



The Unintended Consequences of Moving the Reimbursement Line

Lee E. Mortenson

To cite this article: Lee E. Mortenson (1997) The Unintended Consequences of Moving the Reimbursement Line, *Oncology Issues*, 12:4, 4-4, DOI: [10.1080/10463356.1997.11904690](https://doi.org/10.1080/10463356.1997.11904690)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463356.1997.11904690>



Published online: 18 Oct 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 2



View related articles [↗](#)

Oncology Issues

The Journal of the
Association of Community Cancer Centers

Senior Editor

Lee E. Mortenson, D.P.A.
ACCC Executive Director

Managing Editor

Donald Jewler

Assistant Editor

Cara Egan

Advertising Representative

William J. Asmann

Art Director

Tom Suzuki

Designers

Constance D. Dillman

Hea-Ran Cho

EDITORIAL BOARD

Chairman, Carl G. Kardinal, M.D.

Marija Bjugovich, M.S.N.

Douglas W. Blayney, M.D.

Irvin D. Fleming, M.D.

Kent Giles, M.P.P.M.

Michael E. Mohsen, M.H.A.

Nancy A. Nowak, M.A.

Cary A. Present, M.D., F.A.C.P.

Teresa D. Smith, R.N., M.S.N.

Dolores Thomas, M.Ed., R.N., R.T.T.

James L. Wade III, M.D.

R. Lawrence White, M.D.

ACCC OFFICERS AND TRUSTEES

President

James L. Wade III, M.D. (Decatur, Ill.)

President-Elect

R. Lawrence White, M.D. (Washington, D.C.)

Secretary

Gordon R. Klatt, M.D. (Tacoma, Wash.)

Treasurer

Margaret A. Riley, M.N., R.N., C.N.A.A.
(Atlanta, Ga.)

Immediate Past-President

John E. Feldmann, M.D. (Mobile, Ala.)

Trustees

Edward L. Braud, M.D. (Springfield, Ill.)

Robert J. Brooks, M.D. (Tucson, Ariz.)

Susan J. Brown-Wagner, R.N., M.S.N.,

C.R.N.P., A.O.C.N. (Scottsdale, Ariz.)

Dale E. Fuller, M.D. (Dallas, Tex.)

Charles H. Nash III, M.D., F.A.C.P. (Tulsa, Okla.)

Cary A. Present, M.D., F.A.C.P. (Los Angeles, Calif.)

Diane M. Otte, R.N., M.S., O.C.N. (Omaha, Nebr.)

Teresa Smith, R.N., M.S.N. (Springfield, Ill.)

Joyce G. Stair, M.S., B.S.N. (Ann Arbor, Mich.)

James R. Zabora, M.S.W. (Baltimore, Md.)

Member of Business
Publications Audit, Inc.



Oncology Issues is published bimonthly at the Association of Community Cancer Centers, Executive Office, 11600 Nebel St., Suite 201, Rockville, MD 20852. Copyright ©1997. Association of Community Cancer Centers. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means without permission in writing. Editorial correspondence, changes of address, manuscripts, and letters to the editor should be addressed to: Lee E. Mortenson, Senior Editor, *Oncology Issues*, 11600 Nebel St., Suite 201, Rockville, MD 20852.

Articles, editorials, letters to the editor, and other contributed materials represent the opinions of the authors and do not represent the opinions of the Association of Community Cancer Centers or the institution with which the author is affiliated unless the contrary is specified.

Subscription Rates

Basic rate: \$20 per year for health care providers; \$40 per year for others. ACCC membership dues pay for general, delegate, and chapter member subscriptions. Back issues available for \$5 per copy, prepaid. Bulk rates available upon request.

Advertising

Send correspondence, display advertising, insertion orders, printing materials to Managing Editor, *Oncology Issues*, 11600 Nebel St., Suite 201, Rockville, MD 20852. Questions for general information may be directed to 301/984-9496.

Postage Privileges

Postmaster: Please send address changes to Association of Community Cancer Centers, 11600 Nebel St., Suite 201, Rockville, MD 20852.

FROM THE EDITOR



The Unintended Consequences of Moving the Reimbursement Line

by Lee E. Mortenson, D.P.A.

The story features more old fashioned politics than you can imagine and includes blackmail, sudden reversals, back-room plotting, and strange bedfellows. The story is the Hill debate over what to reimburse oncologists for chemotherapy provided "incident to" in their offices. All this scheming is within the oncology and patient advocacy communities and the pharmaceutical industry—although HCFA staff are also playing their own powerful games. What's at stake is the difference between an oncology practice's acquisition and management costs and the level of Medicare reimbursement.

Where Congress draws the line could have a huge effect on where chemotherapy is delivered and whether an oncology practice is viable. Too low and medical oncologists will start shipping patients back to hospital outpatient departments. Too high and congressional budget cutters will not find the savings they seek.

Over the last month the House Ways and Means Committee made it clear that there would be some cuts. Despite congressional visits from ASCO and ACCC leaders, two drafts came out of the Committee with language that stopped the hearts of many: no greater than 95 percent of AWP (with the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services setting AWP). Fortunately, the proposals were reconsidered primarily through the hard work of Dr. Joe Bailes with help from Dr. Jim Wade and dozens of other oncologists.

Next rumors flew about Senate Finance cuts of AWP-15 percent!

Then it was back to the language HCFA staff preferred: setting reimbursement at no greater than 95

percent of AWP and giving the Secretary (and therefore HCFA staff) discretion to set an actual price and launch a study.

Where will we end up?

It's difficult to know yet. Coming out of the House Ways and Means Committee, reimbursement stood pegged at exactly AWP-5 percent with commercial sources setting average wholesale price as they do now. The Senate Finance Committee bill sounded a lot like price controls. But a little budget savings here, a little there, and soon we will see dramatic changes in the practice of medical oncology. Congress will be pleased with the savings and surprised by the unintended consequences.

While a case can be made that there are huge percentage profits in some chemotherapy drugs, the actual dollar amounts of the variances between acquisition and AWP are often small and could be readily absorbed in making up the difference between the cost of providing infusions versus HCFA's allowable costs. HCFA's own data suggest that it underpays infusion costs by about \$130-\$140, while the huge percentages cited by the Senate often equate to differences of from \$4 to \$20.

Of course there are the other consequences. This will chase oncology patients back to outpatient ambulatory care departments, close a number of rural clinics, and change the role of medical oncologists in the treatment of patients. It will be a further disincentive to young physicians to pursue a career in oncology—one of the few specialties that is already in short supply. And, assuming that hospitals can still make a profit on these patients, it may disappoint congressional budget cutters who are likely to turn on hospital outpatient drug costs next.