Universidade do Minho

Documentos de Trabalho

Working Paper Series

"Competition and Waiting Times in Hospital Markets"

Kurt R. Brekke
Luigi Siciliani
Odd Rune Straume

NIPE WP 9 / 2007

NÚCLEO DE INVESTIGAÇÃO EM POLÍTICAS ECONÓMICAS
UNIVERSIDADE DO MINHO

"Competition and Waiting Times in Hospital Markets"

Kurt R. Brekke
Luigi Siciliani
Odd Rune Straume

NIPE* WP 9 / 2007

URL:
http://www.eeg.uminho.pt/economia/nipe/documentostrabalho.php

* NIPE – *Núcleo de Investigação em Políticas Económicas* – is supported by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology through the *Programa Operacional Ciência, Teconologia e Inovação* (POCTI) of the *Quadro Comunitário de Apoio III*, which is financed by FEDER and Portuguese funds.

Competition and Waiting Times in Hospital Markets*

Kurt R. Brekke† Luigi Siciliani‡ Odd Rune Straume§

March 6, 2007

Abstract

This paper studies the impact of hospital competition on waiting times. We use a Salop-type model, with hospitals that differ in (geographical) location and, potentially, waiting time, and two types of patients; high-benefit patients who choose between neighbouring hospitals (competitive segment), and low-benefit patients who decide whether or not to demand treatment from the closest hospital (monopoly segment). Compared with a benchmark case of regulated monopolies, we find that hospital competition leads to longer waiting times in equilibrium if the competitive segment is sufficiently large. Given a policy regime of hospital competition, the effect of *increased competition* depends on the parameter of measurement: Lower travelling costs increase waiting times, higher hospital density reduces waiting times, while the effect of a larger competitive segment is ambiguous. We also show that, if the competitive segment is large, hospital competition is socially preferrable to regulated monopolies only if the (regulated) treatment price is sufficiently high.

Keywords: Hospitals; Competition; Waiting times

JEL Classification: H42; I11; I18; L13

*We thank seminar participants at University of Bergen, Helsinki Centre of Economic Research and Carnegie Mellon University for helpful comments and suggestions.

†Corresponding Author. Department of Economics and Health Economics Bergen, Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration, Helleveien 30, N-5045 Bergen, Norway. E-mail: kurt.brekke@nhh.no.

‡Department of Economics and Centre for Health Economics, University of York, Heslington, York YO10 5DD, UK; and C.E.P.R., 90-98 Goswell Street, London EC1V 7DB, UK. E-mail: ls24@york.ac.uk.

§Department of Economics and NIPE, University of Minho, Campus de Gualtar, 4710-057 Braga, Portugal; and Health Economics Bergen, Norway. E-mail: o.r.straume@eeg.uminho.pt.

1 Introduction

Waiting times are a major health policy concern in many OECD countries. Mean waiting times for non-emergency care are above three months in several countries and maximum waiting times can stretch into years. Policymakers often argue that more competition and patient choice can reduce waiting times by encouraging hospitals to compete for patients and revenues (Siciliani and Hurst, 2004, 2005).[1] The mechanisms of how this may work are, however, not very clear. Why would hospitals that operate at full capacity and face excessive demand have an incentive to compete for even more patients? The main purpose of this paper is to contribute to the understanding of the relationship between competition and waiting times in hospital markets.

We develop a model of hospital competition within a Salop framework, where hospitals differ in terms of (geographical) location and, possibly, waiting times. We assume that there are two types of patients who differ in expected benefit ("high" and "low") from hospital treatment. Hospitals compete on the segment of demand with high benefit, while they are local monopolists on the demand segment with low benefit. By comparing with a benchmark case of regulated monopolies, we analyse how the introduction of competition in the hospital market affects waiting time and activity in equilibrium. Given a policy regime of hospital competition, we also examine the effects of increasing the *degree of competition*, based on three different measures: (i) patients' travelling costs, (ii) the size of the competitive relative to the monopolistic demand segment, and (iii) hospital density (the number of hospitals). We also derive the socially optimal waiting time and assess the welfare implications of hospital competition.

Most of the existing literature assumes that hospitals are local monopolists (Lindsay and Feigenbaum, 1984; Iversen, 1993, 1997; Martin and Smith, 1999; Olivella, 2002; Barros

[1] There are many examples. Norway introduced activity-based funding (DRG-pricing) in 1997 and nation-wide patient choice of hospital in 2001. Both reforms aimed at stimulating competition and reducing waiting times. In the United Kingdom, the policy *Payment by Results* has been recently introduced, which remunerates hospitals according to a fixed tariff per patient treated. One of the objectives of the policy is to induce hospitals to compete for resources by reducing waiting times. In Denmark patients have had free choice of treatment in any publicly-funded hospital within the county of residence since 1993. In Sweden since 2002 all county councils have introduced free choice among public providers within and between counties.

and Olivella, 2005; see Cullis et al., 2000, for a review of the literature). Two exceptions are Xavier (2003) and Siciliani (2005) who model competition within a Hotelling framework and in a duopoly model with differentiated products, respectively.[2] In these models, competition takes the form of duopoly, with the degree of competition being measured by the substitutability between treatments at the two hospitals, and both find that increased competition (or increased patient choice) leads to *longer* waiting times in equilibrium. An arguable limitation of both these studies is that the analysis of a potential competition effect is confined to a single competition measure that leaves considerable room for interpretation. Furthermore, the lack of a welfare analysis leaves the more fundamental question of whether hospital competition is desirable in the first place, unanswered.

In the present paper, we complement and extend these studies in several different ways. First, we isolate a pure competition effect by considering regulated monopolies versus competition, something which has not been done in the previous literature on hospital competition and waiting times. Second, the richness of our model allows us to use several different measures of the degree of hospital competition, something that turns out to have a crucial impact with respect to both waiting times and activity levels. Third, we include a welfare analysis where we analyse the question of whether hospital competition is socially desirable within a context of third-party funding and waiting times. We also deviate from the above mentioned studies by explicitly modelling semi-altruistic health care providers.

We find that *introducing competition*, by allowing previously regulated monopolies to compete for patients (equivalently, to introduce free patient choice), leads to an increase in equilibrium waiting times (with a corresponding reduction in hospital activity) only if the competitive demand segment is sufficiently large relative to the monopoly segment, and vice versa.[3] Thus, we obtain the previously derived result in the literature as a special

[2] Another related paper is Dawson et al. (2007) who analyse the impact of introducing patient choice on hospital waiting times. They find that the effect of choice on waiting times depends on the demand elasticities. Their model is, however, very different from ours, as they focus solely on the demand-side, assuming the supply-side to be completely exogenous. Thus, hospital competition is not an issue in their paper at all.

[3] The impact of patient choice on hospital waiting times has received surprisingly little empirical attention. Two notable exceptions are: Dawson et al. (2007) who analyse the impact of the London Patient Choice Project, finding that the project led to shorter (and converging) average waiting times in the London region; Siciliani and Martin (2007) who provide empirical evidence supporting a negative relationship

case: when the competitive segment tends to one then competition always increases waiting times. Also, given a competition regime, we find that *increasing the degree of competition* has ambiguous effects on waiting times, depending on the measure of competition. Lower travelling costs for patients increase waiting times, which replicates the result derived by Xavier (2003). In addition, we find that a larger competitive segment has an indeterminate effect, while higher hospital density reduces waiting times.

Furthermore, the relationship between competition and hospital activity is often counter-intuitive. For example, lower travelling costs, which – all else equal – increase demand for hospital treatment, lead in equilibrium to lower hospital activity due to the corresponding increase in waiting time. Similarly, higher hospital density, which – all else equal – reduces demand per hospital, leads in equilibrium to higher per hospital activity due to the corresponding reduction in waiting time.

Regarding social welfare, we show that, if the competitive demand segment is relatively large, hospital competition is socially desirable, compared with regulated monopolies, only if the (regulated) price per treatment is sufficiently high. For a small competitive demand segment, the result is reversed; in this case, competition is desirable only if the treatment price is sufficiently low.

However, the socially optimal waiting time is attainable through optimal price setting, regardless of market regime. We also characterise the socially optimal treatment price and show that whether high-powered incentive schemes substitute or complement competition depends on the measure of competition. Unless the opportunity cost of public funds or altruism is very high, stronger competition through higher hospital density increases the optimal treatment price, while increased competition through lower travelling costs reduces optimal prices.

Finally, we briefly introduce a private treatment option, which is costly (price or premium) but has no waiting time.[4] Assuming that only some (rich) patients can afford

between hospital density and waiting times, for a given level of need.

[4]More extensive contributions on the impact of private care on waiting time for public treatment are Iversen (1997); Hoel and Sæther (2003); Marchand and Schroyen (2005). See also Ma (2003) for explicit public rationing in the presence of a contestable private market; Brekke and Sørgard (2007) for the impact on public (NHS) provision of physician dual practice (moonlightning); and Besley et al. (1999) for the

private treatment (insurance), we show that waiting time for the remaining (poor) patients decreases in the presence of a private alternative. However, all results derived in absence of a private sector still holds. Patients (both poor and rich) are better off with a private alternative, but the overall welfare effect depends, naturally, on the costs of this alternative.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. The model is presented in Section 2, while, in Section 3, we derive and characterise the equilibrium waiting time. The effects on waiting time and hospital activity of, first, introducing competition, and, second, increasing the degree of competition, are analysed in Section 4. In Section 5 we derive and characterise both the socially optimal waiting time and the optimal treatment price, and we assess the social desirability of introducing competition in a public hospital market. In Section 6 we introduce a private treatment option. Finally, Section 7 concludes the paper.

