Tax Relief for Small Business
Act of 2021
Learn more

MEDICAL SERVICES

AMERICA'S LOOMING PRIMARY-CARE CRISIS

By Clifford Marks
June 28, 2021

The coronavirus pandemic's impact on primary care is the worst of any specialty. Photograph from Alamy

Family Medicine is a partner at a private medical clinic in Bangalore, Karnataka, in situated in "nonpare country"—a largely rural region, encompassing southeastern Alabama and parts of Georgia and Florida, named for the ubiquitous vegetation that takes root in its sandy soil like chiggers. In one of a few differing primary care practices in the nation, independent medical practice across the U.S. it has been partly for the coronavirus pandemic. Even though her practice received a lifeline from the federal government's Paycheck Protection Program (PPP), Jenkins had to take a pay cut, reduce staff hours, and lay off some physicians who were about to start work. "For the first time in my career, I'm not sleeping during short-term," she told me recently. "We've never had this level of insecurity."

For decades, health care was America's indomitable industry. While employment in other sectors—retail, manufacturing, construction—rose and fell with the business cycle, clinics, hospitals, and medical practices steadily added jobs. But the pandemic has changed health care's trajectory. Hospitals now find themselves in a crisis of cash flow, forced to postpone elective procedures, and a surge in unemployment is shifting patients from private insurance plans to Medicaid, which is less remunerative for doctors. Some rural hospitals, whose financial footing was already tenuous, are facing the prospect of closure.

Among the more vulnerable parts of the nation's health care system are family medicine, internal medicine, pediatrics, and obstetrics and gynecology clinics. With certain Trump initiatives in place, in-person appointments have dropped precipitously in May, a survey of primary care doctors found that nearly a fifth had temporarily closed their practices, owing to the pandemic, and two in five had laid off or furloughed staff. Primary care clinics are tasked with keeping people healthy and decades of research have shown that this work yields better population-level health outcomes and lower costs. As my colleague Dhruv Khullar, last winter, the health consequences of these closures could be significant. Vaccination rates for children have dramatically fallen, patients are missing screenings powers to save lives, prescriptions are going unfilled, Chronic conditions could worsen, life expectancies could drop.

Even before the pandemic, primary care was in crisis. Primary care doctors were already among the most poorly compensated physicians in the country, for medical students burdened with debt, those smaller salaries lessened the specialty's allure. Experts have long warned of a shortage of doctors providing foundational forms of outpatient care, especially in rural areas. Last year the Kaiser Family Foundation estimated that more than fourteen thousand primary care physicians were needed to eliminate existing shortages.

For this article, I spoke with more than twenty primary care physicians, from New York City to rural Nebraska and suburban Colorado. They work in single-physician practices, in multi-specialty groups, or as part of hospital systems. Nearly all of them described dramatic declines in revenue. Many benefitted from the Paycheck Protection Program, but it covered only a few months, and all the physicians expressed concern about how they would navigate the uncertainty ahead. "This is taking us down," Jacqueline Fincham, an internist and the president of the American College of Physicians, told me. "We're not going to have a vaccine and herd immunity for probably a year—so, is this sustainable for a year? The reality is, it's probably not, certainly not for most small practices." Among of these gaps are of business, the importance for American health could be profound and enduring. What's at stake is the nature of medical practice in America, and the kind of health care system as a whole. The way that patients interact with their doctors and the path that American health care takes in the future may be drawn in dark.

The challenges facing primary care are rooted in the structure of the American health care system. This system wasn't designed at any one moment, instead it has accreted over time, with each new layer seeking to compensate for the deficiencies of the previous one. The U.S. has a patchwork of insurance plans, fee-for-service payments, which was codified in a law passed by the Social Security Amendments of 1965—the law that created Medicare and Medicaid. It is fee-for-service, among the payers, usually a health insurer or government agency, pays the health-care provider a set fee for our given service. Break your arm, and your insurance company might pay one fee for an X-ray, another for a splint, and a third for a follow-up visit. Though conceptually simple, the system has obvious flaws. It encourages health care providers to offer as many services as possible, regardless of patient need, sometimes contributing for quality. If your surgeon's key replacement operation is successful, with no complications, but a stroke is complicated by infection, leading to a series of follow-up visits, the fees are still the same; in fact, the second hospital stay make more money. "It's a fee-for-service payment," Neel Gorsuch of Kaiser Permanente, "we are actually penalized for making the effort to organize and deliver care with the best service, quality, and efficiency in mind."

To address this problem, government programs and insurers have come up with alternative payment schemes—but, at a fundamental, almost philosophical, level, many of these still operate on a fee-for-service principle. In the nineteen-eighties, Medicare proposed its approach to inpatient hospitalizations so that a single global fee would be reimbursed for a patient's entire stay, rather than reimbursed at one payment level for a broken leg, at another for pneumonia, and at a third for sepsis. More recently, the Medicare Access and Care Reauthorization Act of 2015 provided Medicare reimbursements away from a pure fee-for-service model and toward others that pay based on the quality of care the health care provided. Still, for the most part, it's the provision of services that indicates that care has happened. Physicians, physician assistants, and paid, it's the number of office visits, lab tests, and surgeries that matters.

