Variation and Standardization in Prior Authorization Requirements
Insights from a Single Framework for Leading US Insurers

Aya Zaari Jabri[1], Jacob Asher[2], Jacqueline Sandling[3], Kevin Schulman[4,5], and David Scheinker[1,4,6]

1. Management Science and Engineering, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA
2. Retired, formerly Chief Medical Officer, Northern California Employee and Individual Business, UnitedHealth Group, San Francisco, CA
3. Georgetown University School of Medicine, Washington, DC
4. Division of Hospital Medicine and Clinical Excellence Research Center, Stanford Medical School, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA
5. Graduate School of Business, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA
6. Division of Pediatric Endocrinology, Stanford Medical School, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA

Correspondence to:
David Scheinker
dscheink@stanford.edu
Management Science and Engineering
Huang Engineering Center,
475 Via Ortega,
Stanford, CA 94305
(650) 498-7351

Word count (Abstract): 317
Word count (Article): 2640
Abbreviations:
Prior Authorization (PA)
Current Procedural Terminology (CPT)
Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System (HCPCS)
National Drug Code (NDC)

Key Points

Question: Do prior authorization rules, purportedly derived from evidence-based coverage policies, differ across large private US insurers?

Finding: Prior authorization rules differed significantly across services and across insurers with contradictions and inconsistencies. The rules were reproduced with a framework of 6 criteria to determine if prior authorization is required and 23 requirements to obtain prior authorization.

Meaning: The methods presented to reproduce the prior authorization rules of four large insurers in a single framework may help inform efforts to standardize the prior authorization process. The present approach may inform broader efforts to reduce administrative costs and waste through contract standardization.

Abstract

Importance: Prior authorization rules are neither regulated nor standardized and contribute to wasted spending, delays in care, and physician burnout.

Objective: To examine and compare the prior authorization rules of large private US insurers.

Design: This study converted prior authorization rules into a single framework; quantified variations, inconsistencies, and contradictions within and across insurers; and developed a single algorithm to reproduce and compare the prior authorization rules of all insurers.

Setting: Prior authorization rules from the providers manuals of Humana, United Healthcare, Anthem California, and Aetna.

Participants: The prior authorization rules for in-network providers and internally managed contracts were included while the rules for out-of-network providers, for determining provider network status, and for services managed by external vendors were excluded.

Results: The provider manuals cover 19,637 services and medications. Of these, Humana requires prior authorization for 3,048, United Healthcare for 2,682, Anthem California for 2,188, and Aetna for 842. To determine if PA is required, Anthem California provides a medical criteria document for each service and medication. The other insurers use six criteria for varying sets and categories of services and medications. There are 18 potential requirements to obtain prior authorization from Anthem California and a total of five across the other insurers. The manuals contain duplicated, ambiguous, and contradictory guidelines.

Conclusions: In an analysis of the provider manuals of four large US insurers, prior authorization rules differed significantly across services within each provider manual and across provider manuals. The rules were reproduced with a simple framework of 6 criteria to determine if prior authorization is required and 23 requirements to obtain prior authorization, providing an

empirical example of a single standardized contract reproducing the rules of several contracts from different large health insurers. The methods presented to standardize and simplify contracts may help inform efforts to rationalize and improve the prior authorization process as well as broader efforts to reduce administrative costs and waste through standardization.

Introduction

The United States health insurance market comprises 317,987 individual plans, approximately one plan for every 1,000 people in the country.[1] The complexity associated with a lack of standardization in these contracts contributes at least $250 billion of the $400 billion in annual billing and administrative waste.[2,3] Simplifying or standardizing this market could eliminate much of this waste, saving time for physicians, nurses, hospitals, and insurers.[1,4] A comparative study of health systems in countries with hybrid public-private payer models suggests that this complexity is neither essential nor inevitable.[5]

