Prior Authorization in the U.S. Healthcare System: A Payer-Centric Analysis of Strategy, Economics, and the Digital Future

Executive Summary

Prior authorization (PA) stands as one of the most contentious processes in the U.S. healthcare system, a focal point of friction between those who pay for care and those who provide it. From the provider and patient perspective, it is often characterized as a bureaucratic impediment that delays necessary treatment and adds immense administrative waste. From the health plan and payer perspective, however, prior authorization is a fundamental strategic lever for navigating the complexities of American healthcare. It is a core component of utilization management (UM) programs, designed to uphold the principles of the "Triple Aim"—improving patient experience and population health while reducing per capita costs. Payers view PA as an essential safeguard to ensure that care is medically necessary, safe, effective, and affordable, while also serving as a critical defense against the pervasive issues of fraud, waste, and abuse (FWA) inherent in a fee-for-service payment environment.

The operational and economic realities of PA are driving a profound transformation. The process has historically been reliant on manual, labor-intensive workflows involving phone calls and faxes, creating staggering costs for both payers and providers. Data from the Council for Affordable Quality Healthcare (CAQH) reveals a chasm in efficiency: a manual PA transaction costs a payer $3.41, while a fully electronic transaction costs a mere $0.05. This 98% cost reduction represents an astronomical return on investment for automation, explaining the industry's aggressive pursuit of digital solutions. The entire U.S. healthcare system stands to save an estimated $20 billion annually by fully automating key administrative transactions, with PA representing a significant portion of that opportunity.

This transformation is no longer optional. The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) 2024 Interoperability and Prior Authorization Final Rule has

established a new regulatory floor, mandating strict decision timelines and the adoption of standardized, FHIR-based Application Programming Interfaces (APIs) by 2027. This rule effectively makes automation a condition of doing business in government-sponsored health programs and codifies the technical standards pioneered by the HL7 Da Vinci Project. Early case studies of these new interoperable workflows demonstrate their power not just to accelerate approvals, but to eliminate unnecessary work entirely by providing real-time, automated checks on whether a PA is even required.

The next frontier is the application of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Generative AI. While basic AI is already used to automate rules-based intake and data extraction, advanced Large Language Models (LLMs) are beginning to tackle the cognitive labor of clinical review, summarization, and denial management. This technological leap promises further efficiency gains but also introduces significant controversy. Concerns over unregulated, payer-side AI leading to "batch denials" have created a new battleground for transparency and regulatory oversight, forcing payers to invest in "explainable AI" that can defend its logic.

In response to mounting regulatory and provider pressure, payers are also pursuing policy-based solutions to reduce friction. "Gold carding" programs, which exempt high-performing providers from PA requirements, are gaining traction at both the state and national levels. These initiatives, along with voluntary reductions in PA lists by major insurers, represent a strategic shift toward more collaborative, trust-based relationships. Ultimately, the future of utilization management appears to be bifurcated: for the persistent fee-for-service world, a highly automated, data-driven, and transparent PA process will become the norm. For the growing value-based care segment, the adversarial nature of PA will gradually be replaced by collaborative risk-sharing and co-management of population health. The challenge for payers is not whether to abandon prior authorization, but how to transform it into an intelligent, frictionless, and trusted component of a more efficient and effective healthcare system.

I. The Strategic Imperative of Prior Authorization: Balancing Cost, Quality, and Compliance

Prior authorization is not an isolated administrative task but a cornerstone of a health

plan's broader Utilization Management (UM) strategy. For payers navigating the tripartite pressures of cost containment, quality assurance, and regulatory compliance, PA serves as a critical, forward-looking control mechanism. While it is the source of significant provider abrasion, understanding its strategic rationale is essential to grasping its persistence and the direction of its evolution. From the payer's vantage point, PA is an indispensable tool for managing risk, upholding clinical standards, and protecting the financial integrity of the health plan on behalf of its members and employer clients.

