growth-implications-future-spending-projections-and-cost-affordable-care-act-update>. Accessed June 21, 2016.
7. Dranove D, Garthwaite C, Ody C. Health spending slowdown is mostly due to economic factors, not structural change in the health care sector. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2014;33(8):1399-1406.

8. Levine M, Buntin M. Why has growth in spending for fee-for-service Medicare slowed? Congressional Budget Office. August 22, 2013. <https://www.cbo.gov/publication/44513>. Accessed June 22, 2016.
9. Dranove D, Garthwaite C, Ody C. The economic downturn and its lingering effects reduced Medicare spending growth by \$4 billion in 2009-12. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2015;34(8):1368-1375.
10. Social Security and Medicare Boards of Trustees. A summary of the 2016 annual reports. 2016. <https://www.ssa.gov/oact/trsum/>. Accessed June 22, 2016.
11. Blumenthal D, Abrams M, Nuzum R. The Affordable Care Act at 5 years. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;372(25):2451-2458.
12. Pear R. Surge in Medicare Advantage sign-ups confounds expectations. *New York Times*. February 12, 2016. <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/13/us/politics/surge-in-medicare-advantage-sign-ups-confounds-expectations.html>. Accessed June 22, 2016.
13. Jacobson G, Casillas G, Damico A, Neuman T, Gold M. Medicare Advantage 2016 spotlight: enrollment market update. Kaiser Family Foundation. May 11, 2016. <http://kff.org/medicare/issue-brief/medicare-advantage-2016-spotlight-enrollment-market-update/>. Accessed June 22, 2016.
14. Blavin F, Shartzter A, Long S, Holahan J. Employer-sponsored insurance continues to remain stable under the ACA: findings from June 2013 through March 2015. Urban Institute. June 3, 2015. <http://hrms.urban.org/briefs/Employer-Sponsored-Insurance-Continues-to-Remain-Stable-under-the-ACA.html>. Accessed June 21, 2016.
15. Cooper Z, Craig S, Gaynor M, Van Reenen J. *The Price Ain't Right? Hospital Prices and Health Spending on the Privately Insured*. December 2015. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w21815>. Accessed June 22, 2016.
16. Whaley C, Schneider Chafen J, Pinkard S, et al. Association between availability of health service prices and payments for these services. *JAMA*. 2014;312(16):1670-1676.
17. Newhouse J, Garber A, Bach P, et al. *Variation in Health Care Spending: Target Decision Making, Not Geography*. Institute of Medicine. July 24, 2013. <http://www.nationalacademies.org/hmd/Reports/2013/Variation-in-Health-Care-Spending-Target-Decision-Making-Not-Geography.aspx>. Accessed June 22, 2016.
18. Doyle J, Graves J, Gruber J. *Uncovering Waste in US Healthcare*. March 2015. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w21050>. Accessed June 22, 2016.
19. Letter to Secretary Burwell. June 23, 2016. <https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/22130534/Mandatory-bundled-payment-letter.pdf>. Accessed June 23, 2016.

## The Future of the Affordable Care Act Reassessment and Revision

Stuart M. Butler, PhD, MA

**In this issue of JAMA**, President Barack Obama describes many of the features and highlights the results of the Affordable Care Act (ACA).<sup>1</sup> Aligning federal payments more with demon-



Editorial page 492



Related article page 525

strated value and encouraging a move away from a fee-for-service model to managed care has helped reinforce or change the type of reimbursement patterns in the private sector. Allowing young adults to remain on their parents' insurance plan and curbing preexisting condition exclusions addressed significant problems. Creating exchanges was a key step toward allowing US residents to keep the health coverage they want as they move from job to job. Moreover, significantly reducing the number of uninsured households has brought improved care and a measure of financial security to millions of Americans.

However, in looking ahead and thinking about next steps, it is also important to recognize some troubling trends in the ACA that the president has not adequately discussed.

For example, the ACA might be more appropriately labeled the "Medicaid Expansion Act." Although the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) confirmed in March 2016 that there has been a large reduction in the number of uninsured individuals, the sources of coverage are significantly different from its expectations when the law was in the process of enactment.<sup>2</sup> Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) will cover an estimated 17 million more people in 2016 than the CBO's earlier assessment. On the other hand, enrollment in the ACA exchanges has been disappointing, with an estimated 10 million fewer people enrolled compared with ear-

lier projections. Last year, Department of Health and Human Services Secretary Sylvia Burwell announced a sharply reduced goal for growth in exchange coverage in 2016: just 1.3 million compared with much higher earlier projections.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the CBO now estimates that over the next 10 years, as the population increases, the number of people with coverage will expand only modestly, and the proportion of individuals uninsured will cease to decline.<sup>2</sup>

A cause of the disappointing trend in exchange enrollment and the strong Medicaid growth is that the premiums and out-of-pocket exposure make exchange plans unattractive to many US residents. With subsidies focused on people with incomes near the poverty line, many middle class and modest-income households find they face substantial and uncertain costs if they enroll in exchange plans. Those choosing bronze plans to keep premiums low essentially have only catastrophic coverage. While that is an improvement over being uninsured, for many it is coverage in name only. For many households, the president's promise of affordable coverage rings hollow and has not been realized.

The president is also unduly sanguine about the future of health care costs. Financing of Medicare has benefited from a slowdown in the increase in health costs. But this trend preceded enactment of the ACA, and many analysts are uncertain about the cause and continuation of the slowdown in the growth of health care costs, attributing much of the moderation to the Great Recession.<sup>4,5</sup> The president could be correct that the ACA will slow the growth of per capita health spending, but the CBO and others expect spending to increase more rapidly in the future.<sup>6</sup> In addition, the political future of the excise tax on expensive health plans offered through the