The Impact of Unexpected Billing in Spine Surgery and How the Price Calculator Can Improve Patient Care

Tyler Radack, Matthew Meade¹, Tariq Z Issa, Yunsoo Lee², Mark Lambrechts, Jose Antonio Canseco³, Colleen Wixted, Alexander Vaccaro, Christopher Kepler, Gregory Douglas Schroeder

¹Orthopedic Surgery, Jefferson Health - New Jersey, ²Rothman Orthopaedic Institute, ³Rothman Orthopaedic Institute/Thomas Jefferson Uni

INTRODUCTION: The average household faces difficulty paying unexpected medical bills. Although legislative efforts have targeted price transparency and rising costs, elective surgical costs continue to rise. The purpose of this study is to determine the impact of unexpected in-network billing following spinal surgery.

METHODS: Identified patients were administered a postoperative survey to address questions about patients' billing details, whether an unexpected bill was received, knowledge of the billing process, ways to improve their experience, effect of bills on financial standing, and overall satisfaction. Our institution does not contract out services to third party out-of-network providers, so no patients received an out-of-network bill.

For patients who received an unexpected bill, questions regarding the number and amount, whether they were paid, and whether they were sent to collections were asked. Subjective questions were scored via a 5-point Likert rating scale. Lastly, patients were asked questions about a price estimator offered on our institution's public website including knowledge of the tool, ease of use, and accuracy.

Patients were divided for primary analysis based on whether they received an unexpected bill. Continuous variables were assessed using either an independent t-test or Mann Whitney U-test, for parametric and non-parametric data, respectively. All categorical variables were compared using a Pearson chi-square analysis or Fisher's Exact test in the case of small cell counts. P-values less than 0.05 were deemed significant. RESULTS:

One-hundred-eighty-three (22.4%) patients received an unexpected bill. These patients were younger, and more likely to undergo a lumbar decompression or microdiscectomy.

Patients who received an unexpected bill were less likely to feel completely/mostly informed about the billing process. Patients who did not receive an unexpected bill were more likely to report that billing had no impact on their surgical satisfaction (Table 1).

Half of patients who received unexpected bills only received one bill, while 7.8% received 5 or more. A total of 131 (73.2%) patients reported that billing affected their financial status, with 17 (19.5%) reporting "extremely affected" and 35 (20.0%) reporting "severely affected." Most patients directed blame to the medical practice (N=99, 54.1%) or hospital (N=81, 44.3%), while 62 (33.9%) blamed their surgeon (Table 2).

Thirty-five patients (4.3%) knew of the price estimator's existence, but only 33 of these 35 patients (94.3%) used it. Those patients were younger and in higher income brackets, although the latter did not reach statistical significance. Patients who did not utilize the calculator were significantly more likely to report not being informed about the billing process. However, price estimator use was not associated with increased surgical satisfaction (Table 3). Additionally, the majority of patients reported that price calculator was very accurate (N=6, 35.3%) or somewhat accurate (N=8, 47.1%) in predicting total costs (Table 4).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION: A significant portion of patients undergoing elective spine surgery received unexpected bills leading to financial distress and affecting surgical experience. Although most patients were unaware of the price estimator, those who used it found it easy to use and accurate in cost prediction. Patients may benefit from targeted education including information on the price estimator to alleviate unexpected financial burden.

| Table 2. Summary of Parkents' Experiences with Unexpected Hilling | |
|---|-------------|
| N=245 Have many surprise bills did you reache? | |
| Have many surprise bills did you receive? | 122/51.54 |
| 2 | 51/71 #52 |
| 1 | 27 (11.2%) |
| | 17 (7 1%) |
| | 21(88%) |
| What was the total amount of money ton were charged from these | |
| sarmine bills (Please estimate)? | |
| | |
| | |
| 100,1000 | 36/11/202 |
| | 86-05.9% |
| >1000 | 11 (21.7%) |
| Did you pay these bills? | |
| Maine | |
| No | 124 (31.5%) |
| Ym | 117 (48.4%) |
| Were you and to collections over these surprise bill? | |
| No | 100/74459 |
| Yes | 62 (25.8%) |
| What was the total amount of money non paid from these surprise bills | |
| (Piezes ortimate)? | |
| Less than 100 | |
| 103-500 | 40-(34,9%) |
| 500-1000 | |
| 1006-5000 | 40-04,8% |
| 1006-5000 | 917,8% |
| How much did paying this bill affect your financial situation? | |
| Not at all | 68 (25.9%) |
| Mildly affortad | 49 (23.5%) |
| Medennidy afforced | 52 (21.8%) |
| Extremely affected | 26-(10.9%) |
| Severally affected | 44 (18.4%) |
| How Can the Billing Process Be Improved | |
| Pre-Operative Consult with Hilling Department | 95 (51.9%) |
| Pre-Operative Consult with Insurance | 70(38,2%) |
| Itemined Pre-Surgical Invoice | 12 (59,3%) |
| Better Explanation of Bill Received | 64 (33.8%) |
| Video Tutotial of Medical Billing | 10(0.5%) |
| Better Understanding of Doductible | 51 (27.9%) |
| The Billing Process Could Not Be Improved | 8 (4.4%) |
| Who do you blame for the bill you received? | |
| Sutgron Previder | 62 (33.9%) |
| Medical Practice | 99(54.2%) |
| Gevenment agencies | 9 (4.9%) |
| Private Insurance | 41 (77 4%) |
| Hospital | 81 (44,2%) |
| Yound | 12.06.6%) |