A. Framing PA as a Core Utilization Management (UM) Strategy

Utilization Management is a comprehensive program designed to ensure that healthcare resources are used appropriately and efficiently.[1] It is a systematic process that encompasses three distinct temporal reviews: prospective, concurrent, and retrospective.[3]

1. **Prospective Review (Prior Authorization):** This is the process of evaluating the medical necessity and appropriateness of a service *before* it is rendered. It is the most visible and contentious part of UM, applying to specific drugs, advanced imaging, planned surgeries, and durable medical equipment.[2]
2. **Concurrent Review:** This review occurs *during* an episode of care, most commonly an inpatient hospital stay. UM nurses engage with the hospital's case managers to certify the need for continued stay and to facilitate effective discharge planning, aiming to prevent readmissions.[4]
3. **Retrospective Review:** Conducted *after* care has been delivered and claims have been submitted, this review analyzes billing accuracy, coding, and services that may have required but did not receive pre-authorization. It serves as a final check and provides data to refine future prospective review policies.[4]

Within this framework, PA is the primary proactive lever. Its purpose is to manage both potential overutilization (e.g., unnecessary, expensive procedures) and underutilization (e.g., ensuring patients receive evidence-based care instead of less effective alternatives).[1] Payers in both the public and private sectors, including Medicare Advantage (MA) and Medicaid Managed Care Organizations (MCOs), use PA to manage the use of services that are high-cost or have a history of being potentially avoidable.[5]

B. The Triple Aim: Ensuring Safe, Effective, and Affordable Care

In public communications and policy discussions, payers consistently frame prior authorization as a mechanism to achieve the "Triple Aim" of healthcare improvement. The industry's primary trade association, AHIP, states that PA is a tool used to promote "safe, timely, evidence-based, affordable, and efficient care".[8] This rationale is built on three pillars:

- **Safety and Efficacy:** A core function of PA is to ensure that the requested care aligns with the latest clinical evidence and nationally recognized standards.[8] This is particularly crucial for new technologies, genetic tests, and high-cost specialty drugs where clinical guidelines are rapidly evolving. By reviewing requests against these standards, payers aim to prevent the use of treatments that are outdated, experimental for a given condition, or potentially unsafe.[5]
- **Value and Appropriateness:** PA is used to steer utilization away from low-value services and toward higher-value alternatives. This can involve step-therapy protocols, where a more cost-effective drug must be tried before a more expensive one is approved, or directing care to the most appropriate setting.[5] Research has shown that PA programs can be effective in reducing the use of targeted services, such as high-cost diagnostic imaging and opioid prescriptions, where they have been linked to reductions in subsequent abuse and overdose rates.[5]
- **Affordability:** The most direct purpose of PA is to control healthcare spending.[5] By preventing unnecessary or inappropriate care, payers reduce their medical expenditures. These savings, in theory, are passed on to employers and members in the form of more stable and affordable premiums. This cost-control function is central to the value proposition that health plans offer to the large employers who are their primary customers.

This "quality and safety" narrative serves as a critical strategic communication tool. In the face of intense public and regulatory scrutiny, framing PA as a patient safety mechanism is more defensible than presenting it solely as a cost-containment measure.[8] However, this narrative exists in direct tension with the provider and patient experience, where PA is frequently perceived as a harmful delay to necessary care.[11] This creates a fundamental "trust gap" between payers and providers. The strategic challenge for payers is to validate the clinical benefits of their PA programs with transparent data, especially when provider organizations like the American Medical

Association (AMA) publish survey data showing that a significant percentage of physicians believe PA leads to negative clinical outcomes.[13]

Furthermore, the very existence of prior authorization is a direct and necessary response to the financial structure of the U.S. healthcare system. The predominant fee-for-service (FFS) payment model inherently incentivizes a higher volume of services, as provider revenue is tied to the quantity of procedures performed, not necessarily their value or outcome.[14] In this environment, payers deploy PA as an essential external check on this incentive, forcing a justification of medical necessity

before a payment obligation is created.[16] As long as FFS remains a dominant payment model, payers will view PA or a similar UM tool as an indispensable financial control. The gradual shift toward value-based care, where provider and payer incentives are more closely aligned around cost and quality, offers a potential future where the need for such adversarial checks diminishes, but this transition remains slow and incomplete.[14]

