

Prior authorization of medication and its influence on provider behavior: A latent class analysis

Stephen Salzbrenner, Lawrence Scheier, Fang Qiu

Submitted to: Journal of Medical Internet Research
on: April 02, 2025

Disclaimer: © The authors. All rights reserved. This is a privileged document currently under peer-review/community review. Authors have provided JMIR Publications with an exclusive license to publish this preprint on its website for review purposes only. While the final peer-reviewed paper may be licensed under a CC BY license on publication, at this stage authors and publisher expressly prohibit redistribution of this draft paper other than for review purposes.

Table of Contents

Original Manuscript..... 5

Supplementary Files..... 21

0..... 21

..... 21

0..... 21

Figures 22

Figure 1..... 23

Prior authorization of medication and its influence on provider behavior: A latent class analysis

Stephen Salzbrenner¹ MD; Lawrence Scheier² PhD; Fang Qiu³

¹Dept of Psychiatry University of Nebraska Medical Center Omaha US

²Lars Research Institute Sun City US

³University of Nebraska Medical Center Omaha US

Corresponding Author:

Stephen Salzbrenner MD

Dept of Psychiatry

University of Nebraska Medical Center

985575 Nebraska Medical Center

Omaha

US

Abstract

Background: Insurance companies frequently require prior authorization (PA) for medication prescriptions to ensure quality control and safety. The added layer of scrutiny can contribute to provider dissatisfaction and has been associated with adverse patient outcomes. Healthcare providers (HCP's) have changed prescribing behaviors to avoid PA. Understanding factors contributing to this phenomenon can facilitate systemic change and better patient care.

Objective: Identify unique subgroups of HCPs with similar PA-related behaviors using a person-centered mixture modeling approach. Characterize subgroup membership by important covariates, and examine the influence of subgroup membership on three relevant prescribing outcomes.

Methods: Cross-sectional, online, nationwide survey of 1173 HCP's, oversampled for psychiatry in support of developing a software-as-a-solution to facilitate PA. Latent class analysis (LCA) included 12 indicators assessing degree of PA involvement, provider-insurance communication, and methods of obtaining or avoiding PA. Covariates included age, gender, race, provider role, specialty, number of prescribers, and patient load. Three clinical decision outcomes included prescribing medication other than initially preferred due to PA delays, avoiding newer medications due to anticipated need for PA, and modifying a diagnosis to obtain PA.

Results: 1147 HCPs responded with 1144 usable surveys (median [range] age, 50.003 [25.00, 72.00] years; 569 females [49.74%], 67.13% white, 44.84% psychiatrists). Four unique classes were obtained based on 12 indicators assessing PA-related activities. Classes included a high PA denial class (291 [25.15%]), a low PA problem class (178 [15.93%]), a class denoted by problematic communications with insurers (227 [19.96%]), and a low volume PA class with problematic experiences (446 [38.97%]). Out of 7 covariates only 3 (age, specialty type, and patient load) provided additional means to characterize class membership. The largest class reporting problematic PA experiences had significantly higher mean levels for changing their prescribing and diagnostic behaviors than the remaining classes.

Conclusions: Providers are not homogeneous regarding their experience with PA and insurance companies. It is therefore important to recognize subtle behavioral differences and find ways to accommodate the PA process to their unique needs. This will facilitate appropriate implementation of PA by insurance companies. Providers can then avoid the need to alter medications, change diagnoses, or resist prescribing newer effective medications that may require lengthy clinical documentation.

(JMIR Preprints 02/04/2025:75361)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.75361>

Preprint Settings

1) Would you like to publish your submitted manuscript as preprint?

✓ **Please make my preprint PDF available to anyone at any time (recommended).**

Please make my preprint PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that my title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Only make the preprint title and abstract visible.

No, I do not wish to publish my submitted manuscript as a preprint.

2) If accepted for publication in a JMIR journal, would you like the PDF to be visible to the public?

✓ **Yes, please make my accepted manuscript PDF available to anyone at any time (Recommended).**

Yes, but please make my accepted manuscript PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that the title and abstract will remain visible.

Yes, but only make the title and abstract visible (see Important note, above). I understand that if I later pay to participate in <http://www.jmir.org/>

No. Please do not make my accepted manuscript PDF available to anyone. I understand that if I later pay to participate in <https://www.jmir.org/>



Original Manuscript

Prior authorization of medication and its influence on provider behavior: A latent class analysis

Stephen G Salzbrenner, MD*

Department of Psychiatry, University of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE

Lawrence M Scheier, Ph.D.

President, LARS Research Institute, Inc., Sun City, AZ

Senior Research Scientist, Prevention Strategies, Greensboro, NC

and

Fang Qiu, Ph.D

Department of Biostatistics, College of Public Health, University of Nebraska Medical Center,
Omaha, NE

*Address Correspondence to:

Stephen G. Salzbrenner, MD
Department of Psychiatry
University of Nebraska Medical Center
985575 Nebraska Medical Center
Omaha, NE 69198
E-mail: stephen.salzbrenner@unmc.edu
ORCID: 0000-0001-9074-1694

Abstract

Background: Insurance companies frequently require prior authorization (PA) for medication prescriptions to ensure quality control and safety. The added layer of scrutiny can contribute to provider dissatisfaction and has been associated with adverse patient outcomes. Healthcare providers have changed prescribing behaviors to avoid PA. Understanding factors contributing to this phenomenon can facilitate systemic change and better patient care.

Objective: Identify unique unobserved subgroups of prescribers with similar PA-related behaviors using a finite mixture modeling approach. Characterize subgroup membership by important covariates, and examine the influence of subgroup membership on three relevant prescribing outcomes.

