



Kent Academic Repository

da Cunha Saddi, Fabiana, Forbes, Lindsay J.L. and Peckham, Stephen (2021)
Guest Editorial: Policy challenges and innovative analyses of payment for performance in health care. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, 35 (3). pp. 245-248. ISSN 1477-7266.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/87177/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

<https://doi.org/10.1108/JHOM-05-2021-476>

This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives)

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in **Title of Journal**, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).



**Guest Editorial - Policy challenges and innovative analyses
of payment for performance in health care**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Health Organization and Management</i>
Manuscript ID	JHOM-03-2021-0091
Manuscript Type:	Editorial

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1 2 3 **Guest Editorial - Policy challenges and innovative analyses of payment for performance** 4 **in health care** 5 6 7 8 9

10 There has been significant interest in the use of payment for performance in health care
11 worldwide – both by policy makers and by academics. There many evaluations of schemes but
12 the majority of them have focused on a specific country or on countries from the same region
13 or level of income (Saddi *et al.*, 2018; Anselmi *et al.*, 2020). In high income countries (HIC)
14 we have seen a long period of valorisation of the effect of outcomes; with only a few studies
15 recently looking at the policy process and more comprehensive evidence (Forbes *et al.*, 2017;
16 Roland and Guthrie, 2016; Smith and Cumming, 2017). Those studies have brought new
17 knowledge with respect to the role played by policy entrepreneurs (Smith and Cumming, 2017),
18 to challenges faced at the front line by general practitioners and administrative staff (Roland and
19 Guthrie, 2016), and to lack of evidence of effect on the health of the population (Forbes *et al.*,
20 2017). In High income countries, comparative analysis between countries with same level of
21 income is rare. consists of a relevant gap as well. It might seem contradictory, but,
22 comparatively, more studies examining a wider range of issues and employing more complex
23 reviews (Lee *et al.*, 2012; Eijkenaar *et al.*, 2013; Singh *et al.*, 2020), qualitative and policy
24 analysis approaches (Ssengooba *et al.*, 2012; Bhatnagar and George, 2016, Bertone *et al.*, 2018)
25 have been carried out in LMICs', especially in African countries. However, they are usually
26 based on a single country or group of countries from Africa, sometimes including Asian
27 countries under a Performance-based Financing (PBF) scheme, and a few recently taking into
28 account European LMICs (Singh *et al.*, 2020). There have been very few case studies and
29 qualitative analyses related to P4P based in Latin America, and particularly in Brazil (Saddi
30 and Peckham, 2018). In LMICs, there is still the need to develop comparative analysis between
31 countries from different regions. Moreover, the findings of research projects and in-depth
32 evaluations considering both HIC and LMICs constitutes a significant gap in our knowledge.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Moreover, international comparative analysis often focuses on organisation and payment
51 systems, which is useful and worthy but does not address context, does not explain, does not
52 draw learning) and not on the contextual/sociological elements that influence policy, such as
53 power relations, political influences, role of the professions. The main policy challenges related
54 to the implementation, design or evaluation of payment for performance have not been
55 analysed from an international viewpoint.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In a complementary way, new analytical approaches and perspectives may be needed to
4 address the policy challenges in relation to P4P/PBF. Therefore, we do not know yet how policy
5 challenges related to payment for performance vary in different contexts in the world, and from
6 the perspective of comparative and cross-country learning, and more in-depth policy or
7 qualitative country analyses in most countries.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 **The aim of this issue**

17
18

19 This special issue aims to advance our knowledge with respect to policy challenges and
20 methods for analysing payment for performance programmes (P4P) or performance-based
21 financing (PBF) programmes in health care, in diverse health systems around the world.
22
23
24

25 The seven papers included in this issue provide examples of varied types of policy
26 challenges taking place in P4P internationally, such as: practitioners' engagement in policy
27 design, government systems/power relations and selection of instruments, policymaking
28 adaptations in a low-income context and impact on health care utilisation.
29
30
31
32

33 This issue also provides examples of alternative methods and frameworks to better
34 understand the contexts and challenges related to P4P internationally: policy, document,
35 qualitative theme and framework analyses, applying interviews and literature review, and
36 diverse concepts from management, public Policy and Health Policy/Care.
37
38
39
40

41 Analyses are developed for a variety of high-income countries (New Zealand &
42 England, France & Germany, European countries), as well as low- and middle-income
43 countries (Zimbabwe, Burkina Faso, Brazil, LMICs/review) from distinct parts of the globe.
44
45
46
47

48 Therefore, this collection highlights some of the frameworks that we can use to compare
49 and contrast how the historical, political, social and cultural contexts influence policymaking
50 and implementation. The comparative lens provides the ability to think more objectively about
51 making and implementing policy in different settings; challenging the view that this is the 'way
52 we have always done it' as being not the only way. Comparison of the contexts within which
53 health systems operate, within both LMICs or HICs, is challenging – as evidenced by the
54 studies included in this edition of the journal. However, they also suggest that by using such
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 analytical frameworks we can throw light on what might work in different contexts (Okma and
4 Marmor, 2013; *GBD 2016 Healthcare Access and Quality Collaborators, 2018*).