C. A Critical Defense Against Fraud, Waste, and Abuse (FWA)

Beyond managing appropriate utilization, PA is a key programmatic defense against Fraud, Waste, and Abuse (FWA). FWA is a significant drain on the U.S. healthcare system, with some estimates suggesting it accounts for as much as 25% of total healthcare spending.[17] PA programs are specifically designed to target services and items that are known to be highly vulnerable to fraudulent schemes. These often include durable medical equipment (DME), home health services, non-emergent transportation, and certain high-cost lab tests and drugs.[5]

The federal government explicitly recognizes PA as an FWA-fighting tool. The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) is actively testing new models to expand its use. The Wasteful and Inappropriate Service Reduction (WISeR) Model, for example, will leverage technology-enabled PA to target FWA in Original Medicare for services like skin substitutes and certain spinal implants.[16] This initiative signals the government's belief that a streamlined, modern PA process is a vital program integrity instrument.

The legal and financial consequences of failing to maintain a robust PA process are severe. A landmark case involved CareCore National LLC, a company that performed

PA reviews on behalf of Medicare and Medicaid plans. To avoid contractual penalties for slow processing times, the company instituted a program to simply "rubber-stamp" hundreds of thousands of PA requests without proper clinical review. This led to a $54 million settlement under the False Claims Act.[19] This case serves as a stark reminder to payers and their vendors of the immense financial and compliance risk associated with lax PA oversight. It underscores that PA is not merely a cost-management tool, but a required element of regulatory compliance and fiduciary responsibility to protect taxpayer-funded programs from improper payments.

II. The Engine Room: How Payers Operationalize Utilization Management

The execution of a prior authorization program is a complex operational undertaking, requiring a specialized departmental structure, a sophisticated technology stack, and a rigorous, evidence-based decision-making framework. The modern UM department functions as the "engine room" of the health plan, staffed by a multidisciplinary team of clinicians and administrators who apply national standards to millions of individual care requests. Understanding this operational machinery is key to appreciating both the sources of its cost and the immense pressure for its automation.

A. The Modern UM Department: Structure, Staffing, and Expertise

Contrary to the perception of an anonymous, bureaucratic process, UM departments are staffed by a diverse team of healthcare professionals. The goal is to apply the right level of clinical expertise to each review request in a structured and efficient manner.[1] A typical UM department within a health plan includes:

- **Clinical Staff:** The front line of review is composed of licensed clinicians, primarily Registered Nurses (RNs) and Licensed Practical Nurses (LPNs). For behavioral health requests, the team includes mental health professionals and licensed social workers.[1] These professionals handle the initial intake and review of PA requests against established clinical criteria.
- **Physician Reviewers (Medical Directors):** When a request does not meet the initial criteria for approval or requires a higher level of clinical judgment, it is

escalated to a physician reviewer, often titled a Medical Director. Crucially, any adverse determination (a denial for reasons of medical necessity) must be made by a licensed and qualified clinician, typically a physician with expertise in the relevant specialty.[10] This is a long-standing industry standard and a regulatory requirement in many states.

- **Administrative and Support Staff:** This group handles the non-clinical aspects of the workflow, such as data entry, routing of faxes and phone calls, and communicating decisions.
- **Organizational Structure:** To maximize efficiency, payers often organize their UM staff by line of business (e.g., Commercial, Medicare Advantage, Medicaid) or by function (e.g., intake, concurrent review, appeals).[1] Many health plans also form strategic partnerships with or outsource their UM functions entirely to specialized utilization management companies that possess deep expertise and scalable technology platforms.[3]

The very structure of the UM department reveals the human-capital intensity of the traditional PA process. The reliance on a multi-layered team of expensive, licensed clinicians makes UM a significant administrative cost center for the health plan.[1] This high labor cost is a primary economic driver behind the payer's aggressive pursuit of automation. Every request that can be automatically approved based on clear-cut data without requiring a nurse's review represents a direct reduction in the plan's Selling, General & Administrative (SG&A) expenses. The requirement for physician-level review for all denials is a particularly significant bottleneck and one of the most expensive steps in the entire workflow.[10] This reality explains why so much of the focus in PA automation is on improving the quality and completeness of the initial submission, thereby maximizing the probability of a first-pass approval at a lower-cost, automated or nurse-led level.[21]

