A Comparison of Healthcare System of United States and Mexico

Posted on September 27, 2019

Introduction

The healthcare systems of the United States and Mexico are both mixed systems that combine public programs, social insurance, private coverage, and direct out-of-pocket payment. They differ substantially in financing, administration, insurance design, access, workforce regulation, and the distribution of resources. The United States spends far more per person and offers advanced specialized care, but access is fragmented and cost remains a major barrier. Mexico has broader public structures and lower average prices, but patients may face regional inequality, shortages, waiting, and continued dependence on out-of-pocket spending. A useful comparison should avoid describing either country as having one uniform system. Each contains several subsystems serving different populations. (Commonwealth Fund, n.d.-a, n.d.-b)

Overview of the United States Healthcare System

The United States does not have a single national health service. Most nonelderly people receive insurance through employers, while Medicare covers many older adults and eligible people with disabilities. Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program cover eligible low-income populations through federal–state arrangements. Veterans and military personnel may receive care through separate federal systems. Individual-market insurance and uninsured self-payment remain additional pathways. (Commonwealth Fund, n.d.-a)

Providers include private physician practices, nonprofit and for-profit hospitals, public hospitals, community health centers, pharmacies, nursing facilities, home-health organizations, and integrated delivery systems. Insurance benefits, provider networks, deductibles, copayments, and authorization rules vary widely. The result is advanced clinical capacity combined with substantial administrative complexity. (Commonwealth Fund, n.d.-a)

Overview of the Mexican Healthcare System

Mexico's system is also segmented. Formal private-sector workers and their dependents are commonly covered through the Mexican Social Security Institute, while public-sector workers use the Institute for Social Security and Services for State Workers. Other institutions serve the armed forces and specific sectors. IMSS-Bienestar has expanded services for people without employment-based

social insurance in participating areas, and private providers serve patients who purchase insurance or pay directly. (Commonwealth Fund, n.d.-b; IMSS-Bienestar, n.d.)

Public coverage aims to provide access across the population, but entitlement, facilities, and available services may differ according to employment, institution, state, and locality. Many people also use pharmacies, private clinics, or private hospitals because of convenience, waiting times, or perceived quality. Out-of-pocket expenditure therefore remains important even within a broadly public structure. (Commonwealth Fund, n.d.-b; Radcliffe, 2017)

Similarities Between the Two Systems

Both countries use public and private financing, employ multidisciplinary health workforces, regulate professional education, and face chronic-disease burdens such as diabetes, cardiovascular disease, cancer, and obesity. Both struggle with rural access, uneven distribution of specialists, workforce shortages, fragmentation, and the need to coordinate primary, hospital, and long-term care. (Commonwealth Fund, n.d.-a, n.d.-b)

Neither system guarantees that formal coverage produces timely care. A patient may be insured but unable to find an in-network specialist in the United States, while a publicly entitled patient in Mexico may face unavailable medicines, distant facilities, or long waits. Access should therefore be evaluated through affordability, availability, geographic reach, cultural acceptability, and continuity rather than insurance status alone. (Commonwealth Fund, n.d.-a, n.d.-b)

Differences in Healthcare Financing

The United States relies heavily on employment-based private insurance, federal programs, state programs, and substantial patient cost sharing. Prices for hospital care, physician services, pharmaceuticals, and administration are generally high. Multiple insurers and benefit designs generate complex billing and contracting. High spending supports technology and specialization but does not automatically produce equitable access or better outcomes in every area. (Commonwealth Fund, n.d.-a)

Mexico allocates public funding through several social-insurance and government-service institutions, with contributions and general revenue supporting different populations. Average treatment prices are usually lower, but public spending and resource availability are also more limited. Direct household payment remains significant, creating financial risk for people using private services or purchasing medicines outside public facilities. (Commonwealth Fund, n.d.-b; Radcliffe, 2017)