Prior authorization (PA), a process requiring physicians to obtain insurer approval for payment before providing care, exemplifies the costs, care delays, and inefficiencies associated with administrative complexity. A care provider may have hundreds of PA requirements differing across hundreds of health plan contracts.[3] Physicians surveyed by the American Medical Association report that PA is associated with delays in patient care, serious adverse events, and burnout.[6] Patients report that PA causes delays in care, increased anxiety, and increased administrative burden.[7] The American Medical Association, American Hospital Association, and America's Health Insurance Plans support PA reform and the transition to electronic PA.[8–10]

While digital methods have been adopted for other financial transactions in healthcare, such as claim submissions and eligibility and benefits verification, prior authorization lags significantly behind. In 2022, 97% and 90% of medical plans reported using fully electronic claims submissions and eligibility and benefits verification, but only 28% reported using fully electronic PA.[11] Adoption of electronic PA has been hindered by poor interoperability between health plans

and providers, and the complexity that arises from the differences in PA requirements across plans.

The opportunity to improve healthcare contracts through standardization has been compared to successful similar efforts in other industries such as mortgages.[12] Before 1971, states, trade associations, and banks had different mortgage laws, forms, and requirements. The complexity increased uncertainty, wait times, and costs for borrowers applying for mortgages. The complexity also hindered lenders seeking to syndicate mortgages on a secondary market.[12,13] Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, large government-sponsored buyers of mortgages, led the efforts to standardize mortgages and develop uniform mortgage instruments that significantly reduced variation, complexity, and costs of home mortgages. Uniform mortgages, processed primarily with algorithms instead of ad-hoc manual review, now account for over 90% of residential loans.[14] Computable contracts, contracts designed for electronic interpretation and administration, may have the potential to provide similar benefits to health plan administration.[15] In this work, we test the hypothesis that the PA rules of four major US insurers may be abstracted into a simple computable framework.

Methods

Context

Provider manuals

Contracts between health plans and providers stipulate the terms and conditions of payment for services. Detailed instructions for specific transactions are typically included in publicly accessible provider manuals, which serve as appendices to health plan contracts. We downloaded the provider manuals for commercial insurance from the four largest US insurers: Humana, Aetna, United Healthcare, and Anthem (Appendix 1). Anthem-Blue Cross, a division of Elevance, has separate provider manuals for each state. We selected the California manual since it is applicable to the largest patient population.

Prior Authorization

Prior authorization (PA) requires physicians to obtain insurer approval for payment before providing care. PA requirements differ across insurers and across plans offered by each insurer. Depending on the structure of their insurance plans, several PA lists or criteria are presented in each provider manual. Each PA list or criteria applies to some plans, locations, categories of services, or combinations thereof. We limited the scope of the work to the rules for in-network providers and internally managed contracts. We excluded rules for out-of-network providers, for determining provider network status, and for PA managed by external vendors.

Coding

Provider manuals identify services and medications with a variety of codes. The Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) is a coding system defined by the American Medical Association to describe medical, surgical, and diagnostic services provided by healthcare professionals. The Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System (HCPCS) is maintained by the Centers for

Medicare and Medicaid Services and presents two levels of codes. The first level is equivalent to the CPT coding standards and the second level identifies services and medications that are not included in the first level. When HCPCS codes are not specific enough to identify an individual drug product in the PA process, the National Drug Code (NDC), a unique 11-digit number used and updated by the Food and Drug Administration, can be used to identify each medication in the US.

Approach

Developing a unified framework

We categorized each service in each provider manual as medical and surgical; medication; behavioral health; or special programs. Aetna's provider manual includes a category called special programs including services for which the prior authorization process is more complex than usual. In the manuals of other insurers, we used this category for services not identified by a HCPCS code and for which the guidelines are not explicit and unambiguous. For each service and each provider manual, we identify the criteria necessary to determine if PA is required (e.g., age); given those criteria (e.g., over 18 years old) whether PA is required; and, when PA is required, any additional requirements that must be satisfied to obtain PA (e.g., step therapy).

Quantifying variation

We quantify similarities and differences in how services are categorized, the criteria to determine if PA is required, and the additional requirements to obtain PA. We identify services and medications that are not explicitly identified by a HCPCS/CPT/NDC code or are not

accompanied by unambiguous guidelines. We identify codes that appear more than once and with contradictory rules.