Methods: Cross-sectional, online, nationwide survey of 1173 prescribers, oversampled for psychiatry in support of developing a software-as-a-solution to facilitate PA. Latent class analysis (LCA) included 12 indicators assessing degree of PA involvement, provider-insurance communication, and methods of obtaining or avoiding PA. Covariates included age, gender, race, provider role, specialty, number of prescribers, and patient load. Three clinical decision outcomes included prescribing medication other than initially preferred due to PA delays, avoiding newer medications due to anticipated need for PA, and modifying a diagnosis to obtain PA.

Results: 1147 prescribers responded with 1144 usable surveys (median [range] age, 50.003 [25.00, 72.00] years; 569 females [49.74%], 67.13% white, 44.84% psychiatrists). Four unique classes were obtained based on 12 indicators assessing PA-related activities. Classes included a *high PA denial* class (291 [25.15%]), a *Low Volume PA* (178 [15.93%]), a class denoted by *problematic communication issues* with insurers (227 [19.96%]), and a *low volume PA class with problematic experiences* (446 [38.97%]). Only 3 of the 7 covariates (age, specialty type, and patient load) provided additional means to characterize class membership. The observation that certain demographics (race, gender) and provider characteristics (specialty) may not be informative has policy implications and can inform means to improve provider-insurer communication. The largest class reporting problematic PA experiences had significantly higher mean levels for changing their prescribing and diagnostic behaviors than the remaining classes.

Conclusions: Providers are not homogeneous regarding their experience with PA and insurance companies. It is therefore important to recognize subtle behavioral differences and find ways to accommodate the PA process to their unique needs. This will facilitate appropriate implementation of PA by insurance companies. Providers can then avoid the need to alter medications, change diagnoses, or resist prescribing newer effective medications that may require lengthy clinical documentation.

Keywords: Prior authorization; Step therapy; prescribing Behavior; latent class analysis; insurance; pharmacy benefit manager

Introduction

Prior authorization (PA) is used by health insurers to manage access to costly medications and ensure their safe, effective, and value-based use [1]. However, PA can negatively impact workflow, patient care and provider satisfaction. An American Medical Association survey reported that providers

spend a mean of 12 hours on PAs per week [2]. Moreover, 95% of physicians reported that PA had a somewhat or significant negative impact on clinical outcomes, including delayed access to care, treatment abandonment by patients, and serious adverse health events. Prescribers reported that 27% of PA's are often or always denied. Over two-thirds (69%) of physicians reported that PA led to higher overall utilization of health care resources, including ineffective initial treatment, additional office visits, immediate care and emergency room visits, and hospitalizations. To address these issues, 35% of physicians have staff who work exclusively on PA.

The 2019 ePA National Adoption Scorecard by CoverMyMeds noted that the type of medical specialty can also contribute to PA burden [3]. More in-depth qualitative studies reinforce provider burden due to extensive paperwork and inconsistent PA requirements among health plans [4,5]. Given these consequences and the burden of PA, providers, pharmacists, policymakers, and other stakeholders have supported efforts to limit, standardize, and/or streamline PA processes [6-11].

Although there is a body of evidence on the benefits and unintended consequences of PA, we could only find one published study that examined the effect of PA on providers' clinical decision-making. This involved a survey of 326 psychiatrists in which a majority reported at least occasionally using tactics including diagnosis modification or falsification of previous medication trials to obtain PA [12]. An additional two-thirds refrained at least occasionally from prescribing preferred medications due to an actual PA requirement or expectation of one. This gap in the literature prompted us to conduct a nationwide survey of ~1200 prescribers representing all but 7 states, which examined clinical practices such as modifying diagnoses, avoiding evidence-based medications or avoiding prescribing newer medications in relation to various PA burdens and clinical factors [13]. The results of this study as well as survey data from various sources [5,10,11,13] reveal that not all providers feel the same about the PA process nor do they modify their clinical practices in the same way to avoid problems with PA. When it comes to directly interfacing with health insurers over the issue of PA, one size does not fit all, suggesting there may be manifold provider experiences. Subgroups of providers may exist differentiated based on the tenor of their interactions with PA, owing to differences in the volume of PA, patient load, the quality of provider-insurer interactions, and insurers' demands to provide support for a particular prescription or course of treatment. To our knowledge no study has yet examined subgroups of providers who have unique experiences revolving around PA nor determined whether these subgroups differ in prescribing and diagnostic behaviors.

In the current study, we rely on latent class analysis (LCA), a mixture model approach to determine whether providers form qualitatively distinct subgroups (classes) based on their day-to-day interactions with insurers over PA. The classes differ qualitatively rather than quantitatively because the focus is on "response patterns" not distributional behaviors like a measure of central tendency (e.g., mean) would represent. Mixture models are part of a broad class of person-centered analytic techniques that examine relations between people rather than between variables as with a variable-centered approach (i.e., correlation or regression). It is considered a categorical analogue to factor analysis where the underlying latent factor is categorical (and has a multinomial distribution rather than a continuous distribution), and the indicators for the categorical latent factor are themselves also categorical. The different levels of the categorical latent factor correspond to unique (mutually exclusive and exhaustive) "subgroups" that share behavioral similarity [14,15]. To illustrate, if there are two survey questions, each with response formats of 'yes' and 'no,' there would be 2^2 possible response patterns (YY, YN, NY, and NN). When there are 8 survey questions there are 2^8 or 256 possible response patterns, which gets a bit trickier for the naked eye to detect the composition of unique classes. Some type of assignment process is needed that can accurately predict the different response patterns based on the empirical data. This is where LCA can discern meaningful patterns in the data based on probability theorems using a multiway contingency table. Individuals are assigned to their respective class or subgroup based on estimated posterior probabilities using the joint marginal distributions of survey items. There is a margin of error in the

assignment process as class membership cannot be perfectly predicted for any individual (perfect prediction of class membership would create a nominal observed variable like gender or race). Once mutually exclusive subgroups were obtained, we addressed whether they can be further characterized by demographics and other relevant covariates. Following this procedure, we modeled the relationships between class membership and three measures of clinical decision-making that reflect provider behaviors associated with PA experience. As explained below, this analysis provides insight into clinicians' diagnostic and prescribing behavior and whether it differs based on their unique class membership.