2 Model

Consider a market for elective hospital treatment where n hospitals are equidistantly located on a circle with circumference equal to 1. There are two patient types – L and H – differing with respect to the gross valuation of treatment. Both types are uniformly distributed on the circle. A patient demands either one treatment from the most preferred hospital, or no treatment at all.

The utility of an H-type patient who is located at x and seeking treatment at hospital

impact of waiting times on demand for private insurance.

i, located at z_i, is given by[5]

$$U^H(x, z_i) = V - t|x - z_i| - w_i, \tag{1}$$

where w_i is the waiting time at hospital i and t is a travelling cost parameter.

Equivalently, the utility of a L-type patient who is located at x and seeking treatment at hospital i, located at z_i, is given by

$$U^L(x, z_i) = v - t|x - z_i| - w_i, \tag{2}$$

where $V > v$. We concentrate on cases where the H-segment is always covered, while the L-segment is only partially covered. That is, some L-patients will not seek treatment in equilibrium.[6] We assume that the H-segment constitutes a share λ of the total number of patients, which is normalised to 1.

Since the distance between hospitals is equal to $1/n$, the H-patient who is indifferent between seeking treatment at hospital i and hospital j is located at x_i^H, given by

$$V - tx_i^H - w_i = V - t\left(\frac{1}{n} - x_i^H\right) - w_j,$$

yielding

$$x_i^H = \frac{1}{2t}\left(w_j - w_i + \frac{t}{n}\right). \tag{3}$$

[5] This formulation is consistent with Lindsay and Feigenbaum (1984) and Martin and Smith (1999) where patients have to afford a fixed cost to obtain health care. For example, a patient may incur a cost of attending an outpatient department to see a specialist who will agree that they need treatment and place them on the waiting list. This cost is likely to vary across individuals and in particular vary with the distance between the patient and the hospital location. Increases in the waiting time reduce the demand because the present value of the benefit is reduced. Having a positive cost of joining a list incurred before the health benefits are realised seems plausible when patients are seen by a specialist in order to join the list. Lindsay and Feigenbaum (1984) show that with fixed costs the demand reduces with waiting times. Our formulation differs from theirs since we assume a linear discount function rather than an exponential one. This assumption makes the model more simple without qualitatively affecting the results.

[6] Empirical studies, see e.g., Martin and Smith (1999) and Martin et al. (2007), show that, controlling for the supply of private beds, the demand is relatively inelastic, but surely not perfectly inelastic, with respect to waiting time: an increase in waiting by 1% reduces demand by 0.2%. Therefore, when waiting times are higher, some patients renounce to the treatment. Also, in light of our model the evidence suggests that the fraction of high valuation patients – as measured by λ – is quite large.

Total demand for hospital i from the H-segment is given by $X_i^H = 2x_i^H$.

L-patients seek treatment only at the nearest hospital, if at all. The L-patient who is indifferent between treatment at hospital i and no treatment is located at x_i^L, given by

$$v - tx_i^L - w_i = 0,$$

yielding

$$x_i^L = \frac{v - w_i}{t}. \tag{4}$$

Total demand for hospital i from the L-segment is given by $X_i^L = 2x_i^L$. Total demand facing hospital i from both segments is thus given by

$$X_i^D = \lambda X_i^H + (1-\lambda) X_i^L = \frac{2(1-\lambda)v - w_i(2-\lambda) + \lambda w_j}{t} + \frac{\lambda}{n}, \tag{5}$$

where $\lambda \in (0,1)$. Notice that $X_i^D \in \left(\frac{\lambda}{n}, \frac{1}{n}\right)$, while total demand is given by $X^D := \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^D \in (\lambda, 1)$. To gain a better understanding of the mechanisms of the model, it is useful to see how demand reacts to changes in waiting times at the hospital level. From (5) we see that

$$\frac{\partial X_i^D}{\partial w_i} = -\frac{2-\lambda}{t} < 0. \tag{6}$$

Notice that lower travelling costs makes it less costly for patients to demand treatment, or to switch between hospitals; this increases the demand responsiveness to changes in waiting times. However, since the demand loss due to increased waiting time is larger in the L-segment, a larger competitive segment (i.e., an increase in λ) will reduce the demand responsiveness to changes in waiting times.

Hospitals are prospectively financed by a public payer offering a lump-sum transfer T and a per-treatment price p. The objective function of hospital i is assumed to be given by

$$\pi_i = T + pX_i^S + \alpha B_i(w_i, w_j) - C\left(X_i^S\right) - F, \tag{7}$$

where X_i^S is the supply of hospital treatments. Apart from fixed hospital costs, F, the

cost of supplying hospital treatments is given by an increasing and strictly convex cost function $C(\cdot)$. The convexity of the cost function captures a presumably important feature in the context of waiting times, namely that hospitals face come capacity constraints.[7] The function $B_i(\cdot)$ gives the benefit of the patients from receiving treatment at hospital i, while the parameter $\alpha \in [0,1]$ captures the degree of altruism of the provider.[8] More explicitly, the surplus to patients treated at hospital i is given by

$$\begin{aligned} B_i(w_i, w_j) &= 2\lambda \int_0^{\frac{1}{2t}\left(w_j - w_i + \frac{t}{n}\right)} (V - w_i - tx)\, dx \\ &\quad + 2(1-\lambda) \int_0^{\frac{v - w_i}{t}} (v - w_i - tx)\, dx, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where the first term is the surplus to H-type patients, and the second term is the surplus to the L-type patients.

Differentiating (8), we obtain

$$\frac{\partial B_i(w_i, w_j)}{\partial w_i} = -X_i^D - \frac{\lambda}{t}\left(V - \frac{w_i + w_j}{2} - \frac{t}{2n}\right) < 0. \tag{9}$$

A marginal reduction in the waiting time of hospital i has two effects. First, it reduces the waiting time, and thus increases utility, for all existing patients at hospital i. This is represented by the first term in (9). Second, it increases demand for treatment at hospital i. At the margin, the increased demand from the L-segment represents a zero utility contribution. However, in the H-segment, there is an inflow of patients with a strictly positive net utility of hospital treatment. This is represented by the second term in (9). Obviously, the magnitude of this second effect depends on the size of the competitive segment, λ. Notice also that patient surplus at hospital i is a convex function of w_i

[7] A convex variable cost function is also supported by evidence suggesting that economies of scale are quite rapidly exhausted in the hospital sector (see, e.g., Ferguson et al., 1999, and Folland et al., 2004, for literature surveys).

[8] This formulation is consistent with Ellis and McGuire (1986), Chalkley and Malcomson (1998) and Jack (2005). It is also general. The special case of a profit-maximiser hospital can be obtained by setting $\alpha = 0$.

(implying that the altruistic disutility of waiting ($-\alpha B_i$) is concave in w_i).[9]

3 Equilibrium waiting times

In deriving the equilibrium, we assume, as is commonly done, that waiting time acts as a re-equilibrating mechanism between demand and supply, i.e., $X^D(w_i, w_j) = X^S$.[10] This implies that it is equivalent whether we maximise the hospital objective function with respect to supply or waiting time. For analytical purposes, we use the latter approach.

Thus, the hospitals simultaneously and independently choose announced waiting times, in order to maximise their objective functions. We assume that the hospitals are not able/allowed to discriminate between different patient types with respect to waiting times. We also assume that hospitals cannot turn down patients seeking treatment. This latter assumption implies that we do not allow for explicit rationing.

Substituting (5) into (7) and maximising (7) with respect to waiting time yields the following first-order condition for hospital i,

$$\frac{\partial \pi_i}{\partial w_i} = \left[p - C'\left(X_i\left(w_i, w_j\right)\right)\right] \frac{\partial X_i\left(w_i, w_j\right)}{\partial w_i} + \alpha \frac{\partial B_i\left(w_i, w_j\right)}{\partial w_i} = 0, \tag{10}$$

which implicitly defines a best response function $w_i(w_j)$. Notice that we have suppressed the superscript on the demand function.[11]

Differentiating (10), we see that waiting times are strategic complements:[12]

$$\frac{dw_i}{dw_j} = -\frac{\partial^2 \pi_i / \partial w_j \partial w_i}{\partial^2 \pi_i / \partial w_i^2} = \frac{\left(C''(\cdot)\frac{2-\lambda}{t} - \alpha\right)\frac{\lambda}{t} + \alpha\frac{\lambda}{2t}}{\left(C''(\cdot)\frac{2-\lambda}{t} - \alpha\right)\frac{2-\lambda}{t} - \alpha\frac{\lambda}{2t}} > 0 \tag{11}$$

If, say, firm j increases its waiting time, some (H-type) consumers switch to hospital i,

[9] From (9) we derive $\frac{\partial^2 B_i\left(w_i, w_j\right)}{\partial w_i^2} = \frac{4-\lambda}{2t} > 0$.

[10] See Lindsay and Feigenbaum (1984), Gravelle, Smith and Xavier (2003), Iversen (1993, 1997), Martin and Smith (1999) and Siciliani (2005).

[11] The second-order condition is $\partial^2 \pi_i / \partial w_i^2 = -\left[\left(C''(\cdot)\frac{2-\lambda}{t} - \alpha\right)\frac{2-\lambda}{t} - \alpha\frac{\lambda}{2t}\right] < 0$, which is always satisfied for sufficiently convex cost function; also, $\partial^2 \pi_i / \partial w_j \partial w_i = \left(C''(\cdot)\frac{2-\lambda}{t} - \alpha\right)\frac{\lambda}{t} + \alpha\frac{\lambda}{2t}$, which is always positive whenever $\partial^2 \pi_i / \partial w_i^2 < 0$.

