Index

A
ACC. See American College of Cardiology
Accelerated compensation events, 15, 18, 19, 88, 89, 90-91
ACES. See Accelerated compensation events;
Avoidable classes of events
ACOG. See American College of Obstetricians and
Gynecologists
ACS. See American College of Surgeons
Acute myocardial infarction, 105
ADR. See Alternative dispute resolution
Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, 18, 83, 142, 145, 149
Alternative dispute resolution, 13-14, 82, 84-87, 89, 90-93
AMA. See American Medical Association
AMA, SSMLP. See American Medical Association/
Specialty Society Medical Liability Project
American College of Cardiology, 5-6, 8, 50, 58, 96, 106-117
American College of Emergency Room Physicians, 96
American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, 5-6, 8, 50, 56, 58, 63, 65, 71, 96, 106-117, 144
American College of Surgeons, 5-6, 8, 50, 56, 58, 63, 65, 96, 106-117
American Health Care Systems, Inc., 32-33
American Medical Association, 30, 145, 47-48, 150, 156-160
American Medical Association/Specialty Society
Medical Liability Project, 14, 84, 86-87
AM I. See Acute myocardial infarction
Arbitration. See Alternative dispute resolution
Archer, Bill, 2, 95
Arizona
pretrial screening studies, 81
Avoidable classes of events. See accelerated compensation events

B
Baldwin, Laura Mae, 9, 68-69, 70, 97
Birth-related injuries, 14-15, 88, 89
Bovbjerg, Randall, 96
Breast biopsy, 24-25
Brigham and Women’s Hospital, 24-25
Bush, George, 2

C
Caesarean delivery, 2, 5, 8, 11, 68-81, 105, 129, 131
California, 28-29, 49, 80-81, 87, 105, 149-150
Cancer, 9, 24-25, 31-32
Cardiologists. See American College of Cardiology.
Case studies
methodology, 43
use of low osmolality contrast agents, 1 (), 71-74
Channeling arrangements, 87
Clinical practice guidelines, 2, 12-13, 17-18, 81-84, 87, 92, 142-150
Clinical scenario surveys
Duke Law Journal study, 49-50, 51-52
Classman survey of New Jersey physicians, 9, 65-66
methodology, 41-42
OTA surveys, 5-6, 8, 50, 52-65
Congressional Sunbelt Caucus, 95
Conventional malpractice reforms
compensation guidelines, 11-12
description, 2, 11-12, 78-79.92
direct malpractice costs impact, 81
low-income plaintiffs and, 76, 77
multistate data, 79, 133-141
policy option, 16-17
pretrial screening studies, 81, 133-141
pm-defendant bias, 76
single-state studies, 79-81, 133-141
small multistate studies, 79-81, 133-141
Cost Consciousness scale, 109

179
Cost of defensive medicine
Caesarean delivery in a complicated labor example, 129, 131
cost containment and practice guidelines, 148-149
“customary practice” standard, 149
estimate surveys, 128-132, 156-161
head injury example, 5, 131-132
Lewin-VHI, Inc. estimates, 48, 160-161
Reynolds and colleagues estimates, 47-48, 156-160
“Customary practice” standard, 149

“learned treatise” exception, 144
Fee-for-service system
health care reform and, 2, 15,91-92
lower diagnostic testing use in, 104
Financial consequences of malpractice suits. See also Cost of defensive medicine
income loss, 27-28
malpractice premiums and, 29, 159
malpractice reporting systems and, 10,28-29
misperceptions about, 28
Florida, 14-15,29, 82,88,89,96-97, 147
FPs. See Family practitioners

D
Definitions of defensive medicine
benefit or harm to the patient and, 22-25,36
categories of defensive medicine, 23-24
direct examples, 24-25
conscious versus unconscious practice, 2, 22, 36
definitions other than OTA’s, 23
Lewin-VHI, Inc. definition, 48
OTA definition, 1,3,21-22,95-96
primary versus sole motivation, 22,36
probability of disease and medical consequences, 25-26
Delayed diagnosis
breast malignancy claims, 24-25
Diagnostic x-rays - see x-rays
Dingell, John D., 2,95
Direct physician surveys
methodology, 4, 41, 43
findings, 4,43-46
poor response rates, 47
Discomfort with Clinical Uncertainty scale, 109
Duke Law Journal Project
findings, 50
methodology, 5, 41-42
structure, 49-50
Durenberger, Sen. Dave, 2,95

E
Economic issues. See Cost of defensive medicine; Financial consequences of malpractice suits
Eliastam, 131
Enterprise liability, 13, 18,82,87-88,93
Epstein, A. and McNeil, B., 48-49
Erb’s palsy study, 32
"Error in judgment" rule, 143
Expert witnesses, 30,83, 143

F
Failure-to-diagnose claims, 30-31
Family practitioners, 5,9,29,69,71
Federal Rules of Evidence

G
Glassman, P., 4,9,65-66,69
Goold, Susan, 108-109
Graduate medical education, 33-36
Grassley, Sen. Charles E., 2
Gronfein and Kinney, 79-80
Grumbach and Lueft, 69,71,97
Guidelines. See Clinical practice guidelines

H
Harvard Medical Institutions, 33
Hatch, Sen. Orrin, 2,95
Hawaii, 81
Head injuries, 5, 130, 131-132
Health care reform, 2, 15-16,91-92,93
Health Insurance Association of America, 131
Health maintenance organizations, 15,31,87, 105
HMOs. See Health maintenance organizations
Hospitals, 32-34

I
Indiana, 79-80
Informed consent, 32-33
Ischemic heart disease, 105

J
Jacobson, P. and Rosenquist, C. 10,71-74
Joint Commission on Accreditation of Health Care Organizations, 32