Methods

Recruitment

A 58-item survey was administered in October 2020 using the Qualtrics platform. Invitation emails with a unique hyperlink were sent to ~100,000 licensed providers with emails drawn from a curated, nationwide list. The study oversampled psychiatrists to address PA in mental health care settings. All participants were consented online prior to taking the survey (University of Nebraska, IRB # 00000672). The survey took ~10 minutes to complete ($\bar{x} = 3.73$) and providers received a \$10 gift card upon completion. A handful of surveys had to be discarded because providers started the online survey but failed to produce sufficient usable data (97.8% usable with 98.11% survey completion). The response rate for the survey was 1.2%. Additional details of survey administration and sampling procedures can be found in Salzbrenner et al. [13,16].

Measures

We used a total of 12 latent class indicators to model subgroup membership. These included: number of prior authorizations completed in a week, number of hours spent on prior authorization, length of time waiting for PA decisions from health plan (past week), length of time to complete PA, percentage of medication requests approved upon appeal, challenges associated with identifying appropriate step therapy requirements prior to prescribing medication, needing to send additional clinical documentation, not being notified by the insurer of a medication approval, not being notified of a medication denial, being denied PA because the request was missing specific adverse effects of past medication, because of dosing issues, and because of formulation issues. Collectively, these 12 measures capture the providers' degree of engagement with PA, challenges associated with PA (i.e., barriers and obstacles), and provider-insurer communication issues revolving around PA.

All indicators were dichotomized to 0/1, where "1" indicates heavy involvement in PA and numerous challenges. Support for dichotomization is provided when the goal is to acknowledge that a provider's experience with PA has occurred (yes/no), rather than modeling distributional behavior with central moments [17,18]. Covariates in the model include provider characteristics (age, race, gender), type of provider (DO/MD vs. NP/Physician Assistant), provider subspecialty (psychiatrist vs. all others), and practice characteristics (active patient load and the number of providers that can prescribe medications). Three continuous measures were modeled as "distal outcomes." These included, "In what percentage of cases do you prescribe a different medication than initially planned, due to prior authorization delays?" (ranging from 1 'less than 10%' to 5 '>50%'); "How often do you avoid prescribing newer medications due to anticipated difficulties with prior authorization, even if you feel patients meet evidence-based guidelines for their use?" (ranging from 1 'very rarely' to 5 'extremely often'); and "How often have you modified a diagnosis to obtain a prior authorization?" (ranging from 1 'rarely' to 5 'extremely often').

The LCA analyses were conducted using Mplus statistical software [19]. Imputation procedures to correct missing data for the covariates was conducted using the MICE procedure in R [20,21]. This is a fully conditioned imputation utilizing predictive mean matching, which considers the distributional characteristics of each missing variable in a multivariate framework [22]. We used 20 imputations, which is sufficient to obtain unbiased parameter estimates [23].

We first tested LCA models with 2 to 8 classes. Selection of the best fitting model was based on the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) [24], Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) [25], Entropy [26], and the Log-likelihood statistical fit index (LL). These statistics provide a means to gauge whether a model with $k-1$ classes vs. k classes is superior in fit. As more classes are extracted there should be a modicum of shrinkage in the information criteria. The LL statistic reflects the likelihood of observing the empirical data given the set of parameter estimates (the logarithm of the LL is used so that higher values closer to 0 indicate better fit). Entropy (ranging from 0 to 1) is a standardized measure that reflects the chaos of a model with values closer to 1 denoting better classification certainty. Conceptually, we looked for evidence of clear class separation with distinct response patterns for the different classes (i.e., class enumeration) [27]. We also want to avoid small or sparse cells (<5%) that may not generalize or replicate [28].

Following derivation of the class structure, we covariate adjusted the model using the R3STEP procedure available in the Mplus software program [29] (see Supplement 1 for an explanation of how this procedure works). We then modeled relations between the class structure and three distal outcomes using the BCH procedure available in the Mplus statistical program [30] (see Supplement 2 for more about the BCH procedure). Mixture model and subsequent multinomial logistic model analyses were conducted with weights to adjust for non-response and unweighted. Five auxiliary variables were used to compute weights including sex, age, practitioner role (MD/DO vs. NP and Physician Assistant), and specialty type (available for both respondents and nonrespondents). Weights were obtained using iterative logistic regression predicting presence in the sample vs. the

population (delimiting sample data from the population file to avoid overstating presence). This was done to approximate population values and implemented using propensity weighting strategies to make the sample distributions match to the total sample (i.e., the known population distribution). This generates a response probability for each auxiliary measure. A bias statistic was estimated as the difference in parameters between the expected value (based on the population of providers) and the sample value (regression coefficients and SEs). The results were virtually identical and thus for ease of interpretation we only report unweighted results in this paper.