Algorithm

We developed an algorithm that accepts as an input a service and insurer, prompts the user to input required criteria, returns whether PA is required, and returns the requirements that must be fulfilled to obtain PA.

Results

The provider manuals collectively cover 19,637 services and medications, including 11,163 CPT codes and 8,474 HCPCS level 2 codes. Humana requires prior authorization for 3,048 services and medications, United Healthcare for 2,682; Anthem California for 2,188; and Aetna for 842.

Framework

Each provider manual identifies services and medications with an HCPCS code, except that of United Healthcare, which uses the brand and name of the medication. Provider manuals categorize services and medications, implicitly or explicitly, as: medical and surgical; medications; behavioral health; and special programs. For each code, each insurer provides criteria necessary to determine if PA is required and, for those codes requiring PA, the requirements that must be met to obtain PA (Figure 1). A few select services and medications illustrate how the criteria and additional requirements differ across insurers and across services within each insurer (Table 1).

Criteria to determine if PA is required

Anthem California links each code to a specific medical guideline document. For the other three insurers, the criteria required to determine whether PA is required comprise 6 categories: the state where care will be provided, the age of the patient, the diagnoses, additional services to be provided simultaneously, the site of service, and, for some prosthetics, orthotics, and durable medical equipment, whether the retail purchase or cumulative rental costs exceed a certain threshold (Table 2 & Appendix 2).

Requirements to obtain PA

For the services requiring PA, the requirements that must be fulfilled to obtain PA include: change in the contact numbers to submit the request (this occurs when the approval is managed by a benefit management company or when there is a different process for a service category or provider network), site of service review, plan coverage review, dollar amount verification, and any required medical information (photos, sleep study, X-rays and tracings, letters from mental health providers, visual fields, plastic surgery evaluation, psychiatric evaluation, medical clearance, history, physical and ultrasound evaluation, Haller Index +/- CT report, audiometry interpretation, nutritional consultation, BMI, documentation of participation in a weight management program, prosthetics evaluation, or MD prescription). For medications, these additional requirements can include a step therapy (Table 2 and Appendix 3).

Analysis

Difference in PA requirements within and across providers

The categorization of services and medications, criteria to determine if PA is required, and the additional requirements to obtain PA differ across insurers and for each insurer differ across categories. Aetna categorizes services and medications into medical and surgical; medications; behavioral health; and special programs; Humana does not use special programs category; United Healthcare includes behavioral health services in the medical and surgical category; and Anthem includes medications in the medical and surgical category and does not use special programs as a category. Of the 113 services categorized by Aetna as behavioral, 10 are categorized as medical and surgical by Humana, 49 by United Healthcare, and 73 by Anthem (Supplemental Table 2). Diagnosis is used as a criterion to determine if PA is required for 15 medications by Aetna; for 87 medical and surgical services and 2 medications by Humana; and for 287 medical and surgical services and 9 medications by United Healthcare (Table 2). A site of service review is required to obtain PA for 139 medical and surgical services and 91 medications by Aetna; 11 medical and surgical services by Humana; and 33 medical and surgical services by United Healthcare (Table 2).

Imprecision and contradictions

Some services appear more than once in the same provider's manual, occasionally with different criteria for whether PA is required and different additional requirements to obtain PA. Aetna lists HCPCS code 19318 once as gender affirmation surgery for which PA is required and once as a breast reduction surgery for which PA and a site of service review are required. Humana lists 7 medication codes for which the first occurrence specifies that PA is required and that a national drug code must be submitted and the second occurrence specifies that PA is required, that a national drug code must be submitted, and that step therapy is required to obtain PA (Table 3).

Algorithm

We reproduced PA rules as an algorithm representing the framework described above. The algorithm encodes the logic associated with each HCPCS code, United Healthcare-specific logic to translate drug name and brands to HCPCS codes, criteria to determine if PA is required, and additional requirements to obtain PA. The algorithm allows a user to specify a code and an insurer, prompts for the input of the criteria necessary to determine if PA is required, and returns whether PA is required and, if it is, the additional requirements to obtain PA (Figure 1 and Appendix 4). The algorithm, an online interactive tool, and code are available upon reasonable request.

Discussion

We reproduced the prior authorization (PA) logic of the provider manuals or four major commercial health plans, Humana, Aetna, United Healthcare, and Anthem California in a simple common framework with 4 categories of services, 6 types of criteria to determine if PA is required, and 23 types of requirements to obtain PA. The manuals cover 19,637 services and medications, of which we identify the 5,489 that require prior authorization: 3,048 for Humana, 2,682 for United Healthcare, 2,188 for Anthem, and 842 for Aetna. We quantified considerable variation across plans, identifying opportunities for the standardization and simplification of the PA process.

The complexity of different services requiring different levels of review across commercial plans matches the concerns of physicians about the PA process.[6,7] There is broad consensus on the burdens and costs imposed by the PA process on patients, physicians, and insurers.[8–11,16] There is far less consensus in the medical literature on how to simplify the process without creating unintended consequences such as increasing low value care or reducing insurer autonomy. The complexity of the PA process, and of health insurance contracts, is driven in part by regulatory differences across states highlighting the tension between national standardization and state autonomy. A strength of the present work is that we explicitly capture differences across states, illustrating a method to reduce that source of complexity. The variation and inconsistencies in PA rules identified in this work offer a starting point for simplification and rationalization.

Our findings provide some data for why the PA process is so burdensome for physicians and patients. First, we found significant variability in services that require PA across the four health

plans. This is consistent with the absence of rules requiring health plans to justify or provide data to support PA requirements. None of the logic in the provider manuals revealed why one plan determines that a given service requires PA while another does not. Second, we found variability and inconsistency within health plan provider manuals. This is also consistent with the absence of any oversight or standards for health plan PA requirements. Subsequent research should use our framework to identify common services and medications for which PA requirements differ significantly across insurers and evaluate these differences against the available medical evidence.

As part of their charge to reduce administrative complexity and facilitate interoperability, a recently approved rule from Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) mandates payers to transition to electronic prior authorization by 2026. The rule includes standardized formats for computer-to-computer communication, such as Health Level 7 Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (FHiR) Prior Authorization application programming interface (API).[16] However, the rule does not require insurers to standardize which services require PA nor the logic or documentation required for PA. Absent such standardization, the transition will digitize, rather than reduce the complexity and variability of the current process.

Building a Common Platform for Prior Authorization

We translated the framework and logic of four commercial health plan PA manuals into a simple open-source algorithm. The algorithm is available, upon reasonable request, for physicians as an interactive tool to examine PA logic and for insurers as a tool to convert their PA logic into a single, standardized framework. Our results support the proposition that standardized computable

contracts have the potential to preserve the clinical rationale and content of the current system, while reducing the ambiguity and complexity required to administer health care payments. Extrapolation from empirical data on billing and insurance related costs suggests that multi-payer market reform to standardize and simplify contracts has the potential to significantly reduce administrative costs and waste.[1,4] This work provides the first practical, empirical example of such a contractual framework.

The United States Congress is considering a bill to establish standardized PA requirements for Medicare Advantage plans.[17] The algorithm developed here would allow government agencies and health plans to analyze, justify, and reconcile the variation in and across providers. Such an algorithmic approach could enable the creation of computable contracts to facilitate a standardized PA process. At a minimum, computable contracts would automatically identify duplications, ambiguities, and contradictions. Their ultimate promise is a uniform, evidenced-based foundation for electronic PA.

Limitations

This work examined the PA requirements in the manuals of 4 major providers of health insurance. The insurers considered cover a large majority of the US commercial market and the results will generalize to any other insurers whose provider manual does not differ entirely in structure from those of the 4 considered. We did not examine the clinical evidence for the PA requirements, a promising area for future work. We limited our focus to the rules for in-network providers and internally managed contracts, omitting other providers and provider network status and program structure (vendor-managed versus internally managed). The resources required to

develop our model were less than 0.000001% of the revenue of each of the insurers considered; the costs of expanding our approach to reproduce all provider manual should not be prohibitive.

