Price Discrimination In Practice

Posted on July 28, 2022

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/price-discrimination-in-practice/

Introduction

Price discrimination occurs when sellers charge different purchasers different effective prices for the same or closely related product for reasons that are not fully explained by the cost of serving those purchasers. Healthcare contains many forms of differential pricing, but the concept must be applied carefully because a drug's list price, a manufacturer's net price, an insurer's negotiated amount, a pharmacy's cash price, and a patient's out-of-pocket payment are not the same figure. Differences can result from bargaining power, statutory rebates, volume, formulary placement, government purchasing rules, or distribution arrangements rather than unlawful discrimination. Prescription-drug markets illustrate the complexity especially well. Manufacturers may give rebates to pharmacy-benefit managers or insurers, hospitals may receive acquisition discounts, Medicaid obtains statutory rebates, the Department of Veterans Affairs uses federal ceiling prices and national contracts, and Medicare now negotiates Maximum Fair Prices for selected high-expenditure medicines. The key economic and ethical question is therefore not whether every purchaser pays the same amount, but whether pricing arrangements are transparent, justifiable, and compatible with access to necessary care.

List Price, Net Price, and Bargaining Power

A pharmaceutical list price is the publicly stated amount before rebates and other concessions, while the net price is what the manufacturer retains after negotiated rebates, statutory discounts, chargebacks, fees, and related adjustments. The gap can be substantial, which creates confusion because patients may encounter cost-sharing based on a price they cannot easily connect with the manufacturer's eventual net revenue. Manufacturers offer discounts for several reasons: to gain favorable formulary placement, increase sales volume, respond to competition, satisfy government-program requirements, or support particular patient-assistance arrangements. The economic logic resembles price discrimination because buyers with greater leverage or greater ability to substitute may obtain lower net prices. A health plan able to exclude a product from its formulary can negotiate differently from an individual patient who needs one medicine and cannot bargain directly with the manufacturer. Wholesalers, pharmacies, insurers, pharmacy-benefit managers, hospitals, employers, and government programs therefore stand between the manufacturer's list price and the amount paid by the final patient (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2021).

Uninsured Patients, Cash Prices, and Hospital Transparency

Uninsured patients have historically faced high published charges because they lack the bargaining scale of insurers and government programs, although it is inaccurate to assume that every self-pay patient ultimately pays the highest amount. Hospitals may offer charity care, income-based assistance, prompt-pay discounts, or negotiated self-pay rates, and nonprofit hospitals operate under financial-assistance requirements. The practical problem is that people often learn about these options only after receiving a confusing bill. Prescription drugs show another version of the same issue: a pharmacy's cash or discount-card price can sometimes be lower than the amount an insured patient owes under a deductible or negotiated benefit. Using the cash price may have trade-offs because the payment may not count toward the deductible or out-of-pocket maximum and may not appear in the insurer's medication record. Federal hospital price-transparency rules attempt to expose payer-specific negotiated charges and discounted cash prices, but posted data remain difficult to interpret when services, physician fees, complications, and benefit structures differ. Transparency must therefore be usable, not merely technically available.

PBMs, 340B, Medicaid, and the VA

Pharmacy-benefit managers administer drug benefits for insurers, employers, and public programs, negotiating rebates, creating formularies, processing claims, and contracting with pharmacy networks. Their scale can lower negotiated prices, while critics question opaque rebate flows, spread pricing, and incentives tied to high list prices. Hospitals and clinics eligible for the federal 340B program receive discounted outpatient drugs under statutory rules intended to support safety-net providers; the acquisition discount does not automatically determine what an insurer or patient is billed. Medicaid follows another model through mandatory manufacturer rebate agreements, with additional inflation-related rebates and optional state supplemental negotiations. The Department of Veterans Affairs combines statutory federal ceiling prices with the Federal Supply Schedule, national contracts, centralized purchasing, evidence review, and a national formulary. VA guidance for 2026 confirms that manufacturers of covered drugs must enter pricing agreements establishing federal ceiling prices, while national contracts can produce further concessions. These systems demonstrate that lower prices arise from institutional purchasing authority, law, formulary leverage, and volume rather than one universal "government discount" mechanism.

