

Effects of travel time on Healthcare Utilization Evidence from Norway

Work in progress - very preliminary and incomplete

Rosanna Johed and Kjetil Telle

Affiliations: Statistics Norway, University of Oslo, Norwegian Institute of Public Health

Distance Decay Association

- People who live far away from health services, utilize the services less than those who live close-by
- Travel time could be one reason for geographic variation in utilization of health services
 - With associated over- or under-utilization, and excessive costs or deteriorated health

Policy Question:

Will further centralization of services reduce utilization?

Centralization is widely discussed for several reasons

- ervices
- improve quality of treatment by higher volume
- reduce prospects in emergency situations
- reduce patients' satisfaction (longer travel distance)

How can we credibly answer the policy question empirically?

- Reverse causality problem: Not travel distance that causes utilization, but patients' needs of health services that determine travel distance?
 - The patients in need of services may have moved close to them
 - The services may have moved closer to the needy patients switch to nearby services
- If reverse causality, the distance decay association is **not** informative of the effect on utilization of centralizing services
- Randomized controlled trials infeasible
 - Randomly distribute location of inhabitants across the country
 - Randomly distribute location of health services across the country

We use changes in travel time from new bridges, tunnels and roads

- We do not compare travel time across individuals (cross-section), but use changes over time for the same individual
- We do **not** use variation from inhabitants moving closer to the provider
- We do **not** use variation from the inhabitant switching to a nearby provider
- We only use variation over time for each inhabitant from changes in travel time by road
 - Panel model with fixed effects for geographic location of the inhabitant and geographic location of the provider
- We try to mimic an experiment where road investments were randomly distributed across the inhabitants
 - I.e. effect on utilization from i) change in travel time to provider, or ii) any other impacts on utilization from the improvement in roads associated with change in travel time to provider

Norwegian context - GP

 Universal, high-quality health care system covering all important services and all residents

- Funded through general taxes
- Low or no out-of-pocket payments
- Legal right to necessary services for everyone
- Virtually no private alternatives

Every Norwegian resident is assigned one (and only one) GP at every point in time

Free to change GP twice a year

Data

 We have individual level registry data 2010 - 2017 for every Norwegian resident

- All consultations in primary and out-patient specialist health services, including GP (all reimbursements/fee-for-service to the GP/specialist)
- Unique ID of every resident and ID of his/her assigned GP
- Exact geographic location of every resident and every GP office
- Rich array of demographic and socioeconomic variables for every resident
 - Typically include controls for individual's age, sex, education, income, municipality, etc.
- Maps of all roads (with speed limits) in Norway 2010, 2013-2017
- We calculate travel time (minutes) by car from the home of every resident to the office of the resident's GP annually

Some summary statistics

- \approx 5 million inhabitants
- ≈ 38.8 million person-year observations 2010-2017
- Mean number of GP-visits for all inhabitants ≈ 2.2 per year
- \approx 66 percent of the inhabitants had at least one visit per year
- Mean travel time from home to GP \approx 8 minutes (median \approx 5, p90 \approx 20)

Geographic variation in utilization of GP-services

- Pecent of the residents in each Norwegian municipality visiting the GP in 2017
- By quantile of the 427
 municipalities
 Q1 is 33 percent
 - Q3 is 70 percent



Cross-section: Distance decay association



Distance decay association in Norway

- Cannot be given a causal interpretation, and if still done, it would imply that:
- >A 10 minute increase in travel time would
 - Decrease the share of the population visiting the GP in a year by 0.03 percentage points, or 4 percent – or 200 000 inhabitants
 - Decrease the mean number of visits by 0.1, or 5 percent or 500 000 visits per year

Visits over time for same individual: Change in visits to GP 2010-2017 when travel time changes 2010-2017



Main effect estimates – using variation in changes in roads only

- The distance decay association dissolves in the general population when we use variation from changes in roads
 - Effect estimates are >15 times smaller than the association, and statistically insignificant
- But for people on disability pension and with long initial travel time (>15 minutes), the drop is smaller and the estimate remains significant
- As expected, we also find that longer travel time to GP
 - Increases the use of electronic consultations
 - Increases the use of other specialist (out-patient) consultations

Discussion

- The distance decay association vastly overstates any causal effect of travel time on utilization
- Our effect estimates suggest that further centralization of GP-services is unlikely to affect utilization for the general population
- But it may affect utilization of some vulnerable groups
 - Centralization might deteriorate health in some groups unless these groups already over-utilize or compensatory means can be implemented (targeting)?
- How to improve and extend our preliminary analyses?
 - Look at vulnerable groups gender/age, consultation by type (pregnant women, sick leave certificate, diagnoses)?
 - Effects of travel time on health outcomes (mortality, other?)?
 - Other suggestions?

Travel time in minutes by car



Travel time to each inhabitant's assigned GP in each Norwegian municipality

- By quantile of the 426 municipalities in 2017
 - Q1 is 8 minutes
 - Q3 is 12 minutes