| | N-799 | N-33 | P Yah |
|--|-------------|-------------|--------|
| Age at Precedure | 62.3 (12.2) | 54.6 (13.6) | 0.800 |
| Sesi | | | 0.555 |
| Female | 299148.4% | 18 (54.2%) | |
| Male | 299 (58.6%) | 15 (45.5%) | |
| Barr | | | |
| White | 645 (35.9%) | 27 (84.4%) | |
| Hack | 43 (5.9%) | 4 (12.5%) | |
| Other | 38 (5.2%) | 10.2% | |
| What is your second household income? | | | 0.655 |
| <21 | 51(7.4%) | 216.7%) | |
| 25-49 | 75 (33,956) | 215,750 | |
| 41.41 | 232(10.016) | 1111050 | |
| 86-350 | 224 (32.5%) | 14 (46.7%) | |
| >190 | 132(15.8%) | 9 (38.0%) | |
| Insurance Type | | | 0.105 |
| Private Inventor | 604(77.7%) | 25 (50.8%) | |
| Medium | 92 (11.8%) | 0.02.8753 | |
| Medicaid | 63 (8.1%) | 215,2%) | |
| Wodur's Compensation | 18 (2.2%) | 10.250 | |
| How well informed were you about the billing process? | | | 0.828* |
| Not Informed | 211 (21.0%) | 246,7761 | |
| Mildy informed | 121 (15.2%) | 3 (9.4%) | |
| Medenady informed | 97 (12,4%) | 7 (21,5%) | |
| Meets Informed | 177 (20 15) | 9 (78 1%) | |
| Completely Informed | 195 (21.1%) | 11/04/810 | |
| How much did the billing process impact your satisfaction with | | | |
| sarpay? | | | 0.953 |
| Not at all | 574 (73.1%) | 23 (71.9%) | |
| Mildy | 89 (11.3%) | 4 (12.5%) | |
| Medensidy | 58-(7,4%) | 3 (9.4%) | |
| Serveraly | 24 (8.1%) | 1 (3.2%) | |
| Datanely | 40(5.1%) | 1.0.2% | |
| Overall, what was your satisfaction with your surgery? | | | 0.458 |
| Vey desata fied | 27 (9.8%) | 4 (12.1%) | |
| Somewhat datasticled | 33 (4.9%) | 0 (0.010) | |
| Nounal | 34 (4.4%) | 1 (3.8%) | |
| Somewhat satisfied | 135(14.9%) | 2 (6.276) | |
| Vex Salafiel | 535156.2%2 | 25 (78.8%) | |
| Wore you satisfied with your surgery? | | | 1,000 |
| No | 112(14.4%) | 4 (12,1%) | |
| Yes | 667 (85.6%) | 28 (87.8%) | |

| In | | Table 6. Price Estimator Evaluation | N-92 |
|-------------|---------|---|-----------|
| N-33 | P Value | Here easy was the provided billing plan to understand? | |
| 54.6 (13.6) | 0.801* | | |
| | 0.555 | Very Easy | 6 (20%) |
| 18 (54.5%) | | Tary | 9 (42%) |
| 15 (45.5%) | | Medanta | 4(20%) |
| 27 (84.4%) | | Hard | 1.(2%) |
| 4 (12.5%) | | Vary Hard | 0.0%) |
| 1.0.2% | | How accurate was the price estimator tool at predicting your total costs? | |
| 216750 | 0.655 | Very Inscente | 2(11,9%) |
| 2 (6.7%) | | Somewhat insecurate | 1 (5.9%) |
| 1111050 | | Somewhat accurate | 1(47.1%) |
| 14(46.7%) | | Very Accepte | 6(35,2%) |
| 9 (38.0%) | | | |
| | 0.105 | Did ywa pay more than the calculator estimated? | |
| 25 (50.8%) | | No | 15-053350 |
| 0 (0.8%) | | Ye | 3(36.7%) |
| 2 (0.7%) | | | |

| Table 4. Price Estimator Evaluation | |
|---|-----------|
| Lable & Price Laborator Evaluation | No.07 |
| Here each was the provided billing plan to understand? | N=32 |
| | |
| Voy Eary | 6 (20%) |
| lary | 9 (42%) |
| dedama | 4(20%) |
| and . | 1(25) |
| Ann Repl | 9 (05) |
| | 4000 |
| accurate was the price estimator tool at predicting your total costs? | |
| y Inaccurate | 2 (11.9%) |
| newhat insecurate | 1 (5.9%) |
| nowhat accurate | \$147,150 |
| N Accurate | 6(25,2%) |
| Access | 400.5% |
| av more than the calculator estimated? | |
| | 15 05 250 |
| | |
| | 3 (16.7%) |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |