

Index

Note that figures are indicated by an italic *f* and tables are indicated by an italic *t* after the page number.

- Ability-to-pay, 17–19, 21, 41–42. *See also* Market rationing
- Accident victims, 59
- Administrative rationing mechanisms, 106–109, 110. *See also* Formulary committees; Utilization reviews
 - physician advocacy role and, 133–134
- Adverse selection, 44
- Advocacy role of physicians, 101–102, 109, 112–113, 138–139, 147–148. *See also* Physicians' decisions
- Affordability vs. efficiency, colon cancer screening example, 24–26, 27, 37–38
- Age-based rationing, 93
- Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, 38–39
- AIDS, 59, 78, 173, 174, 182
- Alcohol abuse, 16–17, 182
- Allocation decisions, 92–93, 94
 - distinguished from bedside rationing, 19–21
 - re scarce organs for transplants, 22, 81–85, 118
- American Cancer Society, 131, 132
- American with Disabilities Act, 76, 161
- American Medical Association, 131
- Angina treatment, 78
- Antibiotics, 117–118, 134
- Antigen matching, 62–63
- Arthritis, degenerative, 39, 47
- Asch, David, case vignettes survey, 126–128
- Back pain, 36
- Bedside rationing
 - alternative characterizations of, 125, 129, 135, 136
 - arguments for appropriate, 138, 139, 142, 146–149, 150–151
 - conditions defining, 111, 122–124, 123*f*
 - physician controls resource, 112, 120–122, 123*f*, 124
 - serving financial interest other than patients, 112, 117–120
 - withholding treatment in best interests of patient, 111, 114–116, 122–123, 123*f*
- cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA) and, 97
- debate over appropriateness, 125, 127–128, 128*f*, 137

- Bedside rationing (cont.)
 discriminatory potential, 103–104, 110
 external standards or agents and, 130–133, 176–177
 moral values and, 101, 102, 144–145, 146–147
 physician-patient relationship and, 102–103
 physicians' advocacy role and, 101–102, 109, 112–113, 138–139, 147–148
 physician training in, 103, 109, 118, 143–144, 178
 traditional prohibitions against, 99–100
 whether savings benefit patients, 105, 110, 112, 117–120, 123*f*, 123–124, 130, 145–146 (*see also* Patient care vignettes)
- Bioethics group members study (Ubel), 79–81
- Blood products, 179–180
- Blood test study, 93
- Calabresi, G., and P. Bobbit (1978) *Tragic Choices*, 20–21
- Callahan, Daniel, 32
- Cancer. *See* Cervical cancer screening; Colon cancer screening
- Capitation payments, 107, 109, 120, 177
- Certificate of need laws, 106
- Cervical cancer screening, 5–6, 131, 141–142
- Cervical cancer screening vignette (Ubel), 126–128, 128*f*
- Children, illnesses affecting, 56
- Cholesterol-lowering drugs, 100, 180
- Cigarette smokers, 85
- Cleft lips, patients with, 59
- Clinical pathways, 107, 108, 109
- Clinicians advocacy role, 101–102, 109, 112–113, 138–139, 147–148. *See also* Physicians' decisions
- Clinicians' decisions. *See* Physician decisions
- “Closed systems,” 130
- Clot-busting drugs, 112
- Coby Howard story, 3–4, 18, 22, 46
- Colon cancer screening, 23, 24–26, 37–38, 141
 vignette studies, 79–81, 81*f*, 87–91, 88*f*, 90*f*
- Colon cancer screening vignette (Ubel), 79–81, 81*f*, 87–91, 88*f*, 90*f*
- Community values on health care rationing. *See* Public's health care priorities
- Computer reminder systems, 108
- Consumer choices, 48
- Contrast agents, 120, 129–130
- Copayments, patient, 42–43, 144
- Cosmetic surgery, 26–27, 29, 56, 59
 for breast reconstruction, 58
- Cost-benefits analysis (CBA), 67–68
- Cost containment, 3, 11, 30, 37, 183. *See also* Allocation decisions
 budgeting, 177
 considering costs is not necessarily rationing, 114–116, 121, 135–136
 price reduction, 37–40
 public preference for, 57, 67
 wasteful practice elimination, 11, 37–40, 115
- Cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA), 1, 3, 40, 46, 55–56, 160, 172. *See also* QALY (Quality-adjusted life-year); Utility assessment
 bedside rationing and, 100–101, 151
 discriminatory aspects, 76–78
 favoring present over future benefits, 158–161, 160*f*
 the future of, 153, 171–174, 181–183
 incorporating societal values (proposed), 157, 161, 163*f*, 163–168, 165*f*

- Oregon Medicaid Program's experience with, 4–5, 6, 7–10, 33, 46, 47, 52, 53, 75, 161
 positive values of, 5–7, 159–161
 public rejects as sole allocation method, 85, 94
 undervaluing public's priorities, 35*t*, 47–50, 53–56, 55*t*, 55–56, 85, 155, 156, 172, 178
- Cost of health care, 39–40, 145, 146
 health insurance impacting, 32
 technology driving, 32–33
- Critical care professionals study, 56, 57
- CT scans, 130–131
- Diabetes, 134, 173
- Diagnostic tests. *See* Screening tests
- Disability-levels scale, 70–71, 71*f*
- Disabled persons
 cost-effectiveness analysis and, 85, 156, 161–163, 162*f*, 163*f*, 178
 public's preference for nondiscrimination against, 76–77, 77*f*
- Discretionary services, noncoverage of, 42–43, 45
- Discrimination
 against chronically or seriously ill people, 85, 156, 178
 against disabled people, 85, 156, 161–163, 162*f*, 163*f*, 178
 against minorities, 62–63, 85, 103–104, 182
 bedside rationing and, 103–105, 110
 cost-effectiveness analysis and, 76–78, 161, 178
 public views against, 76–78, 77*f*, 85, 161
- Distributional equity. *See* Equity, distributional
- Domestic violence screening, 142
- Drugs, new, 106, 114–115, 173–176
- Economic rationing. *See* Market rationing
- Eddy, David, xiii–xiv, 126
- Efficiency. *See* Health utility maximization
- Emergency treatment, 28
- Equity, distributional
 difficulty in measuring, 86–88, 169–171
 vs. efficiency, 78–85, 79–81, 81*f*, 86, 88*f*, 89–91, 90*f*
 population covered (entire vs. partial), 87–88, 89–91, 90*f*
 public preference for, 78–79, 85, 156
 redistribution schemes and, 86
 withholding existing treatments and, 86
- Evans, Roger, 19–21
- Expert panels, 24, 26
- Explicitness
 vs. implicitness in defining rationing, 1, 10, 13, 14*f*, 15*f*, 16–19, 17*f*, 29, 75*t*
 limiting services and, 122, 176–177
 of Oregon Medicaid program's list, 10, 19, 100
- Fairness, 67, 94. *See also* Discrimination; Equity, distributional
 public views of, 85–86
 unwillingness to abandon patients, 92–93
- False positive results, 116
- Feedback mechanisms, 107, 108, 109
- Fee-for-service reimbursement, 109, 139, 140
- Fertility treatment, 59
- “First-order” and “second-order” decisions, 20–21
- Formulary committees, 105–106, 119, 121, 147–148
- Fowler, E. J. et al., rating study, 58–59
- Framing effects, 91, 93
- Free market allocation of health care. *See* Market rationing
- “Futility” debate, 178–179
- “Fuzzyness” or confusion, 12, 22, 29*f*

- Gene therapy, 38
Greed, 120
- Hadorn, David, 75–76
and Robert Brook, 23, 24–26
Hastings Center, 32
Health care decisions, 74, 93. *See also* Physicians' decisions
as “tragic choices,” 20–21
Health care industry. *See also* Insurance companies; Managed care organizations; Medical institutions; Physician group practice
labor intensive, 38
salary-based systems, 140
Health care rationing. *See also* Bedside rationing; Cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA); Market rationing
debate over necessity of, 33–34, 35, 173
defining, 2, 11–12, 28–30, 29*f*
distinguishing between necessary and beneficial treatment, 24–30, 29*f*
explicit vs. implicit definitions, 1, 10, 13, 14*f*, 15*f*, 16–19, 17*f*, 29, 75*t*
“fuzzyness” or confusion in, 12, 22, 29*f*
politics and, 11–13
problems with restrictive definitions, 16, 19, 22, 24–28, 28
whether including nonhealth care products, 34–37
withholding beneficial or discretionary treatment, 15*f*, 23, 42–43, 45
withholding necessary treatment, 13–14, 14*f*, 15*f*, 24*f*
withholding scarce vs. non-scarce resources, 13, 14*f*, 15*f*, 19–22, 20*f*, 23–24, 81–82, 118, 121–122
the future of, 153, 173–174, 181–183
global rules vs. bedside rationing, 147–150
viewed as a necessity, 3, 4, 5, 31, 33–37
Health care treatment. *See* Treatment (medical)
Health utility maximization, 55–56, 78–79, 85. *See also* Cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA); Utility assessment
Heart conditions and treatments
artificial hearts, 38
congestive heart failure, 22–23, 180
coronary screening tests, 129–130
heart attack, 112
heart bypass surgery, 19, 108
heart pain (angina), 78
HIV infection, 59, 78, 173, 174, 182
Howard, Coby, 3–4, 18, 22, 46
Hypertension, 114
Hysterectomy, 37, 108
- Illness, nature of, 57. *See also* Severity of illness; *and by disorder*
Implicitness, 113. *See also* Explicitness
cost-effectiveness as implicit rationing, 125–129, 134–134
vs. explicitness in defining rationing, 1, 10, 13, 14*f*, 15*f*, 16–19, 17*f*, 29, 75*t*
Information on health care options, 44–45, 135
Informed consent, 181
Innumeracy, 91–92
Insurance companies, 44, 91. *See also* Insurance, health; Reimbursement decisions; Third-party payers; Utilization reviews
case managers, 106
Insurance, health. *See also* Discretionary services; Insurance companies; Moral hazard; Uninsured or underinsured people
basic benefits packages, 27, 174
benefits of risk-spreading, 41–42, 43
impacts on cost of health care, 32
linking with employment, 21

- risk-sharing leads to excess demand, 31, 40
- uninsured or underinsured people, 28, 39
- Insurance study (Rand), 42–43
- Intensive care (ICU) treatment, 178–180
 - public's prioritizing of, 179
- Justice, theories of, 70, 94
- Kahneman, D. and C. Varey, pain pills (follow-up) study, 86, 89
- Kidney transplants, 22, 62–63
- Krebs cycle, 178
- Laboratory tests. *See* Screening tests
- Language. *See* Linguistic factors
- Life saving interventions, 45, 55
 - cost-effectiveness undervaluing, 35*t*, 178
 - public's prioritizing of, 55, 76–78, 77*f*, 156, 179
 - refusing, 178–179
 - treatment outcomes (anticipated) and, 77*f*
- Linguistic factors, 21, 62, 73–74, 74*t*, 125, 129
 - alternative terms for physicians' decisions, 125, 129, 135, 136
- Liver transplants, 16, 22
- Longevity, 36
- Loewenstein, George, transplant study, 82–85
- Mammography testing standards, 132–133
- Managed care organizations, 21–22, 138. *See also* Reimbursement decisions
- Market rationing, 17–19, 21, 48–49
 - health care based on ability-to-pay, 17–19, 21, 41–42
- Mathematics of measurement. *See also* QALY (Quality-adjusted life-year); Studies on health care priorities
- innumeracy, 91–92
- Krebs cycle, 178
- measurement errors, 168–169, 169*f*
- multiplicative intransitivity, 168–169, 169*f*
- the QALY trap, 161–163, 163*f*, 163–168, 164*f*, 165*f*
- random distribution and, 87–88
- Medical advances
 - cost of health care and, 32–33, 175–176, 181
 - new drugs, 106, 114–115, 173–176
 - new technologies, 32–33, 106, 107
- Medical care. *See* Treatment (medical)
- Medical institutions. *See also* Third-party payers
 - formulary committees, 105–106, 119, 121, 147–148
- Medical utilitarianism, 67–68
- Meno, The* (Platonic dialogue), 12–13
- Mill, John Stuart, theory of utilitarianism, 68
- Moral hazard
 - defined, 40–41
 - insurance risk-spreading as, 31, 40
 - restaurant check-sharing example, 31
 - ways of reducing, 40, 105 (*see also* Insurance, health)
 - choosing plans at time of enrollment, 43–46
 - eliminating health insurance, 41–42
 - not covering discretionary services, 42–43
- Moral values, 67, 70, 78. *See also* Value judgements
 - bedside rationing and, 101, 102, 144–145, 146–147
 - cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA) and, 67, 69
 - debates over, 10, 29, 183
- MRI scanners, 20, 121–122, 130–131

- “Multiplicative intransitivity,” 168–169, 169*f*. *See also* Mathematics of measurement
- Narratives. *See* Patient care vignettes
- National Cancer Institute, 132–133
- Noneconomic rationing, 117–118
- Nonhealth care products affecting health, 34–37
- Nord disability-levels scale, 70–71, 71*f*
- Nord, Eric, study of public values, 70–73, 71*f*, 74*t*. *See also* Philadelphia jurors survey
- Older patients, 93
- Oregon Medicaid Program, 11, 56–57, 107, 149
- bone marrow transplants not funded, 3–4, 18, 22, 46
- experience with cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA), 4–5, 6, 7–10, 33, 46, 47, 52, 53, 75, 161
- explicitness of rationing system, 10, 19
- Organ allocation survey (Ubel), 82–85
- Organizational context, 180–181
- Out-of-pocket costs, 105, 118–119, 181
- copayments, 42–43, 144
- Pain pills study, 85–86
- follow-up study, 86, 89
- Pap smears. *See* Cervical cancer screening
- Paraplegia, 76–78, 77*f*, 161–163, 162*f*, 163*f*
- Patient care vignettes
- alcoholic needs transplant (socially undesirable behavior), 16–17
- Andrea’s allergy (out-of-pocket expenses), 118–119
- blood test for Mr. Thrifty (expensive testing), 144
- brain tumor (standards of care), 130–131
- case vignettes survey (Asch), 126–128
- colon screening for Mr. Williams (cost of tests), 126
- coronary problem of Mr. Stevens (cost of testing materials), 129–130
- heart transplant dilemma, 67, 68–69
- high cholesterol of Ms. Corell (trying inexpensive drugs first), 135–136
- hypertension of Mr. Nye (old vs. new drug), 114–115
- Joe’s heart attack (cost of drugs), 112
- knee surgery for Mrs. Glenn (“best” or satisfactory care), 135
- Mr. Jordan wants a PSA test, 115–116
- Pap smear for Mrs. Jordan (testing protocol), 126
- Peace Corps volunteer and murderer (medical ethics), 67
- rectal exam for Mr. Jones (test protocols), 132
- reflux problem of Ms. Lavedan (external rules), 133
- reflux problem of Ms. Lavedan revisited (cost containment), 134
- “soft indication” for MRI screening (Mr. Dylan), 121–122
- urinary infection of Mrs. Baron (plain vs. broad spectrum antibiotic), 117–118
- urinary tract problems of Mr. Olsen (cost of testing materials), 120
- Patient-doctor relationship. *See* Physician-patient relationship
- Patients’ decisions
- ability-to-pay and, 17–19, 21, 41–42
- adverse selection and, 44
- copayments, 32, 42–43, 144

- out-of-pocket costs and, 105, 118–119, 181
- voluntary rationing, 93, 119
- Patients' interests, 30, 134–135, 144–145
 - evaluating treatment from perspective of, 116
 - whether rationing savings benefit, 105, 110, 112, 117–120, 123*f*, 123–124, 130, 145–146
 - withholding treatment that would be, 111, 114–116, 122–123, 123*f*
- Patients' knowledgeability, 44–45, 135
- Pediatric care, 21–22
- Person trade-off method (PTO), 165, 168–169
- PET (positron emission tomographic) scans, 44
- Pharmaceuticals. *See also by individual drug*
 - expensive vs. inexpensive drugs, 114–115, 117–119, 121, 135–136
 - formulary committees determining, 105–106, 119, 121, 147–148
 - new drugs, 106, 114–115, 173–176
- Philadelphia jurors survey (Ubel), 73–74, 74*t*
- Physical therapy, 36
- Physician decisions, standards of care and, 130–131
- Physician group practice, 155
- Physician-patient relationship, 22, 143. *See also* Patients' decisions; Patients' interests; Physicians' decisions
 - trust factor, 102–103, 139–143
- Physicians' decisions, 22, 95. *See also* Bedside rationing
 - administrative hoops and, 133–134
 - advocacy role, 101–102, 109, 112–113, 138–139, 147–148
 - alternative terms for, 125, 129, 135, 136
 - degree of control over resources, 112, 120–122, 123*f*, 124
 - external rules and, 133–134
 - legal protection for, 131
 - medical vs. value judgements, 127–128, 128*f*
- Physician training, 103, 109, 118, 143–144, 178
- Plato, 12–13
- Political processes, 49–50
 - in defining health care rationing, 11–13
 - revealing community values, 48
- Populations
 - entire vs. partial coverage of, 87–88, 89–91, 90*f*
 - statistical groups vs. individuals, 35–36, 92–93, 180
- Practice guidelines, 107–108
- Preventive care, public preference for, 57, 72
- Preventive Services Task Force, U.S., 132
- Price reduction, 37–40
- Prognosis. *See* Treatment outcomes
- Prostate surgery, 37
- Protease inhibitors, 173, 174
- Proton pumps, 147–148, 150
- Public health objectives, 117–118
- Public Health Service, U.S., 171
- Public's health care priorities, 28, 47, 55–56, 74, 140, 182. *See also* Cost containment; Fairness; Life-saving interventions; Preventive care; Severity of illness; Treatment outcomes
 - confusion in or difficulty interpreting, 48–50, 86, 155–156, 168–169, 169*f*
 - cost-effectiveness analysis not reflecting, 35*t*, 47–50, 53–56, 55*t*, 55–56, 85, 155, 156, 172, 178
 - measurement of (*see also* Framing effects; Linguistic factors; Mathe-