Medicare Negotiation and the 2026 Policy Change

Medicare historically relied heavily on private Part D plans and pharmacy-benefit managers for drug negotiation, subject to federal coverage rules. The Inflation Reduction Act created a separate Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Program for selected high-expenditure medicines without generic or

biosimilar competition. The first ten negotiated Maximum Fair Prices took effect on January 1, 2026. These prices do not apply to every prescription drug and do not turn Medicare into the VA model; CMS selects eligible drugs under statutory criteria, conducts negotiations, publishes negotiated prices, and repeats the process in later cycles. The policy changes bargaining power because the federal program can now negotiate directly for a limited set of products rather than relying entirely on plan-level arrangements. Its long-term effects on federal spending, manufacturer revenue, research incentives, formulary design, premiums, and patient access remain subjects for empirical evaluation. The appropriate analysis should therefore distinguish the documented price mechanism from broader predictions about how firms or markets will respond over time (Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 2026).

Innovation, Fairness, and Ethical Limits

Drug manufacturers argue that revenue finances discovery, clinical trials, manufacturing, regulatory work, unsuccessful research programs, and future innovation. Critics respond that public research funding contributes to scientific discovery, monopoly protection can weaken price competition, and high prices may exceed what is necessary to sustain innovation. Differential pricing can sometimes improve access when lower-income purchasers or markets receive lower prices, yet it can also place the greatest burden on people with the least bargaining power. Fairness therefore does not require one identical price for every purchaser because volume, distribution cost, public obligations, and risk can justify differences. The ethical problem becomes sharper when complexity conceals charges, assistance is difficult to obtain, or people delay necessary medicines because they cannot understand or afford their share. A defensible pricing system should make patient costs predictable, protect access, reward meaningful therapeutic innovation, and disclose enough information for policymakers to evaluate whether discounts and rebates improve affordability rather than merely shifting money among intermediaries.

Practical Implications for Patients and Policymakers

Patients can ask pharmacists to compare covered and cash prices, inquire about appropriate lower-cost therapeutic alternatives, request hospital financial-assistance information, and ask whether manufacturer or public programs apply. Clinicians can incorporate affordability into shared decision-making because a medicine that a patient cannot obtain is not an effective treatment plan. Appeals and formulary exceptions may be available when the preferred medicine is clinically unsuitable. Policymakers face a broader task: they must distinguish acquisition prices from reimbursement, list prices from net prices, and patient cost-sharing from manufacturer revenue before judging whether a particular discount is fair or efficient. Comparing the VA, Medicaid, Medicare, and commercial insurance without accounting for their different populations and purchasing structures can produce

misleading conclusions. The central objective should be a system in which bargaining reduces unnecessary cost while preserving clinically appropriate access, incentives for useful innovation, and sufficient transparency for patients to know what they will pay before financial harm occurs.

Conclusion

Healthcare price discrimination is best understood as a network of differential prices created by bargaining, statutory discounts, rebates, formularies, and differences in purchasing power. Manufacturers may discount medicines to secure volume or formulary access; hospitals and insurers negotiate contractual rates; uninsured patients may face high initial charges but may qualify for financial assistance; and cash prescription prices can sometimes beat insured prices. Government programs use distinct mechanisms. Medicaid receives mandatory rebates, the VA combines federal ceiling prices with centralized contracts and formulary leverage, and Medicare's first negotiated Maximum Fair Prices for ten selected drugs became effective on January 1, 2026. No one purchaser always receives the lowest price for every medicine because the relevant price depends on the product, program, point in the distribution chain, and definition used. Ethical policy should therefore focus on understandable patient costs, transparent incentives, evidence about net prices, clinically appropriate access, and a sustainable balance between affordability and innovation rather than assuming that identical prices are the only form of fairness.

References

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. (2026). *Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Program: Selected drugs and negotiated prices*.

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. (2026). *Medicaid Drug Rebate Program*.

U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. (2026). *Federal Supply Schedule Service: Pharmaceutical pricing and federal ceiling prices*.

U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2021). *Prescription drugs: Department of Veterans Affairs paid about half as much as Medicare Part D for selected drugs*.

Anderson, G. F. (2007). From "soak the rich" to "soak the poor": Recent trends in hospital pricing. *Health Affairs, 26*(3), 780–789.