REFORMING COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE IN MARKET CONDITIONS

Kasimova D.A
Almardanov Sh.Q
Bozorov Z.K.
Tashkent State Medical University

Abstract: The reform of compulsory health insurance systems within market-based frameworks represents one of the most significant challenges facing healthcare policy makers globally. This article examines the theoretical foundations, empirical evidence, and practical implementation strategies for reforming mandatory health insurance schemes while maintaining market efficiency, equity, and sustainability. Drawing upon extensive literature from health economics and policy research, we analyze the tensions between universal coverage mandates and market competition, explore various reform models from international experience, and identify key factors that determine reform success. The evidence suggests that effective reform requires careful balance between regulatory oversight and market mechanisms, with particular attention to risk selection, cost containment, and equitable access. We conclude with recommendations for policy makers seeking to navigate the complex terrain of health insurance reform in increasingly market-oriented healthcare systems.

Keywords: health insurance reform, market mechanisms, universal coverage, competition policy, selection problems, risk pooling, healthcare markets, , quality of care, healthcare equity.

Health insurance systems worldwide face mounting pressures from rising costs, aging populations, and increasing demands for access to advanced medical technologies. In response, many countries have pursued reforms aimed at introducing or expanding market mechanisms within compulsory health insurance frameworks (1). These reform efforts reflect a fundamental tension in health policy: how to achieve universal coverage and equity objectives while harnessing competitive market forces to improve efficiency and innovation (3). The evolution of health insurance reform strategies has moved through distinct phases. Early twentieth-century efforts focused primarily on establishing basic coverage for workers and vulnerable populations (5). The late twentieth century witnessed increasing attention to cost containment and efficiency, leading to experiments with managed competition and market-based reforms (7). Contemporary reform debates center on achieving universal health coverage while maintaining financial sustainability and quality of care (9).

This article synthesizes evidence on compulsory health insurance reform in market conditions, examining both theoretical frameworks and empirical outcomes from diverse national experiences. We analyze the key design elements that influence reform success, including financing mechanisms, regulatory structures, benefit package design, and strategies for managing competition and adverse selection. Market-oriented health insurance reforms aim to enhance resource allocation efficiency, foster innovation, and improve responsiveness to consumer preferences while maintaining equity principles (3). The theoretical foundation rests on the premise that properly designed competition can incentivize insurers and providers to deliver higher quality care at lower costs. However, achieving these objectives requires addressing fundamental market failures inherent in healthcare, including information asymmetries, adverse selection, and externalities (10).

Managed competition represents a prominent framework for integrating market mechanisms within regulated health insurance systems. This approach, extensively analyzed in the 1990s reform debates, involves creating sponsor organizations that act as collective purchasing agents for large groups of individuals, thereby leveraging economies of scale while preserving consumer choice (12). The basic elements include standardized benefit packages, risk-adjusted premiums, and regulated competition among health plans based on price and quality rather than risk selection (6).

However, implementation of managed competition faces significant challenges. Geographic market concentration limits the feasibility of robust competition in many areas. Research indicates that populations of at least 360,000 are necessary to support three competing health plans offering comprehensive services, suggesting that managed competition may be viable for only 63 percent of the US population in medium and large metropolitan areas (12). Rural and smaller metropolitan areas require alternative regulatory approaches.

Evidence from consumer behavior studies demonstrates that health plan choices are indeed sensitive to premium differences, with elasticity varying by health risk status—younger, healthier individuals show greater price sensitivity .This heterogeneity creates incentives for risk selection, undermining the theoretical benefits of competition. Successful managed competition therefore requires sophisticated risk adjustment mechanisms and careful monitoring of quality measures to prevent plans from competing primarily on favorable risk selection (17).

International trends reveal movement toward universal mandatory health insurance as a foundation for healthcare systems (3). The rationale for compulsory coverage extends beyond traditional market failure arguments to encompass equity considerations and the collective financing benefits of broad risk pools. Mandatory insurance addresses adverse selection by ensuring that healthy individuals contribute to the risk pool, thereby preventing the insurance market death spiral that can occur

when only high-risk individuals purchase coverage (14). Achieving universal coverage while maintaining market elements requires careful institutional design. Many countries have adopted models combining compulsory basic coverage with opportunities for supplementary private insurance (5). This dual structure can preserve equity in access to essential services while allowing market differentiation for additional services or amenities. However, the interaction between public and private insurance segments requires regulation to prevent adverse selection and maintain the viability of the compulsory scheme (14).

Low and middle-income countries implementing universal health coverage face particular challenges in extending coverage to informal sector workers and vulnerable populations. State budget transfers to health insurance funds have emerged as an important mechanism for subsidizing coverage for those unable to pay contributions.This approach has demonstrated success in European countries, where 13 low and middle-income countries use government transfers to exempt specific population groups from contribution requirements while maintaining integrated insurance pools (22).