The fee-for-service principle remoulders through the whole health care system, but it has especially dire consequences for primary care, because it forces discrete medical episodes over ongoing and preventative treatment. Payers routinely reimburse health-care providers for specialized procedures at high rates, but they underpay for the kind of care that involves patient management, routine vaccinations, or smoking and diet counseling—a genuine lower immense. This imbalance is due, in large part, to the Relative Value Update Committee (RUC), an extraordinarily powerful group of doctors that advises the federal government on reimbursement rates for physicians. The RUC, comprised of three-our doctors convened by the American Medical Association, it's structured such that each specialty has an equal seat. On the RUC, urology, thoracic surgery, and hand-and-arch surgery have seats, and so do family medicine and pediatrics. Although the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) which has final authority to set payment rates for Medicare, but in many years accepted the RUC's recommendations, it's mostly simply over cost of the time.

Primary-care groups and health care policy experts have long contended that the RUC's choices favor procedures over the counselling, education, and chronic-disease management that form the basic of primary care. Twenty years ago, Don Berwick, the co-founder of the Institute for Healthcare Improvement and a mentor of mine, called for a total reimagining of health care reimbursement in a speech that has since become famous in industry circles. Addressing an audience at the institute's annual conference, Berwick said, "Imagine a fire department in 1900, the skilled most members of a town of firefighters. When the firefighters finally realized the immense danger posed by the blaze, they tried to contact—but they did so while shouldering heavy equipment, including their Pulaski, special firefighting axes that combine an axe head with an adze. The firefighters did not recognize that, in this new scenario, their old tools no longer served them, many died carrying them.

VIDEO FROM THE NEW YORKER

The Decline in Bread Crickets, Without Starting to Boost

The health-care system, Berwick said, was falling into the same trap: clinging to a sometimes burdensome tool, no matter the circumstances. "Our Pulaski," he argued, "is the encounter—the visit." A better health-care system could only be built if scientists, professionals, patients, payers, and the health-care workforce agreed "that the product we choose to make is not visits. Our product is healing relationships." In 2010, President Barack Obama, Berwick's former colleague, appointed him the head administrator of CMS. He resigned, in 2013, before he concluded that he would be unable to win confirmation from Republicans in the Senate.

Among other things, the structural bias in favor of procedures and office visits has prevented telemedicine—which could make outpatient care more affordable, accessible, and convenient—from gaining a foothold. For decades, Medicare only paid for telemedicine visits if a patient lived in a designated "rural" area or received the treatment in a medical setting, effectively, for many people, it ruled out home care. Last year, CMS and the Trump administration changed this equation. In March, the federal government expanded the list of telemedicine services eligible for Medicare reimbursement. Clinics across the country started using telemedicine as both a way to provide care and a financial lifeline, used to embrace phone and video visits almost overnight. "I was so close to getting a ninety-year-old woman to turn on a video call," Kelsey Mirbaba, a family medicine doctor in Boise, Idaho, told me. Mirbaba's potential patient because she's found that, on the phone, she could provide the same quality of care as she would in person. Elsewhere, for their part, latest found value in the glimpse that such visits offer of their patients' home lives. Early in the coronavirus crisis, when I began conducting telemedicine visits with my own patients, I was surprised to discover that the technology created a feeling of camaraderie. The power dynamic diminished, convening from our respective apartments, we were on equal footing.

For all the promise of this ongoing telemedical experiment, the future of primary care as a whole remains unclear. CMS has said that the current dispensation is only a temporary emergency accommodation; if support for telemedicine stops before the pandemic does, our country will be taking a big risk. Our practice of what might happen comes from studies assessing health outcomes after a patient's primary care doctor retires. Some health patients don't face a society-wide diminution in access to primary care, because other doctors fill the gap. But some patients encounter sudden difficulty. Even so, a recent study found that nearly all patients experienced unfavorable outcomes, among them difficulty reserving prescriptions and increased use of high-cost care.

Labor economists have long studied a phenomenon called hysteresis in economics, it refers to a situation in which high unemployment caused by a particular event develops an inertia of its own, remaining elevated even after the initial cause has abated. Nobody is quite sure what causes hysteresis. Do workers' skills erode? Or do firms find that they can get along with fewer workers? In any case, note that the pandemic has caused unusual mass unemployment, hysteresis could play a major role in our economic recovery. Similar, it's possible that primary care will lose firms and retreat to practice ways patient volume obviously, during the Great Depression, for instance, some small-town doctors made house calls and accepted barter payments amid the crisis ended. But the situation today is different. A modern medical practice needs physical space, an electronic records system, analgesic insurance, and back-office support to handle the byzantine medical coding on which reimbursement depends. Hanging out a shingle in twenty-first-century America requires more than a diploma; it requires capital.