Statistical Analysis

Power

We used a Monte Carlo simulation to estimate power with the LCA analyses [31]. With a finite mixture model the question of power revolves around having sufficient sample to extract the right number of classes [27]. Computing power for a mixture model is not as straightforward as with regression or factor analysis. This is because traditional power with precise parameter estimates cannot be used given there are boundary conditions for the parameter estimates (item response probabilities and latent class prevalence are between 0 and 1 and the number of classes is indeterminate). Sample size estimation and power considerations with mixture models can be determined using a Monte Carlo simulation. We specified a model with 5 covariates and up to 5 classes, varying the thresholds (logits) for class composition. The simulation model used Maximum Likelihood estimation using an Expectation Maximization algorithm with 10000 replications (the sample size for the study with a goal of gaining stability in the parameter values) and averaging parameter values across these samples.

The study has sufficient power ($\geq .80$) to obtain adequate coverage (the proportion of replications for which the 95% confidence interval contains the true parameter value), with low levels of parameter bias (computed as the simulated parameter value averaged over the replications – population parameter value/population parameter value and not exceeding 10% for parameter bias and 5% for standard error bias). In all cases power is interpreted as the proportion of replications in which the null hypothesis stating the parameter is zero can be rejected at the .05 level of significance (i.e., the probability of rejecting the null when it is false).

Results

The sample was 49.6% female with a mean age of 50.5 years ($SD = 12.9$). A majority were MD/DO providers (76%) with a smaller percentage Nurse Practitioners (14%) or Physician Assistants (10%). A majority of the sample was White (67%), followed by Asian (18%) and 4% identified as non-White Hispanic. The largest proportion of respondents were in Psychiatry per study design (44.9%) followed by Internal Medicine (18%), Dermatology (13.1%), Gastroenterology (8.0%), Neurology (5.9%), Oncology (5.8%), and Rheumatology (4.4%).

Supplemental eTable 1 contains additional sample information including comparisons based on gender, race, and practice subspecialty. The largest share of providers (44%) worked in practices with less than five prescribers, with 23.5% having between 5-10, and another 18% having 20 or more (the remaining percentages were much smaller). Active patient load varied considerably, with the largest number (48%) having over 200 patients, while remaining providers were equally split among smaller practices (<25, 11%; 25-50, 13%; 51-100, 13%; 101-200, 14%). The size of practices varied considerably, with the majority (67%) having less than five advanced practice providers, 18% had between 5-10, and the rest were much smaller practices ranging from 2% having 16-20 to 6.5% having 20 or more providers.

LCA results. Supplemental eTable 2 contains the model fit indices corresponding to the 2-8 class LCA models. Upon careful inspection, the 4-class model provided the best fit, noted by shrinkage in the AIC, BIC, and LL statistic with the progressive extraction of classes. Relative entropy was less helpful in determining which model to choose, as the values fluctuated up and down with the extraction of additional classes. We further inspected the pattern of item response probabilities (IRPs) for all the models, looking for any distinguishing features of class membership and the latent class prevalence for the different classes within each model. The goal is to select the most parsimonious model that most efficiently captures the underlying behaviors of the sample participants while simultaneously obtaining the best class enumeration based on the unique response patterns.

Table 1 shows the IRPs for the 4-class model and should be read in conjunction with Figure 1 (eFigure 1 in Supplement), which graphically portrays the IRPs. The IRPs indicate the probability of endorsing an item conditional on class membership. Items in italics indicate that class members had a high probability of endorsing the item. Class 1 (25.44%) consisted of providers who endorsed lengthy waiting times for PA decision from health plans ($\rho = .794$), high percentage of denied medications approved upon appeal ($\rho = .608$), the need to send additional documentation ($\rho = .750$) and PA denial because of dosing ($\rho = .788$) or formulation issues ($\rho = .651$). Considering this, we labeled this class “*High Denial PA*.” Class 2 (15.58%) was distinguished because they only endorsed one item close to the .6 threshold, for excessive waiting time for PA ($\rho = .599$). Given that members of this class did not endorse any other items above the .6 threshold, we labeled it “*Low Volume PA*” Class 3 (19.91%) had four items above the critical .6 threshold including long average wait for PA ($\rho = .826$), challenges with step therapy ($\rho = .595$) which is reasonably close to the .6 threshold, having to send additional clinical documentation ($\rho = .754$), not being notified of medication approval ($\rho = .877$), and not being notified of medication denial ($\rho = .932$). We labeled this class “*Problematic Communication Issues*.” Class 4 (39.06%) was distinguished by the fact that its members endorsed almost all indicators except for number of PAs completed in a week ($\rho = .474$) and hours spent personally on PA ($\rho = .066$). In the case of the latter parameter, it means that members of this class did not spend a lot of hours working with PA. The remaining indicators were highly endorsed (avg. $\rho = .840$) and as a result, we labeled this class “*Problematic PA Experiences*.” It’s notable that class 4 endorsed significant workflow burden despite the fact that members of this class did not spend significant time per week on PA. This could be reflective of administrative delegation.

Table 1. Item response probabilities for the 4-Class model

	Latent Class			
	1	2	3	4
Class Prevalence	25.44%	15.58%	19.91%	39.06%
# prior authorizations completed in a week	0.241	0.217	0.209	0.474
# hours personally spent on PA per week	0.014	0.012	0.007	0.066

Average wait for PA decision from health plan	0.794	0.599	0.826	0.863
Average time PA completion/submission	0.42	0.364	0.416	0.666
Percentage of denied medication requests approved on appeal	0.608	0.522	0.569	0.662
Challenge to identify appropriate step therapy requirements	0.562	0.32	0.595	0.731
Necessary to send additional clinical documentation for medication	0.75	0.415	0.754	0.94
Not notified of medication approval	0.178	0.125	0.877	0.93
You are not notified of medication denial	0.000	0.023	0.932	0.876
Deny PA request missing adverse effects of past medications	0.461	0.152	0.438	0.847
Deny PA request because of dosing issues	0.788	0.204	0.407	0.955
Deny PA request because of formulation issues	0.651	0.002	0.277	0.932
<i>Note.</i> The italic numbers represent probabilities exceeding .600 (i.e., 60% endorsement of some type of issue with PA). CLASS LABELS: Class 1 = High Denial PA; Class 2 = Low Volume PA; Class 3 = Problematic Communication Issues; Class 4 = Problematic PA Experiences.				