Differences in Access to Care

In the United States, insurance status and network design strongly influence access. Uninsured and underinsured people may delay preventive, primary, dental, mental-health, or specialist care because of cost. Even insured patients can face high deductibles, prior authorization, surprise bills, or limited networks. Geographic shortages affect rural and underserved urban communities. (Commonwealth Fund, n.d.-a)

Mexico's public systems reduce the price barrier for many covered services, but access can depend on the institution to which a person belongs and the capacity of local facilities. Rural and marginalized communities may have fewer health professionals, diagnostic services, medicines, and referral options. Private clinics can offer faster access for those able to pay, producing a two-tier experience. (Commonwealth Fund, n.d.-b; Radcliffe, 2017)

Quality of Care

The United States is strong in medical research, high-complexity surgery, intensive care, specialist training, pharmaceuticals, and advanced technology. However, quality varies among institutions, and fragmentation can cause duplication, poor transitions, medication errors, and preventable gaps. High cost is not itself a measure of high quality. (Commonwealth Fund, n.d.-a)

Mexico contains highly capable specialists and hospitals, especially in major cities and larger public or private centers. Quality can be constrained by staffing, equipment, supply shortages, overcrowding, and regional inequality. Lower price should not be interpreted as poor care in every setting, just as advanced technology should not be assumed to make every U.S. service accessible or appropriate. (Commonwealth Fund, n.d.-b; Radcliffe, 2017)

Primary Care and Prevention

Both countries recognize the importance of primary care, vaccination, maternal health, chronic-disease management, and health education. The United States has community health centers and integrated systems but often rewards specialist and procedural care more strongly. Mexico's public institutions operate primary-care clinics, yet referral capacity and continuity can vary. Strengthening primary care in both countries can reduce avoidable hospitalization and improve chronic-disease outcomes. (Commonwealth Fund, n.d.-a, n.d.-b)

Public Health and Social Conditions

Health outcomes depend on housing, food security, education, employment, transportation,

environmental exposure, violence, and immigration status as well as medical services. Border communities demonstrate the interdependence of the two countries through infectious disease, workforce movement, family ties, commerce, and patient travel. National comparisons should therefore avoid attributing every difference to healthcare organization alone. (Commonwealth Fund, n.d.-a, n.d.-b)

Nursing Education in the United States

U.S. nursing education includes practical or vocational nursing programs, associate-degree nursing, bachelor-of-science nursing, graduate education, and advanced-practice pathways. Graduates seeking registered-nurse licensure generally complete an approved program and pass the NCLEX-RN, while practical or vocational nurses take the NCLEX-PN. State boards regulate licensure and practice. (National Council of State Boards of Nursing, n.d.)

Advanced-practice registered nurses may work as nurse practitioners, clinical nurse specialists, nurse anesthetists, or nurse-midwives, subject to state law and certification. Scope and independent-practice authority vary by jurisdiction. Continuing competence, background checks, renewal, and disciplinary processes are also state based. (National Council of State Boards of Nursing, n.d.)

Nursing Education in Mexico

Mexico offers technical, university, and postgraduate nursing education through public and private institutions. Programs prepare nurses for general practice, community health, hospital care, administration, teaching, and specialties. Educational quality and clinical resources can vary among regions and institutions. Latin American nursing education has increasingly emphasized university preparation, research, leadership, and universal-health goals. (Cassiani et al., 2017)

Professional practice requires appropriate educational credentials and recognition under national rules. Employment standards may also depend on the hiring institution and position. Mexico’s regulatory structure is more nationally oriented than the state-by-state U.S. model, although institutional requirements and regional workforce conditions remain important. (Cassiani et al., 2017; Rietig & Squires, 2015)

Comparison of Nursing Regulation and Mobility

In the United States, nurses are licensed by state boards, and mobility traditionally requires authorization in each jurisdiction. The Nurse Licensure Compact permits eligible nurses from participating states to practice under a multistate license, but it does not cover every nurse or every jurisdiction. Nurses educated outside the United States may need credential evaluation, language evidence, immigration authorization, and successful completion of the applicable licensure

examination. (National Council of State Boards of Nursing, n.d.; Rietig & Squires, 2015)

Mexico does not use the same state-board and NCLEX structure. International movement between Mexico and the United States is therefore not automatic. Differences in curricula, clinical hours, language, documentation, scope, and immigration policy can delay recognition. Harmonization should protect patient safety without creating unnecessary barriers for qualified professionals. (Rietig & Squires, 2015)

Language and Cultural Competence

Spanish-speaking clinicians are valuable in the United States because language-concordant care can improve understanding, consent, medication use, and trust. English may be useful for Mexican professionals accessing international literature or working with cross-border populations, but language ability should be assessed according to job need rather than status. Interpretation services remain essential when clinician and patient do not share a language. (Rietig & Squires, 2015)

Cultural competence requires more than translation. Clinicians should ask about health beliefs, family roles, migration experiences, traditional practices, finances, and barriers without assuming that all Mexican, Mexican American, or U.S. patients share one culture. (Rietig & Squires, 2015)

Strengths and Weaknesses of the U.S. System

Major strengths include biomedical research, specialized services, technology, professional education, emergency capacity, and innovation. Major weaknesses include high prices, unequal access, administrative burden, complex insurance, medical debt, fragmentation, and geographic disparities. (Commonwealth Fund, n.d.-a)

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Mexican System

Mexico’s strengths include large public institutions, commitment to expanding coverage, lower service prices, and extensive experience in community and social-insurance care. Weaknesses include segmentation, limited funding, shortages, variable infrastructure, medicine availability, waiting, and unequal rural access. (Commonwealth Fund, n.d.-b; IMSS-Bienestar, n.d.; Radcliffe, 2017)

Lessons Each Country Can Learn

The United States can learn from greater emphasis on public coverage, lower prices, and community-based care, while Mexico can benefit from stronger funding consistency, referral capacity, workforce distribution, data systems, and quality improvement. Policy transfer must remain cautious because

institutions arise from different legal, fiscal, and demographic contexts. A program successful in one country cannot simply be copied without adaptation. (Commonwealth Fund, n.d.-a, n.d.-b)

Conclusion

The United States and Mexico both operate mixed and segmented healthcare systems, but they organize financing and access differently. The United States offers substantial technology and specialization while imposing high financial and administrative burdens. Mexico provides broad public structures and lower costs but faces resource limitations, institutional segmentation, and regional inequality. Nursing education is well established in both countries, though U.S. regulation is state based and centered on NCLEX licensure, whereas Mexico relies more on national educational and professional recognition. Effective reform in either country must balance affordability, quality, equity, workforce capacity, public health, and sustainable financing. (Commonwealth Fund, n.d.-a, n.d.-b; National Council of State Boards of Nursing, n.d.; Rietig & Squires, 2015)

References

Cassiani, S. H. D. B., Wilson, L. L., Mikael, S. D. S. E., Peña, L. M., Grajales, R. A. Z., McCreary, L. L., & Gutierrez, N. R. (2017). The situation of nursing education in Latin America and the Caribbean towards universal health. *Revista Latino-Americana de Enfermagem, 25*.

Commonwealth Fund. (n.d.-a). *International health care system profiles: United States*.

Commonwealth Fund. (n.d.-b). *International health care system profiles: Mexico*.

IMSS-Bienestar. (n.d.). *Servicios de Salud IMSS-Bienestar*.

National Council of State Boards of Nursing. (n.d.). *NCLEX and licensure resources*.

Radcliffe, S. (2017). Does Mexico have better healthcare than the United States? *Healthline*.

Rietig, V., & Squires, A. (2015). *Building skills in North and Central America: Barriers and policy options toward harmonizing qualifications in nursing*. Migration Policy Institute.