[12] The denominator is positive by the second-order condition. The numerator is also positive as $C''(\cdot)\frac{2-\lambda}{t} - \alpha > 0$ is required for the second-order condition to be satisfied.

which now faces a higher demand. To meet this increase in demand, hospital i has to increase its supply, but this would increase the marginal costs, making the first term in (10) more positive, implying that $\partial\pi_i/\partial w_i > 0$. Since the price is fixed, we see from the first-order condition that the optimal response for hospital i to a higher w_j, is to reduce demand by increasing its waiting time, w_i, until the level where $\partial\pi_i/\partial w_i = 0$. Thus, waiting times are strategic complements for competing hospitals.

In a symmetric equilibrium, $w_j = w_i = w^*$. Using (5) and (6), the equilibrium waiting time is given by

$$-\frac{(2-\lambda)}{t}\left[p - C'\left(X_i\left(w^*\right)\right)\right] = \alpha\left[X_i\left(w^*\right) + \frac{\lambda}{t}\left(V - w^* - \frac{t}{2n}\right)\right], \tag{12}$$

where

$$X_i\left(w^*\right) = 2\left(1-\lambda\right)\left(\frac{v-w^*}{t}\right) + \frac{\lambda}{n}, \tag{13}$$

and $w^* = w^*\left(v, t, \lambda, p, n\right)$.[13] Since the right-hand side of (12) is positive, the expression in the square brackets on the left hand side of (12) must be negative in an interior solution. Thus, the equilibrium waiting time is such that the (regulated) price is lower than the marginal treatment cost. In other words, the marginal patient is financially unprofitable to treat for the hospital.

We want to focus on equilibria with strictly positive waiting times. This requires that the cost of treating the last patient who demands treatment at $w = 0$ is larger than the treatment price p. This requirement will be met if the supply cost function is sufficiently convex. Furthermore, we restrict attention to interior solutions with a partially covered L-segment in equilibrium, i.e., $x_i^L \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2n}\right)$.

Proposition 1 *Assume that the degree of altruism is sufficiently small. Then there exists an equilibrium waiting time, implicitly defined by (12), which is positive and involves a*

[13] Uniqueness and stability of the equilibrium is confirmed by the positive sign of the Jacobian:

$$\Delta := \begin{vmatrix} \frac{\partial^2\pi_j}{\partial w_i^2} & \frac{\partial^2\pi_i}{\partial w_j \partial w_i} \\ \frac{\partial^2\pi_j}{\partial w_i \partial w_j} & \frac{\partial^2\pi_j}{\partial w_j^2} \end{vmatrix} = \frac{4}{t}\left(C''\left(\cdot\right)\frac{2-\lambda}{t} - \alpha\right)\left[\left(C''\left(\cdot\right)\frac{2-\lambda}{t} - \alpha\right)\frac{1-\lambda}{t} - \alpha\frac{\lambda}{2t}\right] > 0,$$

where the expression in the square brackets is positive whenever the second-order condition is satisfied.

partially covered L-segment, if $p \in S := \left(\underline{p}, \min\left\{\overline{p}_1, \overline{p}_2\right\}\right)$*, where* $\underline{p}$ *and* $\overline{p}_1$ *are implicitly defined by*

$$\underline{p} = C'\left(\frac{\lambda}{n}\right) - \frac{\alpha t}{2-\lambda}\left[\frac{\lambda}{n} + \frac{\lambda}{t}\left(V - w^*(\underline{p}) - \frac{t}{2n}\right)\right]$$

and

$$\overline{p}_1 = C'\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) - \frac{\alpha t}{2-\lambda}\left[\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\lambda}{t}\left(V - w^*(\overline{p}_1) - \frac{t}{2n}\right)\right],$$

while $\overline{p}_2$ *is given by*

$$\overline{p}_2 = C'\left(2\left(1-\lambda\right)\frac{v}{t} + \frac{\lambda}{n}\right) - \frac{\alpha t}{2-\lambda}\left[2\left(1-\lambda\right)\frac{v}{t} + \frac{\lambda}{2n} + \frac{\lambda}{t}V\right].$$

The equilibrium waiting time is monotonically decreasing in the treatment price p*.*

Proof. We start by confirming the last part of the Proposition. By total differentiation of the first-order conditions, we obtain[14]

$$\frac{\partial w^*}{\partial p} = -\frac{(2-\lambda)/t}{2\left[\left(C''\left(\cdot\right)\frac{2-\lambda}{t} - \alpha\right)\frac{(1-\lambda)}{t} - \alpha\frac{\lambda}{2t}\right]} < 0$$

An interior solution with positive equilibrium waiting times requires that the following conditions are met: $w^* > 0$ and $x^L \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2n}\right)$. Assume $x^L = 0$, which implies $X\left(w^*\right) = \frac{\lambda}{n}$. Inserting this into the first-order condition for hospital i, and rearranging, we get

$$p = C'\left(\frac{\lambda}{n}\right) - \frac{\alpha t}{2-\lambda}\left[\frac{\lambda}{n} + \frac{\lambda}{t}\left(V - w^*(p) - \frac{t}{2n}\right)\right]$$

Denote the price that solves this equation by $\underline{p}$. Since $\partial w^*/\partial p < 0$ and $\partial x^L/\partial w < 0$ we know that $x^L > 0$ if $p > \underline{p}$. Now assume $x^L = \frac{1}{2n}$, which implies $X\left(w^*\right) = \frac{1}{n}$. Inserting this into the first-order condition yields

$$p = C'\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) - \frac{\alpha t}{2-\lambda}\left[\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\lambda}{t}\left(V - w^*(p) - \frac{t}{2n}\right)\right].$$

[14] $\frac{\partial w^*}{\partial p} = -\frac{\begin{vmatrix} \partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial p & \partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial w_j \\ \partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j\partial p & \partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j^2 \end{vmatrix}}{\Delta}$. Notice that $\partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial p = \partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j\partial p$, so that $\frac{\partial w^*}{\partial p} = -\frac{1}{\Delta}\left(\partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial p\right)\left[\partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j^2 - \partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial w_j\right] = -\frac{\partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial p}{\partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j^2 + \partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial w_j}$.

Denote the price that solves this equation by $\overline{p}_1$. Again, since $\partial w^*/\partial p < 0$ and $\partial x^L/\partial w < 0$ we know that $x^L < \frac{1}{2n}$ if $p < \overline{p}_1$. Finally, assume $w^* = 0$, which implies $X(0) = 2(1-\lambda)\frac{v}{t} + \frac{\lambda}{n}$. The first-order condition is then given by

$$p = C'\left(2(1-\lambda)\frac{v}{t} + \frac{\lambda}{n}\right) - \frac{\alpha t}{2-\lambda}\left[2(1-\lambda)\frac{v}{t} + \frac{\lambda}{2n} + \frac{\lambda}{t}V\right]$$

Denote this price by $\overline{p}_2$. By a similar argument as above, $w^* > 0$ if $p < \overline{p}_2$. Since $\frac{\lambda}{n} < \min\left\{\frac{1}{n}, 2(1-\lambda)\frac{v}{t} + \frac{\lambda}{n}\right\}$, it is straightforward to see that $\underline{p} < \min\{\overline{p}_1, \overline{p}_2\}$, implying that S is non-empty, if α is sufficiently small. ■

The inverse relationship between equilibrium waiting times and the treatment price is easily explained. A higher price simply means that the marginal patient becomes less unprofitable to treat, which dampens the incentive to use waiting time as an instrument to shift demand from unprofitable patients towards neighbouring hospitals.

Notice also that, since positive equilibrium waiting times imply that the marginal patient is unprofitable for the hospitals to treat, the equilibrium is "undercutting proof", in the sense that it is never profitable for a hospital to deviate from the equilibrium by reducing waiting times in order to drive neighbouring hospitals out of the market.

4 The impact of competition on waiting times and activity

We will now use the model to analyse if and how competition in hospital markets affects waiting times and hospital activity in equilibrium. The analysis is done in two steps. We start out by considering the effect of *introducing competition* in a hospital market characterised by regulated monopolies. Subsequently, we consider the effects of different measures to *increase the degree of competition* in a hospital market where there is competition to begin with.

4.1 Introducing competition

Assume that the hospital market described in the previous section consists of regulated monopolies, where patients are allocated to hospitals purely according to geographical distance. If a patient decides to visit a hospital to undergo treatment, she has to attend the nearest hospital. In our model, this means that hospital i's demand from the H-segment is exogenously given by $X_i^H = \frac{1}{n}$. Total demand for hospital i is thus given by

$$X_i^D(w_i) = \frac{\lambda}{n} + (1-\lambda)\frac{2(v-w_i)}{t}. \tag{14}$$

There is now a demand response to waiting time changes only in the L-segment. Differentiating (14) with respect to w_i yields

$$\frac{\partial X_i^D(w_i)}{\partial w_i} = -\frac{2(1-\lambda)}{t} < 0. \tag{15}$$

Comparing (6) and (15), we see that demand responsiveness is lower under regulated monopolies.

The surplus to patients treated at hospital i is given by

$$B_i(w_i) = \lambda 2\int_0^{\frac{1}{2n}} (V - w_i - tx)\,dx + (1-\lambda)\,2\int_0^{\frac{v-w_i}{t}} (v - w_i - tx)\,dx, \tag{16}$$

where the first term is the surplus to H-type patients, and the second term is the surplus to the L-type patients. Differentiating (16), we obtain

$$\frac{\partial B_i(w_i)}{\partial w_i} = -X_i^D(w_i). \tag{17}$$

In the absence of competition, notice how the marginal reduction in patient surplus from waiting is lower in absolute value (see (9)). The reason is that, under regulated monopolies, changing the waiting time has only an effect on inframarginal patients.