Table 2 contains the results of the covariate-adjusted models including the univariate models (upper portion) and multivariate (lower portion) multinomial logistic regression models. The univariate model determines whether a covariate is significantly related to class membership and can be used to detect evidence of suppression in the multivariate model. Only three of the seven covariates including age, specialty, and patient load (in both the univariate and multivariate models) were significantly related to class membership. In the adjusted models, older providers were 18% more likely to be members of the *High Denial PA* class compared to the *Problematic PA Experiences* reference class. Members of the *Low Volume PA* class were 2% more likely to be older compared to the reference class. Members of the *High Denial PA* class were over two times more likely to be psychiatrists compared to the reference class. Members of the *Low Volume PA* class as well as those in the *Problematic Communication Issues* class were less likely to have a high patient load (ORs = 0.49 and 0.54, respectively) compared to the reference class 4.

Table 2. Multinomial logistic regression predicting class membership

	Latent Class						
	1		2		3		4
	OR (95% CI)	p-value	OR (95% CI)	p-value	OR (95% CI)	p-value	
Prevalence	25.44%		15.58%		19.91%		39.06 %
Unadjusted OR ^b							
Age	1.023 (1.007, 1.039)	0.005	1.02 (1.001, 1.039)	0.038	0.998 (0.979, 1.017)	0.797	Ref.
Sex	0.812 (0.557, 1.183)	0.278	0.735 (0.474, 1.139)	0.168	0.903 (0.582, 1.4)	0.648	Ref.
White	0.995 (0.655, 1.51)	0.98	0.818 (0.503, 1.331)	0.418	1.116 (0.677, 1.838)	0.668	Ref.
Specialty	2.252 (1.532, 3.311)	<.001	1.132 (0.714, 1.793)	0.598	1.28 (0.824, 1.988)	0.271	Ref.
Provider role	1.421 (0.913, 2.211)	0.119	1.627 (0.961, 2.754)	0.07	1.22 (0.742, 2.005)	0.433	Ref.
Prov Rx	0.795 (0.548, 1.152)	0.226	0.738 (0.481, 1.131)	0.163	1.158 (0.743, 1.805)	0.518	Ref.
Pt load	0.894 (0.549, 1.455)	0.652	0.51 (0.307, 0.847)	0.009	0.545 (0.33, 0.901)	0.018	Ref.

Adjusted OR ^c							
Age	1.018 (1.001, 1.036)	0.039	1.021 (1, 1.042)	0.045	0.997 (0.977, 1.018)	0.797	Ref.
Sex	0.972 (0.639, 1.478)	0.894	0.889 (0.543, 1.456)	0.641	0.952 (0.582, 1.558)	0.846	Ref.
White	0.873 (0.56, 1.36)	0.549	0.755 (0.447, 1.275)	0.293	1.213 (0.697, 2.11)	0.495	Ref.
Specialty	2.069 (1.392, 3.076)	<.001	0.943 (0.577, 1.542)	0.816	1.243 (0.77, 2.006)	0.373	Ref.
Provider role	1.167 (0.709, 1.923)	0.543	1.531 (0.847, 2.768)	0.159	1.181 (0.641, 2.176)	0.594	Ref.
Prov Rx	0.97 (0.654, 1.436)	0.877	0.782 (0.495, 1.235)	0.291	1.216 (0.745, 1.983)	0.434	Ref.
Pt load	0.909 (0.546, 1.513)	0.713	0.49 (0.292, 0.824)	0.007	0.537 (0.324, 0.891)	0.016	Ref.

Notes: ^aBased on estimated posterior probabilities. ^bCovariates entered one at a time. ^cCovariates entered as a block. Reference class for each covariate is 0: sex (M=0, F=1), white (Other=0, White=1), Specialty (Other=0, Psychiatry=1), Provider role (Other =0, DO/MD=1), Providers who write Rx (Other =0, # of providers ≥5 =1), Patient Load (Other =0, > 50 patients =1). CLASS LABELS: Class 1 = High Denial PA; Class 2 = Low Volume PA; Class 3 = Problematic Communication Issues; Class 4 = Problematic PA Experiences.

Distal Outcomes. With the BCH procedure, individuals are assigned to their most likely class (see Supplemental Materials for more on this procedure), creating a nominal variable that can be used for subsequent variable-centered analyses. Tables 3 and 4 show the results of this procedure including the estimated means for each class (Table 3) and the pairwise comparisons of intercepts between classes (Table 4). The stepwise modeling procedure included contrasting intercepts when only class membership is covariate-adjusted (controlling for unique characteristics of individuals within-class) and then covariate-adjusting the distal outcomes. These adjustments avoid spurious findings when characteristics associated with class membership influence the outcome indirectly or directly influence the outcomes. Fourteen of the 18 pairwise comparisons were significant and only three would be eliminated with a Bonferroni type adjustment for multiple comparisons. A positive mean difference indicates the first class had a larger mean. Overall, the *Problematic PA Experiences* Class 4 had significantly higher means for altering clinical decision-making because of PA issues compared to the remaining three classes. This held for all three distal outcomes (the mean differences were all negative). Class 2 (*Low Volume PA*), on the other hand, which was characterized by the lowest endorsement of PA problems, had much lower means than the remaining classes for all three clinical decision-making outcomes.