Patients may also respond in an enduring way to what seems to be a temporary disruption of the doctor-patient relationship. In ordinary times, engaging people in the treatment of chronic conditions can be a fraught endeavor; patients often need prodding to take an antibiotic for a urinary-tract infection might or exercise to lower their blood pressure, and complications from high blood pressure down the road. Regular checkups help patients develop and maintain fragile habits that the pandemic tore apart disrupted. I have a diabetic patient who finally come in and halved taken insulin in six weeks," Gracy LaRoy, a family physician in Ohio and the president of the American Academy of Family Physicians, told me. "It's, like, Why the heck did you not call? But then, I don't like going to the doctor—and if my doctor says, 'Well, we're not doing more tests now, I think, but I don't have to go to the doctor,' he said. "It gives you an excuse to not do the right thing for yourself."

There are steps that governments and insurers could take now to prevent the crisis from worsening. Many commercial insurers and state-administered Medicaid programs still dock reimbursement rates at the same rates as in-person care, parity is extra less generous than Medicare. Lawmakers could increase payments for elderly and for those in low income or rural communities who don't have access to high-speed Internet. Some surveys of primary-care practices show that more than half of those factors will minimal reimbursement for most of their telemedicine visits in recent months—significant problem at a time of financial strain.

Through the coders' Act and subsequent legislation, Congress has allocated a hundred and seventy-five billion dollars to health care expenses attributable to the pandemic. How that money will be spent, however, remains unclear; there doubt are also supposed to cover aid for hospitals and crisis 19 care for the uninsured, among other things, and a hundred and seventy-five billion sounds less impressive when set against the $3.6 trillion that America spent on health care last year. The Biden administration has proposed a practice, but this is only a temporary lifeline. Without either an increase in funding or a direct allocation aimed at primary care, it seems likely that many clinics will never receive the money they need to stave off closure.

Some professionals and providers have proposed a more radical approach to primary care. Medicare-for-all proposals, championed by health policy experts and a decade getting a test drive as part of the Affordable Care Act's limited of continuing to reimburse providers through a fee-for-service system, the Biden administration could shift payment for primary care and similar specialties to a so-called capitation model. Under this system, payment is reimbursed on a per-person, per-month basis, usually with some portion of the payment tied to quality measures, such as adjusted mortality and recent hospitalizations. Since the A.C.A's passage, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services has tested health care networks called Accountable Care Organizations (A.C.O.s). Clinics UCF Southwestern, Wisconsin ThedaCare, and New York and New Jersey's Montefiore are examples of A.C.O.s.) Despite these efforts, most primary care practices are still paid mainly on a fee-for-service basis.

"It crisis is a terrible thing to waste," the economist Paul Romer once said. The weaknesses that have left our primary-care system so vulnerable to the pandemic have been understood for decades, yet change has come at a glacial pace, it's been easy to ignore the systemic flaws because health care spending has grown over time, with many health-care organizations prospering as a result. Why undertake dramatic change when there is always more money to go around? Even during the financial crisis, Charles Roman, who runs the C.E.O. of Cityroup, was asked why his bank continued to pay out bonuses to its investment bankers, he responded that the bubble would soon burst. "When the music stops, in terms of liquidity, things will be complicated," he said. "But, as long as the music is playing, you've got to get up and dance." For much of American health care, the music has stopped. The best way to address the emergency is by embracing a better system.

MORE MEDICAL DISPATCHES

- Surviving a worse coronavirus infection is hard. So is recovering.
- Some hospitals have postponed cancer surgeries because of the coronavirus crisis. How do doctors assess surgeons' skills during a pandemic?
- It is not too late to go on the offense against the coronavirus. This five-point public-health plan may be the key.
- The lockdown and relatively of treating coronavirus patients at home.
- To fill the vacuum left by the pandemic, doctors are relying on informal networks to get the information and support they need.
- Conflict and confusion reign at New York hospitals over how to handle childbirth during the pandemic.
- In countries where the rate of infection threatens to outstrip the capacity of the health system, doctors are considering ethical quarantines for which nothing is their training prepared them.

Clifford Marks is an emergency medicine resident at the Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai.

More: Health Care Doctors Coronavirus Hospitals Medicine

THE DAILY

Sign up for our daily newsletter and get the best of The New Yorker in your in-box.

Enter your e-mail address

Sign up

Your e-mail address

Will be used in accordance with our Privacy Policy

Read More

POLITICS OF DISEASE

THE PROMISE AND THE PERIL OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH CARE

During the coronavirus crisis, Mitchell Gordon looks back on the future of health care. Is it a future that we want?

MEDICAL SERVICES

THE LONG GAME OF CORONAVIRUS RESEARCH

Where opened vaccine trials goes beyond the current difficulties, work is just as urgent.

A COUPLE FACES THE QUESTIONS POSED BY MALE INFERTILITY

As a couple grappling with infertility, Jonathan Lethem and spouse discussion, they gaines their fears and necessitate the meaning of family and legacy.