Inserting (14) into the first-order condition, (10), and applying symmetry, the equilib-

rium waiting time in a market with regulated monopolies, w^m, is given by[15]

$$-\frac{2(1-\lambda)}{t}\left[p - C'\left(X_i\left(w^m\right)\right)\right] = \alpha X_i\left(w^m\right), \quad i = 1, 2, \tag{18}$$

where

$$X_i\left(w^m\right) = 2(1-\lambda)\frac{v - w^m}{t} + \frac{\lambda}{n}. \tag{19}$$

Comparing (12) and (18) we see that, for $w^* = w^m$, both the left-hand side and the right-hand side of (18) are smaller than the left-hand side and right-hand side of (12). This means that $w^m \lesseqgtr w^*$. A closer scrutiny of the two first-order conditions enables us to derive the following result:

Proposition 2 *Introducing competition in a hospital market with regulated monopolies leads to longer (shorter) waiting times and lower (higher) activity in equilibrium if the competitive segment (λ) is sufficiently large (small);*

$$1 - \lambda < (>)\frac{t}{2n(V-v)}.$$

Proof. Subtracting (12) from (18) yields

$$\frac{2}{\alpha}\left[C'\left(X_i\left(w^*\right)\right) - C'\left(X_i\left(w^m\right)\right)\right] - 2\left(w^m - w^*\right) = \lambda\frac{2(1-\lambda)n(V-v) - t}{n(1-\lambda)(2-\lambda)}.$$

Let us first confirm that the left-hand side (LHS) of this equation is monotonic in w^m and w^*. Using (5) and (14), we have that $\partial(LHS)/\partial w^* = -\frac{2}{\alpha}C''\left(X_i\right)\frac{2-\lambda}{t} + 2$ and $\partial(LHS)/\partial w^m = \frac{2}{\alpha}C''\left(X_i\right)\frac{2(1-\lambda)}{t} - 2$. Applying the second-order conditions, it is straightforward to verify that $\partial(LHS)/\partial w^* < 0$ and $\partial(LHS)/\partial w^m > 0$. Since $LHS = 0$ if $w^* = w^m$, it follows that $w^* > (<)\, w^m$ if the right-hand side of the equation is negative (positive), which is the case if $1 - \lambda < (>)\frac{t}{2n(V-v)}$. Since (13) and (19) are identical for a given waiting time, $w^m < w^*$ implies that $X_i\left(w^m\right) > X_i\left(w^*\right)$ and vice versa. ■

There are two counteracting effects that contribute to this result. First, $\partial X_i/\partial w_i$

[15] The second-order condition is given by $\partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i^2 = -\left(C''(\cdot)\frac{2(1-\lambda)}{t} - \alpha\right)\frac{2(1-\lambda)}{t} < 0$.

increases in absolute value with the introduction of competition (see (6) and (15)). In other words, introducing competition means that demand at each hospital becomes more responsive to changes in the waiting time announced by the hospital, and the magnitude of this effect is increasing in λ. This is intuitive, since, without competition, only patients in the L-segment respond to waiting times. So how does the magnitude of $|\partial X_i/\partial w_i|$ affect equilibrium waiting times? Remember that, with a hospital disutility of positive waiting times (due to altruism), the marginal patient is unprofitable to treat. In equilibrium, this financial loss is optimally weighed against the disutility of increasing waiting times. When hospital demand responds to waiting time changes in the competitive demand segment, each hospital gets a stronger incentive to increase the waiting time, since this now becomes an instrument for shifting unprofitable patients to neighbouring hospitals.

However, there is also another effect, related to the altruistic preferences of the hospitals, that works in the opposite direction. Comparing (9) and (17) we see that the utility gain of reduced waiting times is higher under hospital competition. With free patient choice, a reduction in waiting times by hospital i attracts patients from neighbouring hospitals who, due to altruism, contribute positively to the hospital objective function. All else equal, this gives the hospitals incentives to reduce waiting times with the introduction of competition.

Thus, the introduction of competition has two different implications: on the one hand, there is competition to avoid treating unprofitable patients, while, on the other hand, there is "altruistic competition" to treat high-benefit patients. Both of these effects get stronger when the relative size of the competitive segment increases. However this relationship is more pronounced for the first effect. The reason is that, since treatment costs are convex, while the altruistic disutility of waiting ($-\alpha B_i$) is concave in w_i, the higher level of demand associated with a larger competitive segment means that competition to avoid treating unprofitable patients become a more dominating force as λ increases. Thus, competition leads to longer waiting times in equilibrium if $1-\lambda < \frac{t}{2n(V-v)}$. Furthermore, we see that an increase in t and/or a reduction of n increase the parameter space for

which competition leads to longer waiting times. The reason is that higher travelling costs and/or lower hospital density reduce the (altruistic) utility gain of reducing waiting times under competition, as can be seen from (9).

It should be noted that the ambiguous nature of the competition effect on equilibrium waiting times is crucially dependent on the way altruism is modelled, where hospitals are (partly) altruistic only toward their own patients. If instead hospitals cared equally about *all* patients in the market, competition would not influence the effect of waiting time changes on the altruistic component in the hospital objective function.[16] In this case, competition would unambiguously increase waiting times. Thus, the first of the two above discussed effects – competition to avoid unprofitable patients – is, in some sense, a more robust effect.[17]

Finally, it is important to notice that the introduction of competition does not affect demand *per se*; thus, changes in equilibrium waiting times are driven solely by strategic competition effects.

4.2 Increasing the degree of competition

Depending on interpretation, the effect of increased competition (or increased patient choice) on waiting times and activity can work through three different parameters in the model: t, λ and n. First, a reduction in travelling costs, t, will intensify competition between hospitals in the competitive segment of the market. Second, competition will also naturally increase if a larger share of the total market becomes competitive, i.e., if λ increases. One possible (outside-the-model) interpretation is a reduction in fixed costs of undergoing hospital treatment for some patients, implying that a larger share of patients find themselves in the competitive demand segment. Finally, the number of

[16] Under both competition and regulated monopolies, the effect of a waiting time increase on total patient utility is given by

$$\frac{\partial \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} B_k\right)}{\partial w_i} = -X_i^D.$$

[17] It may also be the case that hospital managers care, to some extent, about all patients, but place a larger altruistic weight on patients at their own hospitals. This intermediate case would weaken the "altruistic competition" effect, without eliminating it completely, increasing the likelihood that competition leads to longer waiting times in equilibrium.

hospitals in the market, n, is a standard measure of the degree of competition. Below we present the comparative statics results with respect to the different competition measures on both waiting time and activity levels, obtained by total differentiation of (12), applying Cramer's rule.

4.2.1 Lower travelling costs

$$\frac{\partial w^*}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\left(\frac{2-\lambda}{t}C''(\cdot)-\alpha\right)\frac{\partial X}{\partial t}+\frac{1}{t}\left[\left(p-C'(\cdot)\right)\frac{2-\lambda}{t}+\alpha\frac{\lambda}{t}\left(V-w^*\right)\right]}{\left(C''(\cdot)\frac{2-\lambda}{t}-\alpha\right)\frac{1-\lambda}{t}-\alpha\frac{\lambda}{2t}} < 0, \tag{20}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dX(w^*)}{dt} &= \underline{\frac{\partial X}{\partial t}}+\underline{\frac{\partial X}{\partial w}}\underline{\frac{\partial w^*}{\partial t}} \\ &= \frac{-\left[(2-\lambda)\left(p-C'(\cdot)\right)+\alpha\lambda\left(V-w^*\right)\right]+\alpha\lambda(v-w^*)}{\left(C''(\cdot)\frac{2-\lambda}{t}-\alpha\right)\frac{2(1-\lambda)}{t}-\alpha\frac{\lambda}{t}}\frac{2(1-\lambda)}{t^3} > 0,\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where $\frac{\partial X}{\partial t} = -\frac{2(1-\lambda)(v-w)}{t^2} < 0$.[18,19] Lower travelling costs have two different effects on the hospitals' optimal choice of waiting times. First, there is a direct demand effect, as more patients in the L-segment will seek treatment. Each hospital will meet this demand increase by increasing waiting times, and the strength of this response depends on the additional costs of treating more patients relative to the altruistic disutility of longer waiting times. Notice here that a higher level of demand also implies that the utility loss of increasing the waiting time is larger, since there are more patients that need to wait for treatment at hospital i. However, due to the convexity of treatment costs, the net effect is still positive with respect to waiting time. Second, lower travelling costs imply that demand facing each hospital becomes more sensitive to changes in waiting times (see (6)), which means that it becomes more effective to use waiting times as an instrument to shift unprofitable demand to neighbouring hospitals. Thus, both effects contribute to increase

[18] Notice that the first-order condition ensures that the expression in the square bracket of the numerator of $\partial w^*/\partial t$ is negative.

[19] $\frac{\partial w^*}{\partial t} = -\frac{\begin{vmatrix}\partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial t & \partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial w_j \\ \partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j\partial t & \partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j^2\end{vmatrix}}{\Delta}$. Notice that $\partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial t = \partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j\partial t$, so that $\frac{\partial w^*}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{\Delta}\left(\partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial t\right)\left[\partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j^2 - \partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial w_j\right] = -\frac{\partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial t}{\partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j^2+\partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial w_j}$.

equilibrium waiting times as a result of lower travelling costs.

The effect of lower travelling costs on equilibrium hospital activity is given by the sum of a direct positive demand effect and an indirect negative effect through the increase in equilibrium waiting time. We see from (21) that the total effect is negative. It is perhaps surprising that lower travelling costs lead to *reduced* activity in equilibrium. This can be explained in the following way: since treatment costs are strictly convex, while the disutility of waiting (due to altruism) is concave in w_i, it is more costly for hospitals to meet increased demand by increasing activity, relative to waiting times. Consequently, the hospitals will meet a demand increase (induced by lower travelling costs) by increasing waiting times until the level where the demand increase is completely offset. However, there is a second effect of lower travelling costs, as explained above. The effect on the responsiveness of demand to waiting times implies that the hospitals have incentives to increase demand even beoynd the level where the initial demand increase is nulled out. Thus, a reduction of travelling costs, which initially causes an increase in demand for hospital treatments, will actually lead to lower activity in equilibrium, due to the equilibrium response in waiting times.

4.2.2 A larger competitive segment

$$\frac{\partial w^*}{\partial \lambda} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\left(\frac{2-\lambda}{t}C''(\cdot)-\alpha\right)\frac{\partial X}{\partial \lambda}+\frac{p-C'(\cdot)}{t}-\frac{\alpha}{t}\left(V-w^*-\frac{t}{2n}\right)}{\left(C''(\cdot)\frac{2-\lambda}{t}-\alpha\right)\frac{1-\lambda}{t}-\alpha\frac{\lambda}{2t}} \gtrless 0. \tag{22}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dX(w^*)}{d\lambda} &= \underset{+}{\frac{\partial X}{\partial \lambda}}+\underset{-}{\frac{\partial X}{\partial w}}\underset{-/+}{\frac{\partial w^*}{\partial \lambda}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\frac{-(p-C'(\cdot))\frac{2(1-\lambda)}{t^2}+\frac{2\alpha}{t^2}\left[(1-\lambda)\left(V-w^*-\frac{t}{2n}\right)+\lambda(v-w^*-\frac{t}{2n})\right]}{\left(C''(\cdot)\frac{2-\lambda}{t}-\alpha\right)\frac{1-\lambda}{t}-\alpha\frac{\lambda}{2t}},\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where $\frac{\partial X}{\partial \lambda}=2(\frac{1}{2n}-\frac{v-w}{t})>0$ since, in equilibrium, $x^H=1/2n$ and $x^L=(v-w)/t$, and, by assumption, $x^L<x^H$.[20]

[20] $\frac{\partial w^*}{\partial \lambda}=-\frac{\begin{vmatrix}\partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial\lambda & \partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial w_j\\ \partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j\partial\lambda & \partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j^2\end{vmatrix}}{\Delta}$. Notice that $\partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial\lambda=\partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j\partial\lambda$, so that $\frac{\partial w^*}{\partial \lambda}=-\frac{1}{\Delta}\left(\partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial\lambda\right)\left[\partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j^2-\partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial w_j\right]=-\frac{\partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial\lambda}{\partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j^2+\partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial w_j}$.

The first term in the numerator of $\partial w^*/\partial\lambda$ is positive while the second and the third are negative. Notice that even for a low degree of altruism, the effect of λ on waiting time is indeterminate. There are two offsetting effects that contribute to this ambiguity. Since demand is higher from the competitive segment, a higher λ will increase total demand, which – all else equal – contributes to longer waiting times. However, a larger H-segment implies that demand becomes less responsive to changes in waiting times, as seen from (6). This means that it becomes less effective to use waiting times to shift unprofitable patients to neighbouring hospitals, which – all else equal – reduces equilibrium waiting times. The sum of these two effects is indeterminate.

The effect of a larger competitive segment on equilibrium activity is also indeterminate, although clearly positive for sufficiently low values of λ. The reason is that, for low values of λ, the magnitude of the indirect effect through changes in equilibrium waiting times is relatively low, making the direct demand effect the dominant one. The first term in the numerator of $dX\left(w^*\right)/d\lambda$ is always positive. The second term is given by a weighted average of the utility of a H-type patient and a L-type patient when receiving treatment and located at $x = 1/2n$ (by assumption this utility is positive for the H-type and negative for the L-type). This term is consequently also positive if λ is sufficiently low.

4.2.3 Increased hospital density

$$\frac{\partial w^*}{\partial n} = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{\left(C''\left(\cdot\right)\frac{2-\lambda}{t} - \alpha\right)\frac{\lambda}{n^2} + \alpha\frac{\lambda}{2n^2}}{\left(C''\left(\cdot\right)\frac{2-\lambda}{t} - \alpha\right)\frac{1-\lambda}{t} - \alpha\frac{\lambda}{2t}} < 0 \tag{24}$$

$$\frac{dX\left(w^*\right)}{dn} = \underset{-}{\frac{\partial X}{\partial n}} + \underset{-}{\frac{\partial X}{\partial w}}\underset{-}{\frac{\partial w^*}{\partial n}} = \frac{1}{2n^2 t}\frac{\alpha\lambda}{\left(C''\left(\cdot\right)\frac{2-\lambda}{t} - \alpha\right)\frac{1-\lambda}{t} - \alpha\frac{\lambda}{2t}} > 0 \tag{25}$$

$$\frac{d\left[nX\left(w^*\right)\right]}{dn} = X + n\frac{dX}{dn} > 0. \tag{26}$$

Notice that the signs of (24) and (25) are determined by applying the second-order condition.[21]

[21] $\frac{\partial w^*}{\partial n} = -\frac{\begin{vmatrix} \partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial n & \partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial w_j \\ \partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j\partial n & \partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j^2 \end{vmatrix}}{\Delta}$. Notice that $\partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial n = \partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j\partial n$, so that $\frac{\partial w^*}{\partial n} = -\frac{1}{\Delta}\left(\partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial n\right)\left[\partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j^2 - \partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial w_j\right] = -\frac{\partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial n}{\partial^2\pi_j/\partial w_j^2 + \partial^2\pi_i/\partial w_i\partial w_j}$.

Increased hospital density unambiguously reduces waiting times in equilibrium. The intuition is quite simple. An increase in n means that – all else equal – each hospital faces a lower demand from the competitive segment. This means, due to the convexity of treatment costs, that the marginal treatment cost (for the last patient) is lower at each hospital. Consequently, the marginal patient becomes less unprofitable to treat and the hospitals will respond by reducing waiting times. Note that increased capacity, in itself, is not enough to reduce waiting times, since the effect on waiting times comes only through the competitive segment, where increased capacity means lower demand for each hospital. This can easily be confirmed by observing that $\partial w^*/\partial n = 0$ if $\lambda = 0$.

There are two effects – one direct and one indirect – of an increase in n on the equilibrium activity at the hospital level. Increased hospital density in the market means that the number of patients treated per hospital from the competitive segment goes down. However, there is an indirect "spillover" effect from the competitive to the monopoly demand segment. Due to the demand effect in the competitive segment, resulting in shorter waiting times, demand increases from the hospitals' monopoly segments. Equation (25) shows that the net effect on demand is positive. In this case, the reduction in waiting times fully compensates for the initial drop in demand. *Total activity* clearly increases with hospital density, given that activity per hospital increases.

The effects of increased hospital competition on waiting times and activity can be summarised as follows:

Proposition 3 *(i) Lower travelling costs increase waiting times and decrease hospital activity.*

(ii) A larger competitive market segment has an indeterminate effect on waiting times and hospital activity. In general, the effect on activity is positive if the competitive segment is sufficiently small.

(iii) Increased hospital density reduces waiting times and increases activity per hospital, as well as total activity in the market.

5 Hospital competition and welfare

Having derived and characterised the equilibrium waiting time, we want to explore the issue of whether competition leads to excessive or suboptimal levels of waiting time from a social welfare perspective. To answer this question, we first need to specify the welfare function. We use the conventional measure of welfare as an unweighted sum of consumers' and producers' surplus. The welfare analysis is conducted at the hospital level; for total welfare just multiply by n.

Since the model is symmetric, the socially optimal waiting time must be uniform across hospitals. Setting $w_i = w_j = w$, the surplus to patients treated at a particular hospital is then given by

$$B(w) = \lambda 2 \int_0^{\frac{1}{2n}} (V - w - tx)\, dx + (1-\lambda)\, 2 \int_0^{\frac{v-w}{t}} (v - w - tx)\, dx, \tag{27}$$

where the first term is the surplus to H-type patients, and the second term is the surplus to the L-type patients. Notice that we are assuming, as we did for the hospitals, that the regulator cannot discriminate between patient types in terms of waiting time. The patient surplus function can be written as

$$B(w) = \frac{\lambda}{n}\left(V - w - \frac{t}{4n}\right) + \frac{(1-\lambda)}{t}(v-w)^2. \tag{28}$$

Not very surprisingly, we see that the consumer surplus is always maximised at zero waiting time.

Writing the social welfare function as the sum of consumers' and producers' surplus net of third-party payments, welfare at the hospital level is given by

$$W(w) = B(w) + T + pX(w) - C(X(w)) - F - (1+\gamma)\left[pX(w) + T\right], \tag{29}$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is a positive constant denoting the opportunity cost of public funds.[22] Since

[22] The altruistic component αB is not included in the welfare function as this would lead to double-counting. As argued by Chalkley and Malcomson (1998), "There is a strong case for excluding this

it is costly for the regulator to fund hospital care, we assume that the lump-sum transfer T is set such that the hospital's participation constraint is binding. Adding the (realistic) assumption that the provider also has a limited liability constraint, the transfer is set so that $pX + T = C(X) + F$. The social welfare function then simplifies to

$$W(w) = B(w) - (1+\gamma)[C(X) + F]. \tag{30}$$

5.1 The socially optimal waiting time

The socially optimal waiting time is obtained by maximising welfare with respect to waiting time, yielding the following first-order condition[23]

$$\frac{\partial W}{\partial w} = \frac{\partial B(w)}{\partial w} - (1+\gamma) C'(\cdot) \frac{\partial X(w)}{\partial w} = 0, \tag{31}$$

which states that waiting time is socially optimised at a level where the utility loss to patients from a marginal increase in waiting time is equal to the corresponding reduction of treatment costs.