- Public's health care priorities (cont.)
 matics of measurement; Studies on health care priorities)
 assessing willingness to pay, 60–61
 direct vs. indirect valuation, 168–169, 169*f*
 ranking methods, 56–58
 rating methods, 58–60
 statistical populations vs. individual scenarios, 35–36, 92–93, 180
 utility-elicitation, 50–51
 subconscious influences, 62–64
 Public values, Nord study of, 70–73, 71*f*, 74*t*
- QALY (Quality-adjusted life-year), 8–9, 51, 53–54, 156–157, 159–161
 CEA measurement, 8–9, 51, 53–54, 65
 incorporating preferences, 159–161, 163–168, 164*f*, 165*f*
 measurement errors, 168–169, 169*f*
 the QALY trap, 161–163, 163*f*, 163–168, 164*f*, 165*f*
- Quality-of-life, 157. *See also* Treatment outcomes
 judgements about patients', 179–180
 public priorities regarding, 57
- Racial factors, 62–63, 85, 103–104.
See also Discrimination
- Radiology testing, 11–12, 27, 142
 contrast agents, 120, 129–130
- Rand health insurance study, 42–43
- Rationing decisions, public. *See* Public's health care priorities
- Rationing. *See* Bedside rationing;
 Cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA);
 Health care rationing
- Rawls, John, 182
- Reimbursement arrangements
 capitation payments, 107, 109, 120, 177
 fee-for-service, 109, 139, 140
- Reimbursement decisions, 105–106
- Rescue, rule of, 76
- Restaurant story, 31. *See also* Moral hazard
- Rule of rescue, 76
- Screening tests, 23, 44, 109, 126, 150
 cervical cancer screening, 5–6, 131, 141–142
 colon cancer screening, 23, 24–26, 37–38, 141
 coronary, 129–130
 MRI scanning, 20, 121–122, 130–131
- Self-interest, 73–74, 74*f*
- Severity of illness, 74*t*, 75*t*
 cost-effectiveness analysis and, 161–162
 public's prioritizing of, 56, 69–71, 71–76, 74*t*, 75*t*, 85, 156
- Sigmoidoscopy. *See* Colon cancer screening
- Socially unacceptable behavior, 16–17, 182
- Societal financial interests, 129–130
- Societal values. *See also* Public's health care priorities
 incorporating into CEA measures, 157, 161, 163*f*, 163–169, 164*f*, 165*f*
 patients' collective interests, 145
 public health objectives, 117–118
- Society of Medical Decision Making, 79
- Socioeconomic factors, 103. *See also* Ability to pay; Out-of-pocket costs
- Socrates, 12–13
- Standards of care, 130–131
- Standards of evidence, 132–133
- Statistical populations vs. individuals, 35–36, 92–93, 180
- Statistical vs. individualized decisions, public preference and, 35–36
- Stories. *See* Patient care vignettes