Equity represents a central concern in health insurance reform, particularly when introducing market mechanisms. The concept of equity in health insurance encompasses multiple dimensions: horizontal equity (equal treatment for equal need), vertical equity (differential treatment based on ability to pay), and equity in access regardless of health status.Market-based reforms must be designed to maintain or improve equity while pursuing efficiency gains.

Evidence suggests that equity can be maintained in competitive systems if properly defined and operationalized. One framework proposes defining equity as equal access to cost-effective care within reasonable timeframes, with responsibility for determining cost-effectiveness resting with healthcare providers supported by clinical guidelines and financial incentives embedded in contracts (3). This approach shifts focus from equal access to all services toward equal access to services that provide value relative to their costs.

Financing mechanisms significantly influence equity outcomes. Progressive financing through income-based contributions or general taxation can support universal coverage while maintaining vertical equity.Research on equitable financing for universal coverage recommends replacing regressive premium-based financing with progressive income taxation, combined with elimination of cost-sharing for medically necessary services (21). However, political economy considerations often constrain the feasibility of such fundamental financing reforms.

Adverse selection poses one of the most significant challenges to market-based health insurance systems. When insurers cannot perfectly observe individual health risks, high-risk individuals have greater incentive to purchase comprehensive coverage

while low-risk individuals may prefer minimal coverage or forego insurance entirely. This pattern can destabilize insurance markets and undermine universal coverage objectives (15). Regulatory Framework and Competition Policy

The regulatory framework fundamentally shapes how market competition functions within compulsory health insurance systems. Effective regulation must balance competing objectives: fostering competition to drive efficiency and innovation while preventing market failures and protecting consumer interests. This requires ongoing calibration of regulatory intensity based on submarket characteristics and competitive conditions (20).

Competition policy in healthcare requires attention to product definition and market structure. Traditional antitrust enforcement focuses on preventing market consolidation, but may prove insufficient without addressing regulatory distortions in how healthcare products are defined and marketed (19). Competition may fail to reduce costs, increase access, or improve quality when markets trade poorly defined or assembled products. Policy makers should therefore focus on enabling the definition and warranting of healthcare products that consumers can meaningfully evaluate and compare.

State-level experiences provide valuable lessons for regulatory design. Analysis of state health insurance reforms in the 1990s reveals distinct patterns between market-based and state-based policy strategies (6). States with greater institutional capacity and liberal-party legislative presence adopted more state-based policies and fewer market-based reforms. Market-based approaches proved politically more feasible but potentially less effective in reducing uninsurance. These findings suggest that institutional characteristics create important constraints on feasible policy options, with implications for reform success or failure.

Insurance exchange regulation illustrates the complexity of creating well-functioning markets. Exchanges consolidate and regulate individual and small-group insurance markets, aiming to foster choice and competition (15). However, design features including open enrollment, individual choice, and imperfect risk adjustment create adverse selection challenges. Successful exchange operation requires comprehensive regulation of plan offerings, pricing rules, and consumer protections, demonstrating that market-based approaches demand intensive regulatory oversight rather than simple deregulation (18).

International experiences with health insurance reform provide valuable empirical evidence on the outcomes of different reform strategies. European countries have been particularly active in implementing market-oriented reforms within universal coverage frameworks. The Netherlands and Germany, among others, have reformed their insurance systems to introduce regulated competition while maintaining solidarity principles and universal coverage (14).

The Netherlands' reform represents a notable case of managed competition implementation. The system combines universal mandatory insurance with consumer choice among competing private insurers, risk adjustment to prevent selection, and standardized benefit packages. While this model has achieved universal coverage and contains certain cost-control mechanisms, ongoing challenges include managing premium growth and ensuring that competition focuses on quality and efficiency rather than risk selection.

The Thai approach prioritized coverage extension to vulnerable populations, invested in primary care infrastructure, and eventually harmonized fragmented insurance schemes. This experience underscores that successful universal coverage requires sustained investment in delivery system capacity alongside insurance expansion.

Implementing health insurance reforms in market conditions presents numerous practical challenges. Political economy considerations often dominate technical design issues. The history of health reform efforts reveals that grassroots mobilization, stakeholder interests, and broader political dynamics significantly influence reform outcomes (8). Successful reforms typically require coalition-building among diverse constituencies and sustained political commitment through implementation challenges.

Benefit package definition represents a politically difficult but technically critical implementation issue.The minimum benefit package determines societal costs, provider incomes, population health outcomes, and system workability. Standard packages facilitate price competition among insurers and enable consumers to make meaningful comparisons. However, determining appropriate inclusions and exclusions requires balancing medical effectiveness, cost considerations, and societal values—a process fraught with political controversy.