Table 3. The estimated distal outcomes per class^a

Outcome	Latent class	Mean	S.E.
Q14	C1	3.274	0.278
	C2	2.452	0.275
	C3	3.36	0.27
	C4	3.712	0.257
Q15	C1	3.102	0.231
	C2	2.602	0.249
	C3	3.22	0.223
	C4	3.527	0.218
Q16	C1	2.045	0.201
	C2	1.835	0.2

C3	2.173	0.197
C4	2.538	0.191

Note: ^aAll BCH models controlled for covariates. LABELS: Q14 = Prescribe a different medication due to PA delays; Q15 = Avoid prescribing newer medication due to PA; Q16 = Modified a diagnosis to obtain PA. CLASS LABELS: Class 1 = High Denial PA; Class 2 = Low Volume PA; Class 3 = Problematic Communication Issues; Class 4 = Problematic PA Experiences.

Table 4. Pairwise comparisons for LCA model with distal outcomes^a

Outcome	Latent class	Mean Difference	S.E.	P-Value
Q14	1 vs 2	0.821	0.184	<.001
	1 vs 3	-0.086	0.16	0.591
	1 vs 4	-0.439	0.13	0.001
	2 vs 3	-0.907	0.182	<.001
	2 vs 4	-1.26	0.146	<.001
	3 vs 4	-0.353	0.15	0.019
Q15	1 vs 2	0.5	0.161	0.002
	1 vs 3	-0.118	0.13	0.362
	1 vs 4	-0.426	0.107	<.001
	2 vs 3	-0.619	0.165	<.001
	2 vs 4	-0.926	0.133	<.001
	3 vs 4	-0.307	0.123	0.013
Q16	1 vs 2	0.211	0.112	0.06
	1 vs 3	-0.127	0.107	0.232
	1 vs 4	-0.493	0.093	<.001
	2 vs 3	-0.338	0.112	0.003
	2 vs 4	-0.704	0.094	<.001
	3 vs 4	-0.366	0.108	0.001

Note: ^aAll models controlled for covariates. LABELS Q14 = Prescribe a different medication due to PA delays; Q15 = Avoid prescribing newer medication due to PA; Q16 = Modified a diagnosis to obtain PA. CLASS LABELS: Class 1 = High Denial PA; Class 2 = Low Volume PA; Class 3 = Problematic Communication Issues; Class 4 = Problematic PA Experiences.

Discussion

We identified four distinct classes based on PA-related insurance interactions, PA volume, and various challenges they confront as part of the PA process. These qualitative distinctions have not

been noted in the literature, which has focused on descriptively showing the prevalence of providers who encounter problems. This glosses over the fact that not all providers share the same sentiment or have identical PA experiences. Understanding the nature of these experiences and the composition of different subgroups may foster corrective actions to improve efficiency while decreasing provider burden. We also examined whether the unique classes are different in their respective clinical decisions regarding prescribing and diagnosis. The latter issue gets at the heart of how PA affects providers and the effect of PA on medical practice.

The largest Class 4 (*Problematic PA Experiences*) encountered the most problems in every facet of the PA process. Although they had low volumes of PA and spent very few hours engaged in PA, they reported waiting extensively for PA decisions, experience frequent denials, challenges with step therapy, responded to requests for additional clinical documentation, were not notified of approvals or denials, and encountered denials because of missing adverse medication effects, dosing issues or formulation issues. In contrast, the smallest class endorsed waiting for PA decisions as the sole challenge faced. The two remaining classes endorsed a few problems but in no consistent or definable pattern that could distinguish their PA experiences.

All four classes were distinguished by minimal endorsement of two questions; how many prior authorizations are completed in a week and the number of hours personally spent on PA. These patterns may indicate either that the medical providers have dedicated staff addressing these problems or that providers represent practices with relatively low volume of PAs. In the latter case they still encountered problems as evidenced by the way they endorsed the other PA-related survey questions. Practically speaking, the sample consisted of a fair representation of different specialties, favoring a larger share of psychiatrists by design (45%) but including specialties like Internal Medicine and Dermatology that routinely have heavy PA exposure.

Modeling covariates helps to further characterize class membership. Of the seven covariates, age, specialty and patient load were the most prominent measures to distinguish class membership. Members of Class 1 (*High Denial PA*) were older than the reference Class 4 (*Problematic PA Experiences*) and more likely to be psychiatrists. Members of Class 2 (*Low Volume PA*) were also older than the reference class suggesting that older providers did not see PA as problematic compared to the members belonging to the *Problematic PA Experiences* reference class. Patient load was relatively low for members of the *Low Volume PA* class and likewise Class 3 (*Problematic Communication Issues*) compared to the reference class. Taken together, providers in the *Problematic PA Experiences* class were younger, and had higher patient loads compared to the other classes, suggesting that large practices with younger providers experience more significant issues with PA and may want to see system-wide changes to alleviate the burdens of PA.

This study also showed that there is a significant relationship between whether providers encounter difficult challenges with PA and three measures of their clinical decision making. This is a strong indication that the burdensome experiences brought about through the PA process has the ability to change medical practice by altering the treatment decisions made by providers. This raises the potential that the actions that providers take to avoid PA-related burdens could have significant downstream implications for patient safety, including undesired clinical outcomes and threats to public health. We only examined the relationship between class membership and clinical decision making at a high level of analysis. Future studies may want to break this down and examine further what contributes to the changes in clinical decision making and whether this can be rectified in some fashion. This type of more detailed analysis could be quite informative and influential regarding health policy and practice.

Limitations

There are several limitations worth noting. First, the data are cross-sectional providing only a glimpse of provider behaviors at one point in time. Longitudinal data would be required to infer some causal sequence relating, for example, provider-insurer interactions and determine if these

behaviors and sentiments are stable or change progressively (for better or worse). This could entail a repeated measures design that samples provider-insurer interactions at numerous occasions and develops a model that includes change in provider and patient behaviors (i.e., clinical outcomes). Second, although we sampled more than one specialty, there were several that were not included. Casting a wider net around different practice specialties might shed light on the extent of provider dissatisfaction and whether class structure is consistent across specialty. Included would be oncology, gastroenterology, cardiology, and nephrology since those specialists write a large volume of specialty prescriptions. Extending the study to include more practice types that differ by composition would also lend credence to how pervasive PA dissatisfaction is and whether it is volume or specialty dependent. Third, while dichotomization of the 12 class indicators was necessary from an analytic point of view, some of the items (e.g., wait times, documentation burden) may contain significant gradations that would provide more information and richer class distinction. Therefore, the dichotomization of LCA indicators could obscure meaningful inter-class differences. Finally, the low response rate of 1.2% increases the risk of selection bias, specifically those who are dissatisfied with PA or have issues revolving around PA may be overrepresented.

Comparison with Prior Work

Past studies have identified provider issues with PA; however, they have treated providers as a single undifferentiated population. This assumes providers will have the same reactions and results when interacting with insurance companies over PA. Moreover, the nature of relations between PA activities and provider clinical outcomes e.g., dissatisfaction with PA procedures, has been examined only at the bivariate level of analysis. This limits what we know about PA and provider behaviors to a very small slice of experiences that are examined in an isolated manner. In the current study, the inclusion of 12 indicators capturing a more holistic set of experiences can shed light on systemic factors that affect provider behaviors.

Conclusions

This study adds important insight to the effect of PA on providers' experience. Factors such as age and patient load significantly influence the provider experience, as well as prescribing behaviors, which could lead to disparate health outcomes. Recognizing unique provider experiences can help facilitate optimization of patient care while decreasing provider burden.

Clinically, this study reveals a concerning trend that could have dangerous implications for patients. First, the study demonstrated that providers occasionally modify diagnoses in charts in order to avoid insurance denial or the need for PA. This means, in practical terms, that a patient with Bipolar Disorder may be diagnosed with "Major Depressive Disorder" in order to get effective medication authorized if insurance only authorizes the medication for treatment of unipolar depression. The downstream implications of this can be quite pronounced, affecting public health measures that rely on analysis of this clinical data. For instance, public health officials might use the clinical data to promote health policy to address medical conditions that are not as prevalent as the records may show. Conversely this could take important resources away from conditions that are under-reported by healthcare providers.

Acknowledgements

Author Contributions: Dr. Salzbrenner and Dr. Scheier contributed equally to the conceptualization of the survey and its contents. Dr. Qiu engaged data management and conducted the statistical analysis. Dr. Salzbrenner and Dr. Scheier contributed equally to the construction of the manuscript including editing the final draft. Dr. Scheier and Dr. Qiu jointly conducted the mixture modeling and interpreted the model findings. Dr. Scheier provided supervision for the statistical analyses and

writing up the results, creation of tables and figures.

Ethical approval: All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

Informed consent: Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study. The study received IRB approval from the University of Nebraska Medical Center (IRB # 00000672 Protocol # 423-19-EP).

Conflicts of Interest: Dr Salzbrenner is founder and CEO of Breezmed LLC which is building a software-as-a-solution prototype for prior authorization. He holds multiple patents for a method of optimizing medication selection and prior authorization.

Funding/Support: This study was supported by funding from the National Institute of Mental Health, National Institutes of Health as part of a Small Business Technology Transfer Grant (1R41MH124600-01). The grant supported development of a prototype software as a solution platform to expedite PA from the point-of-care.

Role of the Funder/Sponsor: The National Institute of Mental Health had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data, preparation, review or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Abbreviations

BCH: Bolck, Croon, and Hagenaars

IRB: Institutional review board

IRP: Item response probabilities

LCA: Latent class analysis

NP: Nurse practitioner

OR: Odds ratio

PA: Prior authorization

R3STEP: 3-step procedure

References

1. Academy of Managed Care Pharmacy Professional Practice Committee. Prior Authorization and Utilization Management Concepts in Managed Care Pharmacy. *J Manag Care Spec Pharm*. 2019; 25(6):641-644. [doi:10.18553/jmcp.2019.1906](https://doi.org/10.18553/jmcp.2019.1906)
2. AMA. 2023 AMA Prior Authorization Physician Survey. 2024 [cited 2024 November 22]; Available from: <https://www.ama-assn.org/system/files/prior-authorization-survey.pdf>.
3. CoverMyMeds. 2019 ePA National Adoption Scorecard. 2019 [cited 2024 November 22]; Available from: <https://marketingbuilder.covermymeds.com/insights/scorecard>.
4. Bhattacharjee S., Murcko AC, Fair MK, et al. Medication prior authorization from the providers perspective: A prospective observational study. *Res Social Adm Pharm*. 2019;15(9):1138-1144. [doi:10.1016/j.sapharm.2018.09.019](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sapharm.2018.09.019)