Conclusion

The prior authorization rules of four large private US insurers differ significantly but may be reproduced with a surprisingly simple framework with 6 criteria to determine if PA is required and 23 requirements to obtain PA. Multi-payer market reform to standardize and simplify contracts has the potential to significantly reduce administrative costs and waste. This work provides the first practical, empirical example of such a contractual framework.

References

1. Tseng P, Kaplan RS, Richman BD, Shah MA, Schulman KA. Administrative Costs Associated With Physician Billing and Insurance-Related Activities at an Academic Health Care System. *JAMA*. 2018;319(7):691. doi:10.1001/jama.2017.19148

2. Sahni NR, Carrus B, Cutler DM. Administrative Simplification and the Potential for Saving a Quarter-Trillion Dollars in Health Care. *JAMA*. 2021;326(17):1677. doi:10.1001/jama.2021.17315

3. Shrank WH, Rogstad TL, Parekh N. Waste in the US Health Care System: Estimated Costs and Potential for Savings. *JAMA*. 2019;322(15):1501. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.13978

4. Scheinker D, Richman BD, Milstein A, Schulman KA. Reducing administrative costs in US health care: Assessing single payer and its alternatives. *Health Serv Res*. 2021;56(4):615-625. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.13649

5. Richman BD, Kaplan RS, Kohli J, et al. Billing And Insurance–Related Administrative Costs: A Cross-National Analysis: Study examines health care billing and insurance related administrative costs across several countries. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2022;41(8):1098-1106. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2022.00241

6. *2023 AMA Prior Authorization Physician Survey*. American Medical Association; 2023. Accessed September 22, 2024. https://www.ama-assn.org/system/files/prior-authorization-survey.pdf

7. Chino F, Baez A, Elkins IB, Aviki EM, Ghazal LV, Thom B. The Patient Experience of Prior Authorization for Cancer Care. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2023;6(10):e2338182. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.38182

8. *Reduce Practice Burdens with Electronic Prior Authorization*. American Medical Association; 2017. Accessed September 22, 2024. https://www.ama-assn.org/sites/ama-assn.org/files/corp/media-browser/premium/arc/epa-promo-flyer.pdf

9. Prior Authorization. America's Health Insurance Plans. 2024. Accessed September 22, 2024. https://www.ahip.org/issues/prior-authorization

10. Thompson A. AHA Urges CMS to Finalize the Improving Prior Authorization Processes Proposed Rule. Published online October 27, 2023. Accessed September 22, 2024. https://www.aha.org/lettercomment/2023-10-27-aha-urges-cms-finalize-improving-prior-authorization-processes-proposed-rule

11. *2023 CAQH Index Report*. Council for Affordable Quality Healthcare, Inc; 2024. Accessed September 22, 2024. https://www.caqh.org/hubfs/43908627/drupal/2024-01/2023_CAQH_Index_Report.pdf

12. Zenios S, Favaro K. Precedent Thinking Method. *Harv Bus Rev*. Published online Forthcoming 2024.

13. Carrozzo P. Marketing The American Mortgage: The Emergency Home Finance Act Of 1970, Standardization And The Secondary Market Revolution. *Real Prop Probate Trust J*. 2005;39(4):765-805.

14. Randolph P. The Future of American Real Estate Law: Uniform Foreclosure Laws and Uniform Land Security Interest Act. *Nova Law Rev*. 1996;20(3):1113.

15. Istvan, Brooke, Nielsen Jr, Perry, Eluhu, Megan, et al. Applying Precedents Thinking to the Intractable Problem of Transaction Costs in Healthcare. *Health Manag Policy Innov*. 2024;9(3).

16. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Advancing Interoperability and Improving Prior Authorization Processes for Medicare Advantage Organizations, Medicaid Managed Care Plans, State Medicaid Agencies, Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) Agencies and CHIP Managed Care Entities, Issuers of Qualified Health Plans on the Federally-Facilitated Exchanges, Merit-Based Incentive Payment System (MIPS) Eligible Clinicians, and Eligible Hospitals and Critical Access Hospitals in the Medicare Promoting Interoperability Program. *Fed Regist*. 2024;89(42):8762-8763.