Using (13) and (28), and rearranging (31), we can write the expression for the socially optimal waiting time, denoted by w^s, as follows:

$$(1+\gamma) C'(X(w^s)) = \frac{-X(w^s)}{\frac{\partial X(w^s)}{\partial w}}, \tag{32}$$

benevolent component from social welfare on the grounds that benevolence represents a desire to do what is in the social interest and, as such, should have no role in determining what the social interest is." See also Hammond (1987) for further discussion. Notably, our results will not be qualitatively affected by this in any case.

[23] The second-order condition is given by

$$\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial w^2} = -\frac{2(1-\lambda)}{t}(1+\gamma)\left[C''(\cdot)\frac{2(1-\lambda)}{t} - \frac{1}{1+\gamma}\right] < 0.$$

Thus, the supply cost function must be sufficiently convex for the condition to be fulfilled, i.e.,

$$C''(\cdot) > \frac{t}{2(1-\lambda)(1+\gamma)}.$$

where

$$X\left(w^s\right) = 2\left(1-\lambda\right)\left(\frac{v-w^s}{t}\right) + \frac{\lambda}{n}, \tag{33}$$

$$\frac{\partial X\left(w^s\right)}{\partial w} = -\frac{2\left(1-\lambda\right)}{t}. \tag{34}$$

and $w^s = w^s\left(v, t, \lambda, n\right)$.

Equation (32) defines an interior solution for the socially optimal waiting time with a partially covered L-segment, i.e., $w^s > 0$ and $x^L \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2n}\right)$. Proposition 4 below provides the exact conditions needed to support this equilibrium:

Proposition 4 *There exists a socially optimal waiting time, w^s, implicitly defined by (32), which is strictly positive and involves a partially covered L-segment, if*

$$C'\left(\frac{\lambda}{n}\right) < \frac{t\lambda}{2n\left(1-\lambda\right)\left(1+\gamma\right)}, \quad \textit{and}$$

$$C'\left(2\left(1-\lambda\right)\frac{v}{t} + \frac{\lambda}{n}\right) > \frac{v}{1+\gamma} + \frac{t\lambda}{2n\left(1-\lambda\right)\left(1+\gamma\right)}.$$

Proof. First, $x^L = 0$ implies $X\left(w^s\right) = \frac{\lambda}{n}$. It follows from (32) that $C'\left(\frac{\lambda}{n}\right) < \frac{t\lambda}{2n(1-\lambda)(1+\gamma)}$ for $x^L > 0$. Second, $x^L = \frac{1}{2n}$ implies $X\left(w^s\right) = \frac{1}{n}$. We see from (32) that $C'\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) > \frac{t}{2n(1-\lambda)(1+\gamma)}$ for $x^L < \frac{1}{2n}$. Third, $w^s = 0$ implies $X\left(0\right) = 2\left(1-\lambda\right)\frac{v}{t} + \frac{\lambda}{n}$. From (32) it is evident that $w^s > 0$ requires $C'\left(2\left(1-\lambda\right)\frac{v}{t} + \frac{\lambda}{n}\right) > \frac{v}{1+\gamma} + \frac{t\lambda}{2n(1-\lambda)(1+\gamma)}$. Finally, observe that since, by definition, $2\left(1-\lambda\right)\frac{v}{t} + \frac{\lambda}{n} \leq \frac{1}{n}$, it follows that $w^s > 0$ implies $x^L < \frac{1}{2n}$, making the condition for $x^L < \frac{1}{2n}$ redundant. ■

We see that a positive socially optimal waiting time with a partially covered L-segment requires that the cost function C is sufficiently convex.

5.2 The socially optimal treatment price

The socially optimal waiting time can always be implemented by an appropriate choice of p.[24] This price, denoted by p^*, is such that:

$$p^* = X(w^*)\frac{t[\lambda + 2(1-\lambda)(1-\alpha)]}{2(1-\lambda)(2-\lambda)} - \gamma C'(X(w^*)) - \frac{\alpha\lambda}{2-\lambda}\left(V - w^* - \frac{t}{2n}\right). \quad (35)$$

Intuitively, the optimal price is higher when the marginal benefit from a reduction in waiting time is higher ($-\frac{\partial B}{\partial w} = X$), and it is lower when the degree of altruism α or the opportunity cost of public funds γ is higher. The last term in the above equation takes into account the fact that the marginal benefit from a reduction in waiting time in a competitive setting ($-\frac{\partial B(w_i,w_j)}{\partial w_i}$) is higher from the provider's perspective than from the social one ($-\frac{\partial B(w^*)}{\partial w_i^*}$): the higher the difference between the two, the lower is the optimal price. The following proposition illustrates the effect of our different competition measures on the optimal price.

Proposition 5 *If the degree of altruism or the opportunity cost of public funds is sufficiently low, then a higher hospital density increases the optimal price while lower travelling costs decrease the optimal price. A higher competitive segment has an indeterminate effect on the optimal price:*

$$\frac{\partial p^*}{\partial n} = \left(\frac{t[\lambda + 2(1-\lambda)(1-\alpha)]}{2(1-\lambda)(2-\lambda)} - \gamma C''(\cdot)\right)\frac{dX(w^*)}{dn} + \frac{\alpha\lambda}{2-\lambda}\left(\frac{dw^*}{dn} - \frac{t}{2n^2}\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial p^*}{\partial t} &= \left(\frac{t[\lambda + 2(1-\lambda)(1-\alpha)]}{2(1-\lambda)(2-\lambda)} - \gamma C''(\cdot)\right)\frac{dX(w^*)}{dt} \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda + 2(1-\lambda)(1-\alpha)}{2(1-\lambda)(2-\lambda)}X(w^*) + \frac{\alpha\lambda}{2-\lambda}\left(\frac{dw^*}{dt} + \frac{1}{2n}\right)\end{aligned}$$

[24] The optimal price p^* maximises (30) so that: $[\partial B(w^*)/\partial w^* - (1+\gamma)C'(\cdot) * \partial X(w)/\partial w]\,\partial w^*/\partial p = 0$, where $\partial B(w^*)/\partial w^* = -X(w^*)$ and $\partial X(w^*)/\partial w^* = -2(1-\lambda)/t$. Comparing the above with Eq.(10), the result is obtained.

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial p^*}{\partial \lambda} &= \left(\frac{t\left[\lambda + 2(1-\lambda)(1-\alpha)\right]}{2(1-\lambda)(2-\lambda)} - \gamma C''(\cdot)\right)\frac{dX(w^*)}{d\lambda} \\ &+2t\frac{\lambda^2(1-2\alpha) + (\alpha-1)4\lambda + 2(2-\alpha)}{(2(1-\lambda)(2-\lambda))^2}X(w^*) \\ &+\alpha\left(\frac{\lambda}{2-\lambda}\frac{dw^*}{d\lambda} - \frac{1}{2-\lambda}(V - w^* - \frac{t}{2n})\right).\end{aligned}$$

Since $dX(w^*)/dn > 0$, a higher hospital density increases activity and increases the social marginal benefit from a reduction in waiting times and therefore increases the optimal price. However a higher activity also increases the marginal cost, which induces a lower price. Furthermore, a higher hospital density reduces waiting times and travelling costs increasing the marginal benefit from a reduction in waiting time for the semi-altruistic provider, which induces a lower price. Whenever the opportunity cost of public funds or the degree of altruism is sufficiently low the first effect dominates and the optimal price increases.

Since $dX(w^*)/dt > 0$, lower travelling costs reduce activity and reduce the marginal social benefit from a reduction in waiting times and therefore reduces the optimal price. However a lower activity also reduces the marginal cost, which induces a higher price. Furthermore, lower travelling costs imply a more responsive demand, which increases the marginal revenue for the hospital from a reduction in waiting times, inducing a lower optimal price. Finally, lower travelling costs increase waiting times but increase the utility of the patients, so that the marginal benefit from a reduction in waiting time for the semi-altruistic provider can be higher or lower (last term). Whenever the opportunity cost of public funds or the degree of altruism is sufficiently low the optimal price reduces when travelling costs are smaller.

The effect of variations in the competitive segment λ on optimal prices is generally indeterminate. Overall, the analysis in this section suggests that whether higher-powered incentive schemes complements or substitute competition depends on the type of competition. Given that α or γ are not too high, while more competition through a higher hospitals density makes higher-powered incentive schemes more desirable, more competition through lower travelling costs makes higher-powered incentive scheme less desirable.

5.3 Does competition improve social welfare?

Consider the policy choice of regulated monopolies versus competition in the hospital market. Since, for a given waiting time, the patient surplus $B(w)$ is unaffected by this choice of market regime, it is straightforward to see that competition is welfare neutral if the treatment price is set at the level which maximises social welfare, i.e., $p = p^*$. In this case, the effect of competition on equilibrium waiting times will be neutralised by an appropriate adjustment of p, keeping $w^* = w^s$. However, in the general case, where p is not necessarily set at the optimal level,[25] the welfare effect of hospital competition is characterised as follows:

Proposition 6 *Let p^* and p^m be the prices that yield $w^* = w^s$ and $w^m = w^s$, respectively.*

(i) Assume that the competitive demand segment is large; $1 - \lambda < \frac{t}{2n(V-v)}$, implying $w^* > w^m$ and $p^* > p^m$. Then there exists a price $\widetilde{p} \in (p^m, p^*)$ such that hospital competition is welfare superior (inferior) if $p > (<)\, \widetilde{p}$.