- Studies on health care priorities
 bioethics group members study (Ubel), 79–81
 blood test study, 93
 case vignettes survey (Asch), 126–128
 colon cancer screening vignette (Ubel), 79–81, 81*f*, 87–91, 88*f*, 90*f*
 critical care professionals study, 56, 57
 Fowler et al. rating study, 58–59
 Nord study of public values, 70–73, 71*f*, 74*t*
 pain pills follow-up study (Kahneman and Varey), 86, 89
 Philadelphia jurors survey (Ubel), 72, 73–74, 74*t*
 Rand health insurance study, 42–43
 transplant study (Loewenstein), 82–85
 utility assessment study (Ubel), 53–56, 54*t*, 55*t*, 70
 Suicidal patients, 59
 Sulmasy, Dan, 119–120
 Surgery, 37. *See also* Transplants; *and by procedure*
 Survival probability, 56, 57, 82–83, 92

 Technologies, new. *See* Medical advances
 Third-party payers, 45, 105, 110, 121, 138, 174. *See also* Administrative rationing mechanisms
 bedside rationing and, 150–151, 176–177
 responding to medical advances, 175–176
 TMJ (temporomandibular joint)
 splints, 52
 Tonsillectomy, 37
 “Tragic choices,” 20–21
 Transfusions, 179–180
 Transplants
 allocation of scarce organs, 22, 81–85, 118
 blood test vignette study, 93
 bone marrow, 107
 bone marrow (Coby Howard story), 3–4, 18, 22, 46
 kidney, 62–63
 liver, 22
 retransplants, 85
 Transplant study (Loewenstein), 82–85
 Treatment (medical), 18, 33–34, 35–36, 55. *See also* Life saving interventions; Medical advances; *and by technology or intervention*
 alternative characterizations of, 125, 129, 135, 136
 distinguishing between necessary and beneficial, 14*f*, 15*f*, 24–30, 27–28, 29*f*, 43, 45, 177
 marginal or infinitesimal benefits, 108, 148–149, 177–178
 Treatment outcomes, 30, 72–76, 83, 118. *See also* Quality-of-life factored in CEA, 7, 15–158
 improving disability levels, 71*f*
 reversibility of disorder, 57
 survival probability, 56, 57, 82–83, 92
 Treatment. *See* Treatment (medical)
 Triage policies, 70
 Trust between patient and physician, 102–103, 139–143. *See also* Physician-patient relationship

 Ubel, Peter A., and colleagues
 bioethics group members study, 79–81
 cervical cancer screening vignette, 126–128, 128*f*
 colon cancer screening vignette, 79–81, 81*f*, 87–91, 88*f*, 90*f*
 organ allocation survey, 82–85
 Philadelphia jurors’ survey, 72, 73–74, 74*t*

- Ubel, Peter A. (cont.)
 utility assessment study, 53–56, 54*t*,
 55*t*, 70
- Ulcer treatments, 147–148, 150
- Uninsured or underinsured people,
 28, 39
- United Kingdom, 177
- Urinary tract problems, 117, 120
- Utilitarianism, medical, 67–68. *See*
also Cost-effectiveness analysis
 (CEA)
- Utility assessment, 64–65, 70
 aggregate nature of, 57–58
 health utility maximization goal, 55–
 56, 78–79, 85
 not predictive of rationing deci-
 sions, 53–56, 55*t*, 70
 person trade-off method (PTO),
 165, 168
- Utility assessment study (Ubel), 53–
 56, 54*t*, 55*t*, 70
- Utility-elicitation methods, 50–51
 standard gamble method, 52, 54*t*,
 55*t*
 time trade-off method, 52, 54*t*, 55*t*
 utility rating scale, 51–52, 54*t*, 55*t*
- Utilization reviews, 45, 105, 106,
 110, 121, 177
- Value judgements, 27, 94. *See also*
 Framing effects
 about patients' quality-of-life, 179–
 180
 in determining necessary (vs.
 beneficial) treatment, 24–30, 29*f*
- Veatch, Robert, 112–113
- Veterans Administration (VA) sys-
 tem, 106, 140–141, 181
- Viagra, 106, 174
- Wasteful practice elimination, 11, 37–
 40, 115
- Wording. *See* Linguistic factors
- Yaari, M. E., and M. Bar-Hillel
 (1991), pain pills study, 85–86