5
6
7 The first paper by Verna Smith is a policy analysis comparing development of the
8 English and New Zealand P4P programmes. It identifies a key difference between the
9 approaches to general practitioners' engagement between the two countries, which may explain
10 the differences in their achievements and longevity. In the UK, where P4P had much better
11 buy-in from general practitioners, the policy approach was to align scheme design with the
12 profession's values. Particular features of the approach in the UK were highly skilled
13 negotiators, principle-based negotiations and involvement of academics in selecting indicators.
14
15

16
17
18 Mathias Brunn brings the complexity of power relations to the analysis of P4P as a
19 policy instrument. He employs the theoretical frameworks of public policy instruments and
20 performance of actors to explore differences in P4P in ambulatory care between France and
21 Germany. His comparative analysis is supported by findings from a literature review and
22 interviews with stakeholders. The analysis demonstrates the way key system characteristics
23 and actors shape the development and implementation of P4P policy instruments. In France,
24 the centralised institutional architecture, together with statutory health insurance director
25 personal characteristics and the policy implementation capacity of Social Health Insurers
26 (SHI), shaped the selection of P4P instruments. In Germany, on the other hand, the federal
27 system did not enable the formation of a coalition in favour of P4P, given the veto players in
28 the federalism and conflicting roles regarding data generation and transmission.
29
30
31

32
33
34 The paper by Kadungure *et al.* explores contextual factors explaining adaptations that
35 occurred in PBF in Zimbabwe between 2010 and 2017. Based on policy documents and
36 interviews, the paper stresses that the PBF went through key adaptations during this period,
37 mainly due to its phased design, in which the scale-up planned implementation permitted
38 revisions and extraction of lessons to other LMICs. It also points out that exogenous factors
39 had been underestimated in the process and they could have been used to anticipate problems
40 and improve effectiveness. The study provides essential lessons to researchers and
41 policymakers and managers of PBF/P4P: the importance of considering both endogenous and
42 exogenous factors in the policy process.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57
58
59
60
Seppely *et al.* employs a sustainability framework to analyse PBF in Burkina Faso. The
framework is formed by five components: organizational memory, codes and values, rules and
procedure, adaptation and stakeholders' relationships. Both deductive and inductive thematic

1
2
3 analyses are developed from interviews and observations data. Their analysis shows that there
4 is a need to know more about what/how contextual issues can either enable or hinder
5 sustainability in PBF. The authors call attention to the relations that exist between
6 implementation issues and sustainability, something which is rarely studied. They also analyse
7 “global issues” that can threaten sustainability, such as the effect of power imbalances on
8 ownership. In sum, the authors use the Burkina Faso case to highlight the factors that can hinder
9 sustainability and which should be taken into account in the study of PBF in LMIC.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16 Saddy *et al.* develop a policy analysis of a P4P programme in primary care in the city of
17 Goiania, Brazil, employing a qualitative approach. Interviews are thematically and
18 hierarchically analysed according to themes coming from both implementation theory and
19 political studies on performance, such as; policy knowledge, policy adherence, forms of
20 accountability, alternative logics, organizational capacity and policy feedback. Their analysis
21 shows that successful implementation requires adaptations and increases in organizational
22 capacity, knowledge, participation and policy feedback at the frontline.

23
24
25
26
27
28 Paul *et al.* reports the findings of a scoping review to locate theories used to justify the
29 adoption of PBF the health sector in LMICs. The authors selected sixty-four studies that had
30 cited a programme theory underpinning PBF in LMICS. They found that economic theoretical
31 bases were predominant with two thirds of studies citing economic principal-agent theory.
32 However, few studies explained how theory could justify PBF and few alluded to more than
33 one theoretical basis.

34
35
36
37
38
39 The final paper by Hayes *et al.* examines if payment methods – including payment for
40 performance - for integrated care adopted by European countries have affected health and
41 primary care use by people with multimorbidity. The authors use survey data from twenty
42 European countries from 2011-2015 to analyse the associations between types of P4P and
43 outcomes. Findings reveal that payment methods exert little effect on reported health and
44 number of medical visits, suggesting that current P4P policies may not effectively incentivise
45 care for people with multimorbidity.