17. Rep. Kelly, Mike [R-PA-16]. *Improving Seniors' Timely Access to Care Act of 2024*.; 2024. Accessed January 11, 2025. https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/8702/text

Figure 1: Common framework encoding the prior authorization logic of the provider manuals of Aetna, Humana, United Healthcare, and Anthem



Table 1: Services chosen to illustrate the criteria for when prior authorization is required and the requirements to obtain prior authorization

Insurer	Service or Medication	Criteria for prior authorization	Requirements to obtain prior authorization
Humana	Chiropractic therapy	Service provided in Arizona, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Ohio, or Florida	None specified
Humana	Immune globulin	Always required	Step therapy through company preferred drug
United Healthcare	Breast reconstruction	PA required except for specified ICD codes	None specified
United Healthcare	Percutaneous transcatheter closure	Patient age 18 and above	None specified
United Healthcare	Durable medical equipment	Retail purchase cost above $1000	None specified
United Healthcare	Cerebral seizure monitoring	Inpatient services only (not required for outpatient/ambulatory)	None specified
United Healthcare	Bariatric surgery	Always required	Plan coverage review due to variable benefit plan coverage
Aetna	Lumbar neurostimulators	When requested with specific CPT codes	None specified
Aetna	Cochlear devices	Always required	Medical necessity review of service site
Anthem California	Cervicoplasty (transgender)	Always required	Mental health letter and plastics evaluation
Anthem California	Cervicoplasty (reconstructive/cosmetic)	Always required	Photo submission
Anthem California	Gastric restrictive procedures	Always required	BMI documentation, Psychological evaluation, Nutritional consultation, 6-month weight management program, and Medical clearance

Table 2: Service categories, the criteria for when prior authorization is required, and the requirements to obtain prior authorization

	Aetna		Humana		United Healthcare		Anthem
	Medical and surgery	Medication	Medical and surgery	Medication	Medical and surgery	Medication	Medical and surgery/ Medication
Total	573	145	2660	366	2247	182	2142
Criteria to determine whether prior authorization is required							
State			4		858	5	
Age					1		
Diagnosis		15	87	2	287	9	
Service combination	4				77		
Purchase cost					243		
Site of care			9		1039	9	
Code-specific medical guidelines							217
None	569	130	2560	364	602	168	1925
Requirements to obtain prior authorization							
Different contact n°		1	27	6	27	9	434
Step therapy				99		8	
NDC required				58			
Site of service review	139	91	11		33		
Plan coverage review					22	150	
All other requirements							Supplemental Table 2

None	434	54	2622	220	2165	15	1211

NDC - national drug code

Table 3: Codes appearing with different criteria for prior authorization or different requirements to obtain prior authorization

Insurer	Code	Service category	Criteria and requirements	
			First occurrence	**Second occurrence**
Aetna	19318	Medical/surgery	Gender affirmation surgery: PA required	Breast reduction: PA required with site of service review
Aetna	J0129	Medication	Orencia SQ (abatacept): PA not required	Orencia IV (abatacept): PA required with a site of service review
Humana	64999	Medical/surgery	Epidural injections: PA required for outpatients only	Facet injections: PA required
Humana	J0593	Medication	Takhzyro (lanadelumab-flyo): PA required with step therapy	Takhzyro subcutaneous (lanadelumab-flyo): PA required with NDC
Humana	J0885	Medication	PA required with NDC	PA required with NDC and step therapy
Humana	J1744	Medication		
Humana	J1745	Medication		
Humana	Q4081	Medication		
Humana	J1599	Medication		
Humana	J8499	Medication		
Humana	J0256	Medication		
United Healthcare	J1449	Medication	Neutropenia: PA required	Eflapegrastim-xnst (Rolvedon®): PA required in an outpatient setting for a cancer diagnosis

PA – prior authorization