5. Jones LK, Laddl IG, Gregor C, et al. Understanding the medication prior-authorization process: A case study of patients and clinical staff from a large rural integrated health delivery system. *Am J Health Syst Pharm*. 2019;76(7):453-459. doi:10.1093/ajhp/zxy083
6. *Consensus Statement on Improving the Prior Authorization Process*. 2018 [cited 2014 November 22]; Available from: <https://www.ama-assn.org/>.
7. Association, AM. *2 big insurers take small steps to ease prior authorization burden*. 2023 [cited 2024 November 22]; Available from: <https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/prior-authorization/2-big-insurers-take-small-steps-ease-prior-authorization>.
8. Group, A.E.P.A.W. Proceedings of the AMCP partnership forum: NCPDP electronic prior authorization standards-building a managed care implementation plan. *J Manag Care Spec Pharm*. 2015;21(7):545-50. doi:10.18553/jmcp.2015.21.7.545
9. Hoffman S. *Step Therapy: Legal and Ethical Implications of a Cost-Cutting Measure*. 2018; Case Western Reserve University School of Law.
10. Miller AP, Shor R, Waites T, et al. Prior authorization reform for better patient care. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2018;71(17):1937-1939. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2018.03.465
11. Nayak RK, Pearson SD. The ethics of 'fail first': guidelines and practical scenarios for step therapy coverage policies. *Health Aff*. 2014;33(10):1779-85. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2014.0516
12. Barnett BS, Bodkin JA. A survey of American psychiatrists concerning medication prior authorization requirements. *J Nerv Ment Dis*. 2020;208(7):566-573. doi:10.1097/NMD.0000000000001171
13. Salzbrenner SG, Lydiatt M, Holding B, et al. Influence of prior authorization requirements on provider clinical decision-making. *Am J Manag Care*. 2023;29(7):331-337. doi:10.37765/ajmc.2023.89394
14. McCutcheon A. *Latent Class Analysis*. Sage Publications; 1987.
15. Collins LM, Lanza S.T. *Latent Class and Latent Transition Analysis: With Applications in the Social, Behavioral, and Health Sciences*. John Wiley & Sons; 2010.
16. Salzbrenner SG, McAdam-Marx C, Lydiatt M, et al. Perceptions of prior authorization by use of electronic prior authorization software: A survey of providers in the United States. *J Manag Care Spec Pharm*. 2022;28(10):1121-1128. doi:10.18553/jmcp.2022.28.10.1121
17. Cohen J. The costs of dichotomization. *Appl Psych. Meas*. 1983;7(3):249-253. doi:10.1177/01466216830070
18. MacCallum RC, Zhang S, Preacher KJ, et al. On the practice of dichotomization of quantitative variables. *Psychological Methods*. 2002;7:19-40. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.7.1.19
19. Muthén LK, Muthén BO. *Mplus User's Guide. Eighth Edition*. Muthén & Muthén; 2017.
20. White IR, Royston P, Wood AM. Multiple imputation using chained equations: Issues and guidance for practice. *Stat. Med*. 2011;30(4):377-399. doi:10.1002/sim.4067
21. van Buuren S, Groothuis-Oudshoorn C. MICE: Multivariate imputation by chained equations. *Stat. Soft*. 2011;45:1-67. doi:10.18637/jss.v045.i03
22. van Buuren S, Brand JPL, Groothuis-Oudshoorn CGM, et al. Fully conditional specification in multivariate imputation. *J. Stat. Comp. Sim*. 2006;76:1049-1064. doi:10.1080/10629360600810434
23. Graham JW, Olchowski AE, Gilreath TD. How many imputations are really needed? Some practical clarifications of multiple imputation theory. *Prevention Science*. 2007;8:206-213. doi:10.1007/s11121-007-0070-9
24. Akaike H. Likelihood of a model and information criteria. *J Econ*. 1981;16(1):3-14. Doi:10.1016/0304-4076(81)90071-3
25. Schwarz G. Estimating the dimension of a model. *Ann Stat*. 1978;6:461-464. doi:10.1214/aos/1176344136_
26. Celeux G, Soromenho G. An entropy criterion for assessing the number of clusters in a mixture model. *J Class*. 1996;13:195-212. Doi:10.1007/BF01246098

27. Nylund KL, Asparouhov T, Muthén BO. Deciding on the number of classes in latent class analysis and growth mixture modeling: A Monte Carlo simulation study. *Structural Equation Modeling*. 2007;14(4):535-569. [doi:10.1080/10705510701575396](https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510701575396)
28. Garrett ES, Zeger SL. Latent class model diagnosis. *Biometrics*. 2000;56:1055-1067. doi.org/10.1111/j.0006-341X.2000.01055.x
29. Asparouhov T, Muthén BO. Auxiliary variables in mixture modeling: Three-step approaches using Mplus. *Structural Equation Modeling*. 2014a ; 21(3):329-341. [doi:10.1080/10705511.2014.915181](https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2014.915181)
30. Lanza ST, Tan X, Bray BC. Latent class analysis with distal outcomes: A flexible model-based approach. *Structural Equation Modeling*. 2013;20(1):1-26. doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2013.742377
31. Muthén LK, Muthén BO. How to use a Monte Carlo study to decide on sample size and determine power. *Structural Equation Modeling*. 2002;9(4):599-620. [doi:10.1207/S15328007SEM0904_8](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0904_8)

Supplementary Files

Untitled.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/b0ddec0ff4ee98485dffe8a0e7e8d9e3.docx>

Untitled.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/1a1ff06d5d4dc0abd87cd482e5c469a1.docx>

Untitled.

URL: <http://asset.jmir.pub/assets/a4f04a5b2c71bf9dbfc14d28d9c9617d.docx>

Figures

4 Class LCA Model.