(ii) Assume that the competitive demand segment is small; $1 - \lambda > \frac{t}{2n(V-v)}$, implying $w^* < w^m$ and $p^* < p^m$. Then there exists a price $\widetilde{\widetilde{p}} \in (p^*, p^m)$ such that hospital competition is welfare superior (inferior) if $p < (>)\, \widetilde{\widetilde{p}}$.

Proof. We know (Proposition 1) that $\partial w^*/\partial p < 0$, and it is straightforward to show that this also holds under regulated monopolies, i.e., $\partial w^m/\partial p < 0$.

(i) From Proposition 2 we know that, if $1 - \lambda < \frac{t}{2n(V-v)}$, $w^* > w^m$ for all p, implying that $p^m < p^*$. This means that, from a social welfare perspective, waiting time is too long in both regimes if $p < p^m$ and too short in both regimes if $p > p^*$. Since $w^* > w^m$ for all p, it follows that competition is always welfare superior if $p > p^*$, while a market regime with regulated monopolies is always welfare superior if $p < p^m$. For $p \in (p^m, p^*)$, replacing regulated monopolies with competition means going from a regime with too short waiting to a regime with too long waiting times in equilibrium. Since W is single-peaked in p,

[25] Indeed, the most frequently used hospital payment system is DRG-pricing, which is close to average cost pricing for specific treatments, and clearly not in line with the optimal pricing rule considered in this section.



Figure 1: Welfare effects of competition with a large competitive segment

there exists a unique price $\widetilde{p} \in (p^m, p^*)$ such that competition is welfare superior (inferior) if $p > (<) \widetilde{p}$.

(ii) By the inverse argument we can define an equivalent price $\widetilde{\widetilde{p}}$ for the case of $1-\lambda > \frac{t}{2n(V-v)}$. ■

Whether or not hospital competition improves social welfare depends here on the characteristics of the reimbursement system (more specifically, the level of prices p) and the relative size of the competitive demand segment (λ). An increase in the treatment price always induces hospitals to increase supply and shorten waiting times. An illustration of the case of $1-\lambda < \frac{t}{2n(V-v)}$ is given in Figure 1. The following discussion summarises the different cases:

High price. When the price is sufficiently *high*, waiting times in the regulated monopolies equilibrium are shorter than the socially optimal level and activity is excessively high (i.e., the marginal benefit from treating an extra patient is below the marginal cost).

a) If, in addition, the competitive segment λ is sufficiently large so that $w^* > w^m$, then hospital competition increases waiting times towards the optimal level w^s, reducing activity and increasing welfare (see Figure 1 for $p > p^*$).

b) In contrast, if the competitive segment λ is sufficiently small so that $w^* < w^m$, then hospital competition reduces waiting times even further from the optimal level w^s, increasing activity and reducing welfare.

Low price. The opposite analysis holds if the price is sufficiently *low*. Then waiting times in the regulated monopolies equilibrium are longer than the socially optimal level and activity is excessively low (i.e., the marginal benefit from treating an extra patient is above the marginal cost).

a) If, in addition, the competitive segment λ is sufficiently large so that $w^* > w^m$, then hospital competition increases waiting times further from the optimal level w^s, reducing activity and reducing welfare (see Figure 1 for $p < p^m$).

b) In contrast, if the competitive segment λ is sufficiently small so that $w^* < w^m$, then hospital competition reduces waiting times towards the optimal level w^s, increasing activity and increasing welfare.

Suppose that we start by a situation where waiting times are excessively high and prices too low. For example, until a few years ago in the UK hospitals were paid with fixed budgets ($p = 0$). Similarly, in Norway in 1997 only 30% of the revenues were based on tariffs. In both countries waiting times are considered a major policy concern and are at least perceived as too high. Our analysis suggests that policies that encourage competition will have the expected effect only if the competitive demand segment is sufficiently low. It is only in this case that competition will reduce waiting times, increase activity and increase welfare.

6 Private (out-of-plan) option

Let us briefly discuss how the presence of private (out-of-plan) hospital care might influence our results. To keep things simple, we assume that alongside each public (in-plan) hospital there is a co-located private hospital offering an identical treatment. The only difference is that private treatment is provided instantaneously (no waiting time), but charged a monetary cost (price or premium) $s > 0$.

We assume that patients differ in income m, where a fraction δ are poor and the residual fraction $(1-\delta)$ are rich. The income for the rich is m_R and the income for the poor is m_P with $m_R > m_P$. We also assume that both rich and poor patients are distributed uniformly on the unit line segment, independently of patient types.

We assume that if patients opt for the public sector, the utility of a k-type patient attending public hospital i for treatment is

$$U^k(x, z_i, w_i) = \begin{cases} V - t|x - z_i| - w_i + u(m) & if \quad k = H \\ v - t|x - z_i| - w_i + u(m) & if \quad k = L \end{cases},$$

with $u' > 0$ and $u'' < 0$, while if this patient opt for the co-located private hospital, her utility is

$$U^k(x, z_i, w_i) = \begin{cases} V - t|x - z_i| + u(m - s) & if \quad k = H \\ v - t|x - z_i| + u(m - s) & if \quad k = L \end{cases}.$$

Therefore, patients (regardless of type) opt for the public treatment if $u(m) - u(m-s) > w_i$.

Since public and private hospital care are perfect substitutes, patients base their decision solely on relative prices – i.e., the price for private treatment (s) relative to the "price" for public treatment, given by the utility loss of waiting measured in monetary terms (w_i). Since by assumption, the marginal utility from income is decreasing, patients opt for the private treatment if their income is sufficiently high. Notice that if the price for private treatment is sufficiently low, then both rich and poor opt for the private sector. In contrast, if the price is sufficiently high, they both opt for the public treatment. In the following we focus on the more realistic case: $u(m_P) - u(m_P - s) > w_i$ and $u(m_R) - u(m_R - s) < w_i$, i.e. the poor prefer the public treatment and the rich prefer the private treatment.

Demand for treatment at public hospital i is then simply $\Theta_i(\cdot) = \delta X_i(\cdot)$, where $X_i(\cdot)$ is given by (5) under competition (free choice of in-plan hospitals) and (14) under monopoly (referral to the closest in-plan hospital). The corresponding surplus to poor patients receiving treatment from public hospital i is then $\Phi_i(\cdot) = \delta B_i(\cdot)$, with $B_i(\cdot)$ being given by (8) under competition and (16) under monopoly. We can now write the payoff function

to hospital i as follows:

$$\Pi_i = p\Theta_i - C(\Theta_i) + \alpha\Phi_i = \delta[pX_i + \alpha B_i] - C(\delta X_i). \tag{36}$$

Following the procedure in Section 3, we obtain the following equilibrium waiting times with a private (out-of-plan) option under monopoly and competition:[26]

$$-\frac{2(1-\lambda)}{t}\left[p - C'(\delta X_i(w^m))\right] = \alpha X_i(w^m), \tag{37}$$

$$-\frac{2-\lambda}{t}\left[p - C'(\delta X_i(w^*))\right] = \alpha\left[X_i(w^*) + \frac{\lambda}{t}\left(V - w^* - \frac{t}{2n}\right)\right], \tag{38}$$

respectively, where

$$X_i(w) = 2(1-\lambda)\left(\frac{v-w}{t}\right) + \frac{\lambda}{n}$$

for $w \in \{w^m, w^*\}$.

A first observation is that our main result in Proposition 2 still holds. The presence of a private out-of-plan option does not qualitatively change the impact of introducing competition in a regulated hospital market on waiting times and activity. This follows straightforwardly by inspection.

The next question is how equilibrium waiting time is affected by the private out-of-plan option. Total differentiation of (38), applying the Cramer's rule, yields the following:

$$\frac{\partial w^*}{\partial \delta} = \frac{C''(\cdot)\left(\frac{2-\lambda}{t}\right)\left[\frac{\lambda}{n} + 2(1-\lambda)\left(\frac{v-w^*}{t}\right)\right]}{2\left[\left(\delta C''(\cdot)\frac{2-\lambda}{t} - \alpha\right)\frac{1-\lambda}{t} - \alpha\frac{\lambda}{2t}\right]} > 0, \tag{39}$$

where the positive sign is confirmed by the second-order condition. Thus, equilibrium waiting time for public treatment becomes lower as a larger fraction of (rich) patients demand instant, private treatment. In other words, the presence of a private option reduces public sector waiting times.

This is a highly intuitive result and the explanation is also reasonably straightforward.

[26] The restrictions on the equilibrium conditions can be derived as in Section 3, but are skipped here to save space. They can be obtained from the authors upon request.

The private alternative yields lower demand for public treatment, which in turn reduces revenues, altruistic benefit and costs. Since the impact on each argument is proportional, the residual effect is simply a lower marginal cost due to lower activity. As a consequence, the marginal patient becomes less financially unprofitable and public hospitals are induced to reduce waiting times.

In terms of welfare, aggregate patient surplus is unambiguously improved by the private option: poor patients benefit because waiting time for public treatment is lower; rich patients benefit because the price of private treatment is lower than the utility loss of waiting for public care; and finally, both rich and poor benefit because more patients are treated in equilibrium. On the other hand, there are of course fixed costs associated with private hospital entry, which may well exceed the benefit to patients. The basic welfare question is whether it is more favourable to increase the public in-plan capacity rather than allowing for a private out-of-plan alternative. This issue is clearly beyond the scope of the current paper. A full welfare analysis of public and private care provision should also take into account any potential strategic effects on the supply-side, which is something we leave for future research.