Technical capacity requirements should not be underestimated. Sophisticated risk adjustment, quality measurement, and data infrastructure demand substantial investment and expertise. Many jurisdictions lack the administrative capacity or data systems necessary to implement complex market oversight mechanisms. Building these capabilities requires time and resources, suggesting that reform timelines must account for capacity development alongside policy implementation (11).

Conclusion: Reforming compulsory health insurance in market-based systems requires balancing universal coverage goals with competitive mechanisms. Evidence suggests that markets can enhance efficiency and innovation only within strong regulatory frameworks that address market failures, adverse selection, and equity concerns. Mandatory coverage and effective risk adjustment are essential foundations, while price regulation and competition function as complementary tools rather than substitutes. Cost containment cannot rely solely on market forces and requires integrated regulatory strategies. Equity, administrative capacity, and political

sustainability must be explicitly incorporated into reform design. A gradual, capacity-building approach improves the likelihood of achieving universal, efficient, and high-quality health coverage.

References

1.Nudelman PM, Ganim DJ. A Blueprint for U.S. Health Insurance Reform. Ann Intern Med. 2024;177(6):803-813. PMID: 38739923

2.Himmelstein DU, Woolhandler S. National health insurance or incremental reform: aim high, or at our feet? Am J Public Health. 2003;93(1):102-105. PMID: 12511395

3.Schut FT, Van de Ven WP. Market-oriented health care reforms: trends and future options. Soc Sci Med. 1996;43(5):655-666. PMID: 8870130

4.Gordon C. Foul weather friends: big business and health care reform in the 1990s in historical perspective. J Health Polit Policy Law. 2002;27(4):605-638. PMID: 12374291

5.Blomqvist A, Léger PT. Alternative health insurance schemes: a welfare comparison. J Health Econ. 2002;21(5):811-823. PMID: 12349880

6.Weissert CS, Weissert WG. Notes from the laboratories of democracy: state government enactments of market- and state-based health insurance reforms in the 1990s. J Health Polit Policy Law. 2007;32(4):655-683. PMID: 17639016

7.Fuchs VR, Garber AM, Gabel JR. Health reform: the good, the bad, and the bottom line. Health Aff (Millwood). 1994;13(1):126-134. PMID: 8188131

8.Hoffman B. Health care reform and social movements in the United States. Am J Public Health. 2003;93(1):75-85. PMID: 12511390

9.Ahn S. Understanding American health care reform, 1910-1932: toward an interpretive history of health policy. Uisahak. 2001;10(2):169-188. PMID: 11618952

10.Enthoven AC. Universal health insurance through incentives reform. JAMA. 1991;265(19):2532-2536. PMID: 2020071

11.Meyer JA, Lewin ME. Health care reform: managed competition and beyond. J Health Hum Resour Adm. 1993;16(1):85-119. PMID: 10129612

12.Kronick R, Goodman DC, Wennberg J, Wagner E. The marketplace in health care reform: the demographic limitations of managed competition. N Engl J Med. 1993;328(2):148-152. PMID: 8416437

13.Berenson RA, Upadhyay DK, Delbanco SF, Murray R. How Price Regulation Is Needed To Advance Market Competition. Health Aff (Millwood). 2021;40(12):1867-1875. PMID: 34982623

14.Neudeck W, Podczeck K. Adverse selection and regulation in health insurance markets. J Health Econ. 1996;15(4):387-408. PMID: 10164036

15.Busch SH, Golberstein E, Meara E. Regulating a health insurance exchange: implications for individuals with mental illness. Psychiatr Serv. 2010;61(11):1074-1080. PMID: 21041344

16.Hall MA, Jacobs DB. Making Choice and Competition Work in Individual Insurance in Health Reform Proposals. J Gen Intern Med. 2019;34(1):165-171. PMID: 30698403

17.Marquis MS, Long SH. Consumer-oriented health care reform strategies: a review of the evidence on managed competition and consumer-directed health insurance. Annu Rev Public Health. 2010;31:9-24. PMID: 20021587

18.Hall MA, Ginsburg PB. Implementing insurance market reforms under the federal health reform law. J Health Polit Policy Law. 2010;35(4):465-487. PMID: 20530346

19.Sage WM. Getting the product right: how competition policy can improve health care markets. Health Aff (Millwood). 2014;33(6):981-987. PMID: 24841884

20.Stolk C, Koolman X, Varkevisser M, Johar M, Schut FT, van Vliet RC. Balancing between competition and regulation in healthcare markets. Health Econ Policy Law. 2024;19(1):1-15. PMID: 38124549

21.Rasell E. An equitable way to pay for universal coverage. Int J Health Serv. 1999;29(1):179-188. PMID: 10079403

22.McIntyre D, Thiede M, Birch S. Achieving equity within universal health coverage: a narrative review of progress and resources for measuring success. Int J Equity Health. 2014;13:72. PMID: 25928840