K
Kaiser Foundation, 80
Kennedy, Sen. Edward M., 2,95
Kington, R., 71
Kinney. See Gronfein and Kinney

L
“Learned treatise” exception, 143-144
Legal standard of care, 30-32, 142-145
Lewin-VHI, Inc., 48, 160-161
Localio R, 2,5,8, 11,68,81
LOCAs. See Low osmolality contrast agents
“Loss of chance” doctrine, 31-32
Low osmolality contrast agents, 10,72-74

M
Maine, 12,82-84, 109, 146-147, 148
Malpractice reform. See Reforms
Mammograms, 24-25,83
Managed competition, 15,92
Maryland, 148
Massachusetts, 105
Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act, 80-81
Medical Insurance Exchange of New Jersey, 65-66
Medical Liability Demonstration Project, 12,82-84, 146-147, 148
Medicare Act, 146
Medicare reimbursement rates, 132
Methodology of studies. See also Study evidence
behavioral model of physician test ordering, 39,40
case studies, 43
clinical scenario surveys, 5-6, 8, 41-42
direct physician surveys, 41
“prompting” issue, 41,63,74
statistical analyses, 42-43
for this report, 95-100
Meyer, J., 24-25
MICRA. See Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act
Minnesota, 82, 147-148
Multistate studies of malpractice reform, 79-81, 133-141

N
National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey, 158
National Cancer Institute, 83
National Center for Health Statistics, 131
National Electronic Injury Surveillance System, 132
National Health Interview Survey, 131, 132
National Practitioner Data Bank, 10,28, 29
Negative defensive medicine, 3,5,9,69,71
Neurological injuries. See also Head injuries, 88, 89
Neurosurgeons, 123-124
New Jersey, 9, 4, 9,65-66,69
New York, 2,5, 8, 11, 28,68-69,71,81, 105
No-fault malpractice reform proposals, 14-15, 18-19,82, 88-91,93
Nonclinical factors in physicians’ resource use, 104-105
NPDB. See National Practitioner Data Bank

O
OB/GYNs. See Obstetricians/gynecologists
Obstetric claims. See also Caesarean delivery, 4,8, 68-69,90
Obstetricians/gynecologists. See also American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, 5,9, 29,69,71, 125-126
OTA clinical scenario surveys, 5-6,50,52-65,67, 106-111, 113-114, 118-127, 130-132

P
Patient Compensation Funds, 79-80
PCFs. See Patient Compensation Funds
Physician Payment Review Commission, 132
Physician test ordering surveys, 48-49
Physicians’ attitudes, 2,9-10,26-32,37, 104-105, 108-109, 127
Physicians’ Insurance Association of America, 24-25
Policy options, 16-19
Positive defensive medicine studies, 2, 5, 8-9, 11, 68-69,81
Pretreatment arbitration agreements. See Voluntary binding arbitration
Pretrial screening studies, 81, 133-141
Project structure
advisory panel, 96
background papers, 97
clinical scenario surveys, 96
contract papers, 97, 100
empirical research in addition to clinical scenario surveys, 96-97
planning workshop, 95-96
report review process, 97
workshop participants, 98-99
“Prompting” issue, 41,63,74
Prostate specific antigen test use, 9
Psychological consequences of malpractice suits, 29
Quality assurance
influence on defensive medicine, 32-33

Q
Reforms
alternative dispute resolution, 13-14, 82, 84-87, 89,90,91,92-93
clinical practice guidelines, 12-13, 81, 82-84,92, 142-150
conventional, 11-12, 76-81
enterprise liability, 13, 18, 82, 87-88, 93
health care reform considerations, 15-16, 91-92
newer reforms, 81-91
no-fault compensation, 14-15, 18-19, 82, 88-91, 93
“Relative avoidability” concept, 90
Residency training. See Graduate medical education
"Respectable minority" rule, 143
Reynolds R., 47-48, 156-160
Risk management, 32-33
Risk Management Foundation, 32
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, 9, 68-69, 70
Rosenquist. See Jacobson and Rosenquist

S
Secretary’s Commission on Medical Malpractice, 23
Shoulder dystocia study, 32
Single state studies of malpractice reform, 79-81, 133-141
SMS survey. See Socioeconomic Monitoring System survey
Socioeconomic Monitoring System survey, 156-157
Sources of defensive medicine, 26-36
St. Paul’s Fire and Marine Insurance Company, 30
Stanford University Medical Center Emergency Department, 25
Statistical analyses
common hypothesis, 67
methodology, 4, 42-43
multivariate analyses, 42
negative defensive medicine studies, 9, 69, 71
OTA clinical scenario surveys, 114-115
positive defensive medicine studies, 68-69
StatXact-Turbo software, 115-116
Study evidence. See also Methodology of studies
case study of LOCAs, 71-74
clinical scenario surveys, 5-6, 8, 49-67
direct physician surveys, 4, 43-47
physicians’ reasons for ordering tests and procedures, 48-49
specific measures, 113-114
statistical analyses, 67-71
survey-based estimate of cost, 47-48
Study summaries
conclusions, 74
methodology, 41-43
study evidence, 43-74
SUDAAN software, 115-117
Surgeons. See also American College of Surgeons, 121-122
Survival rates, 31-32

T
Tort reform. See Reforms
Traditional reforms. See Conventional malpractice reforms

U
University of California, 87

V
Vermont, 82, 148
Virginia, 14-15, 88-89
Voluntary binding arbitration, 13-14, 84-86

W
Washington State, 4, 8, 68-69, 105
Wickline v. State of California, 149-150

X
X-rays
criteria for when not to obtain cervical spine x-ray, 2, 5, 25, 82-83, 130-132

Y
Youngberg v. Romeo, 149