7 Conclusions and policy implications

This study has analysed the impact of hospital competition on waiting times, using a Salop-type model. Our main result is that, compared with a benchmark case of regulated monopolies, hospital competition reduces waiting times only if the competitive demand segment is sufficiently small. Otherwise, if free choice is relevant for a sufficiently large share of the total patient mass (i.e., if the competitive segment is sufficiently large), then competition *increases* waiting times. Therefore we suggest that policies that encourage choice and competition in health care markets may not be as successful as policymakers might expect. The intuition for this ambiguous result is that, on the one hand, free patient choice induces hospitals to "compete" to avoid treating unprofitable patients, while, on the other hand, free patient choice also induces semi-altruistic providers to compete to

attract high-benefit patients. The first effect dominates when the competitive segment is sufficiently large.

We also find that policies aimed at reducing travelling costs (like reimbursing travel expenses for patients choosing to receive treatment in hospitals outside their catchment area) may surprisingly increase waiting times and reduce overall activity. Intuitively, reducing travelling costs makes the demand for treatment more elastic, making waiting times a more effective rationing tool.

According to our analysis, policies aimed at increasing hospital density will have the expected effect of reducing waiting times and increasing activity. For example, in countries like Denmark, the UK and Spain, governments have decided to contract out patients to existing private hospitals. This policy can be seen as effectively increasing the density of hospitals by opening the patients from the public waiting list to private providers. Since demand in each hospital is lower and the marginal cost less steep, providers will respond by increasing activity and reducing waiting times.

Many countries increasingly remunerate hospitals according to activity-based funding rules (like DRG pricing in Norway and other European countries or HRG pricing in the UK) where hospitals receive a price for each patient treated. Our analysis suggests that for countries where waiting times are excessively low and prices are too high, hospital competition is socially preferable to regulated monopolies if the competitive demand segment is sufficiently large. In this case, competition will increase waiting time towards the optimal level, reducing activity and increasing welfare.

In contrast, for countries (like perhaps the UK, Finland or Norway) where waiting times are excessively high and prices too low, competition will reduce waiting times, increase activity and increase welfare only if the competitive demand segment is sufficiently small.

Finally, we show that whether higher-powered incentive schemes complements or substitute competition depends on the type of competition. While more competition through a higher hospitals density makes higher-powered incentive schemes more desirable, more competition through lower travelling costs makes higher-powered incentive scheme less

desirable.

References

[1] Barros, P., Olivella, P., 2005. Waiting lists and patient selection. Journal of Economics and Management Strategy 14, 623–646.

[2] Besley, T., Hall, J., Preston, I., 1999. The demand for private health insurance: do waiting times matter? Journal of Public Economics 72, 155-181.

[3] Brekke, K.R., Sørgard, L., 2007. Public versus private health care in a national health service. Health Economics, forthcoming.

[4] Cullis, P., Jones, J.G., Propper, C., 2000. Waiting and Medical Treatment: Analyses and Policies. Chapter 28 in A. J. Culyer and J. P. Newhouse (eds), Handbook on Health Economics, Amsterdam: Elsevier.

[5] Chalkley, M., Malcomson, J.M., 1998. Contracting for Health Services when patient demand does not reflect quality. Journal of Health Economics 17, 1-19.

[6] Dawson, D., Gravelle, H., Jacobs, R., Martin, S., Smith, P.C., 2007. The effects of expanding patient choice of provider on waiting times: evidence from a policy experiment. Health Economics 16, 113-128.

[7] Ellis, R., McGuire, T., 1986. Provider behavior under prospective reimbursement: Cost sharing and supply. Journal of Health Economics 5, 129-151.

[8] Ferguson, B., Sheldon, T., Posnett, J. (eds.), 1999. Concentration and choice in health care. London: Royal Society of Medicine.

[9] Folland, S., Goodman, A.C., Stano, M., 2004. The economics of health and health care. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

[10] Gravelle, H., Smith P.C., Xavier, A., 2003. Performance signals in the public sector: the case of health care. Oxford Economic Papers 55, 81-103.

[11] Hammond, P., 1987. Altruism. In: Eatwell, J., Milgate, M., Newman, P. (Eds.), The New Palgrave: A Dictionary of Economics. Macmillan, London, 85-87.

[12] Hoel, M., Sæther, E.M., 2003. Public health care with waiting time: the role of supplementary private health care. Journal of Health Economics 22, 599–616.

[13] Iversen, T., 1993. A theory of hospital waiting lists. Journal of Health Economics 12, 55-71.

[14] Iversen, T., 1997. The effect of private sector on the waiting time in a National Health Service. Journal of Health Economics 16, 381-396.

[15] Jack, W., 2005. Purchasing health care services from providers with unknown altruism. Journal of Health Economics 24, 73-93.

[16] Lindsay, C.M., Feigenbaum, B., 1984. Rationing by waiting lists. American Economic Review 74, 404-417.

[17] Ma, A., 2003. Public rationing and private cost incentives. Journal of Public Economic 88, 333-352.

[18] Marchand, M., Schroyen, F., 2005. Can a mixed health care system be desirable on equity grounds? Scandinavian Journal of Economics 107, 1-23.

[19] Martin, S., Smith, P.C., 1999. Rationing by waiting lists: an empirical investigation. Journal of Public Economics 71, 141-64.

[20] Martin, S., Rice N., Jacobs R., Smith, P.C., 2007, The market for elective surgery: Joint estimation of supply and demand. Journal of Health Economics, 26 (2), 263-285.

[21] Olivella, P., 2002. Shifting public-health-sector waiting lists to the private sector. European Journal of Political Economy 19, 103–132.

[22] Siciliani, L., 2005. Does more choice reduce waiting times? Health Economics 14, 17-23.

[23] Siciliani, L. Hurst, J., 2004. Explaining waiting times variations for elective surgery across OECD countries. OECD Economic Studies 38, 1-23.

[24] Siciliani, L. Hurst, J., 2005. Tackling excessive waiting times for elective surgery: a comparison of policies in twelve OECD countries. Health Policy 72, 201-215 .

[25] Siciliani, L., Martin, S., 2007. An empirical analysis of the impact of choice on waiting times. Health Economics, forthcoming.

[26] Xavier, A., 2003. Hospital competition, GP fundholders and waiting times in the UK internal market: the case of elective surgery. International Journal of Health Care Finance and Economics 3, 25–51.

Most Recent Working Papers

NIPE WP 9/2007	**Brekke, Kurt R., Luigi Siciliani, Odd Rune Straume;** "Competition and Waiting Times in Hospital Markets", 2007.
NIPE WP 8/2007	**Thompson, Maria;** "Complementarities and Costly Investment in a One-Sector Growth Model", 2007.
NIPE WP 7/2007	**Monteiro, Natália;** "Regulatory reform and labour earnings in Portuguese banking", 2007.
NIPE WP 6/2007	**Magalhães, Manuela;** "A Panel Analysis of the FDI Impact on International Trade", 2007.
NIPE WP 5/2007	**Aguiar-Conraria, Luís;** "A Note on the Stability Properties of Goodwin's Predator-Prey Model", 2007.
NIPE WP 4/2007	**Cardoso, Ana Rute; Portela, Miguel; Sá, Carla; Alexandre, Fernando;** "Demand for higher education programs: the impact of the Bologna process", 2007.
NIPE WP 3/2007	**Aguiar-Conraria, Luís and Yi Wen**, "Oil Dependence and Economic Instability, 2007.
NIPE WP 2/2007	**Cortinhas, Carlos,** "Exchange Rate Pass-Through in ASEAN: Implications for the Prospects of Monetary Integration in the Region", 2007.
NIPE WP 8/2006	**de Freitas, Miguel Lebre,** Sobre a perda de ímpeto no processo de convergência da economia portuguesa: uma abordagem dogmática, 2006.
NIPE WP 7/2006	**Aguiar-Conraria, Luís; Gulamhussen, Mohamed Azzim** and **Aguiar, Sandra**; "Foreign Direct Investment in Brazil and Home Country Risk", 2006.
NIPE WP 6/2006	**Veiga, Francisco José** and **Veiga, Linda Gonçalves**, "The impact of local and national economic conditions on legislative election results?", 2006.
NIPE WP 5/2006	**Veiga, Linda Gonçalves and Veiga, Francisco José,** "Does Opportunism Pay Off?", 2006.
NIPE WP 4/2006	**Ribeiro, J. Cadima and J. Freitas Santos,** "An investigation of the relationship between counterfeiting and culture: evidence from the European Union", 2006.
NIPE WP 3/2006	**Cortinhas, Carlos,** "Asymmetry of Shocks and Convergence in Selected Asean Countries: A Dynamic Analysis", 2006.
NIPE WP 2/2006	**Veiga, Francisco José,** "Political Instability and Inflation Volatility", 2006
NIPE WP 1/2006	**Mourão, Paulo Reis,** The importance of the regional development on the location of professional soccer teams. The Portuguese case 1970-1999, 2006.
NIPE WP 17/2005	**Cardoso, Ana Rute and Miguel Portela,** The provision of wage insurance by the firm: evidence from a longitudinal matched employer-employee dataset, 2005.
NIPE WP 16/2005	**Ribeiro, J. Cadima and J. Freitas Santos,** Dilemas competitivos da empresa nacional: algumas reflexões, 2005.