54 **Future Challenges**

55
56
57
58
59
60 There is a need to advance comparisons in the health sector between HICs and LMICs
in a more systematised way, as well as to start developing cross-sector comparisons. Moreover,
given the Covid-19 crisis around the Globe, researchers and policymakers need to better

1
2
3 understand challenges faced by P4P/PBF schemes during the pandemic in diverse countries of
4 the globe, and if and how P4P/PBF will continue to play a role in funding health systems after
5 the pandemic. To what extent could payment for performance schemes be considered an
6 essential tool to reconstruct or re-initiate health programmes and types of health care in diverse
7 health systems around the world? If they are, policy challenges and innovative analyses
8 presented in this issue offer lessons on both policy development and programme evaluation. It
9 is clear that more attention should be paid to policy design, considering power relations in
10 distinct government structures, adaptations in policymaking, prioritizing sustainability issues
11 and frontline staff perspectives during the design and implementation processes and that
12 analysts should draw more on social (action-based) theories.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 References

- 24 Anselmi, L., Borghi, J., Brown, G., Fichera, E., Hanson, K., Kadungure, A., Kovacs, R.,
25 Kristensen, S. R., Singh, N. S. and Sutton, M. (2020), “Pay for Performance: A
26 Reflection on How a Global Perspective Could Enhance Policy and Research”,
27 *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*. Vol 9, Issue 9, Pages 365-369,
28 Available at: [10.34172/IJHPM.2020.23](https://doi.org/10.34172/IJHPM.2020.23)
29
30 Bertone, M.P., Jacobs, E., Toonen, J., Akwataghibe, N. and Witter, S. (2018) “Performance-
31 based financing in three humanitarian settings: principles and pragmatism”, *Conflict*
32 *and Health*, 12, 28 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13031-018-0166-9>
33
34 Bhatnagar, A. and George, A. (2016), “Motivating health workers up to a limit: partial effects
35 of performance-based financing on working environments in Nigeria”. *Health Policy*
36 *and Planning*, Vol. 31, Issue, pp. 868–877.
37
38 Eijkenaar, F., Emmert, M., Scheppach, M. and Schöffski, O. (2013), “Effects of pay-for-
39 performance in health care: a systematic review of systematic reviews”, *Health Policy*,
40 Vol. 110, Issue 2-3, pp. 115-130, available at:
41 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2013.01.008>
42
43 Forbes, L.J., Marchand, C., Doran, T. and Peckham, S. (2017), “The role of the Quality and
44 Outcomes Framework in the care of long-term conditions: a systematic review”, *The*
45 *British Journal of General Practice*, Vol. 67, No. 664, pp. e775–e784, available at:
46 <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp17X693077>
47
48 GBD 2016 Healthcare Access and Quality Collaborators (2018), “Measuring performance on
49 the Healthcare Access and Quality Index for 195 countries and territories and selected
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 subnational locations: a systematic analysis from the Global Burden of Disease Study”,
4 *The Lancet*, Vol 391 June 2, 2018, available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140->
5 [6736\(18\)30994-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30994-2)
6
7
8
9 Lee, J.Y., Lee, S., Jo, M. (2012), “Lessons From Healthcare Providers' Attitudes Toward Pay-
10 for-performance: What Should Purchasers Consider in Designing and Implementing a
11 Successful Program?”, *Journal of Preventive Medicine and Public Health*, Vol. 45, No.
12 3, pp. 137-147.
13
14
15 Okma, K G and Marmor, T. R. (2013), “Comparative studies and healthcare policy: learning
16 and mislearning across borders”, *Clinical Medicine* 2013, Vol 13, No 5: 487–91.
17
18
19 Roland, M. and Guthrie, B. (2016), “Quality and Outcomes Framework: what have we
20 learnt?”, *BMJ*, 354, pp. 1-4, available at: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.i4060>
21
22
23 Saddi, F.C. and Peckham, S. (2018), “PMAQ seen from a global health and public policy
24 perspective - What does it mean for research and policy?”, *Journal of Ambulatory*
25 *Care Management*, Vol. 41, Issue 1, pp. 25-33, available at: doi:
26 [10.1097/JAC.0000000000000220](https://doi.org/10.1097/JAC.0000000000000220)
27
28
29 Saddi, F C; Peckham, S, Mundim, P. (2018), “Presentation: Pay for Performance,
30 Formulation, Implementation and Policy Success”. *Sociedade e Cultura*, v. 21, p. 4a-
31 11, available at: <https://doi.org/10.5216/sec.v21i2.56304>
32
33
34 Singh, N.S., Kovacs, R.J., Cassidy, R., Kristensen, S.R., Borghi, J., Brown, G.W. (2020), “A
35 realist review to assess for whom, under what conditions and how pay for
36 performance programmes work in low- and middle-income countries”, *Social Science*
37 *& Medicine*, Dec 18; 270:113624, doi: [10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113624](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113624)
38
39
40
41 Ssengooba, F., Mcpake, B. and Palmer, N. (2012), “Why performance-based contracting failed
42 in Uganda – An “open-box” evaluation of a complex health system intervention”,
43 *Social Science & Medicine*, Vol. 75, Issue 2, pp. 377-383.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60