B. The PA Lifecycle: A Three-Pronged Approach

As previously noted, prior authorization is the prospective component of a broader UM lifecycle. Payers manage utilization across a continuum of care through three distinct but interconnected review processes [2]:

1. **Prospective Review (Pre-Authorization):** This is the familiar PA process that occurs *before* a planned service is delivered. It is the primary focus of automation efforts and the main source of provider friction. The goal is to confirm medical

necessity, benefit coverage, and alignment with clinical guidelines upfront, providing financial certainty to both the provider and the patient before care is rendered.[2]

2. **Concurrent Review:** This review takes place *during* an ongoing course of treatment, most often for inpatient hospitalizations. UM nurses from the health plan engage with the hospital's care management team to review the patient's progress, certify the medical necessity of each additional day of care, and collaborate on a safe and timely discharge plan. A key objective of concurrent review is to prevent avoidable hospital readmissions.[4]
3. **Retrospective Review:** This review is conducted *after* care has been provided and a claim has been submitted. It serves multiple purposes: identifying claims for services that should have been pre-authorized, auditing for billing and coding errors, detecting patterns of FWA, and gathering data to inform and refine future prospective and concurrent review policies.[4]

C. The Foundation of Decision-Making: Integrating MCG and InterQual Clinical Guidelines

To ensure that UM decisions are consistent, objective, and defensible, payers do not invent their clinical criteria in isolation. Instead, they overwhelmingly rely on comprehensive, evidence-based clinical guideline sets licensed from two dominant third-party vendors: **MCG (formerly Milliman Care Guidelines)** and **Optum's InterQual**.[23]

These vendors employ teams of clinicians and researchers who systematically review thousands of peer-reviewed articles and research studies each year. From this evidence, they distill and codify standards of care for a vast array of medical conditions, surgical procedures, diagnostic tests, and therapies.[23] The guidelines are updated annually to reflect the latest advancements in evidence-based medicine.[25]

These guideline sets are the bedrock of the payer's UM operation. They are integrated directly into the payer's care management software platforms, such as GuidingCare or HELIOS.[23] This creates a standardized framework for decision-making. The typical workflow for a UM nurse involves receiving a PA request with supporting clinical documentation from a provider. The nurse then enters the relevant clinical data points (e.g., diagnoses, lab values, symptoms, prior treatments) into the MCG or InterQual software. The platform presents a series of specific, often yes/no or checkbox-style,

criteria.[24]

- If the submitted documentation demonstrates that the patient's case meets all the required criteria, the nurse is empowered to approve the request.
- If the criteria are not met, or if the case is ambiguous, the nurse does not deny the request. Instead, the case is escalated to a physician-level Medical Director for a final determination.[25]

This reliance on third-party, nationally recognized guidelines is a crucial risk-mitigation strategy for payers. First, it is far more efficient than attempting to develop and maintain a similarly comprehensive set of guidelines internally.[26] Second, and more importantly, it provides an objective and defensible basis for coverage decisions. In the event of an appeal or litigation, the payer can demonstrate that its decision was not arbitrary but was based on established, evidence-based standards used by health systems across the country.[24] This practice is intended to create a "common language" between payers and the thousands of hospitals and provider groups that also license the same guideline sets, which theoretically should streamline the review process by aligning expectations.[23] In practice, however, friction persists due to factors like incomplete documentation submitted by the provider, differing interpretations of the patient's clinical status, or fundamental disagreements between the treating physician and the guidelines themselves.

III. The Economics of Gatekeeping: A Payer-Centric Cost-Benefit Analysis

At its core, a prior authorization program is an economic proposition for a health plan. It represents a significant investment in administrative overhead with the express purpose of controlling the larger, more volatile expense of medical claims. The financial logic of PA hinges on a continuous cost-benefit analysis: the money spent administering the program must generate greater savings by preventing unnecessary or low-value care. This economic reality is the primary force driving the industry-wide imperative to automate, as the cost disparity between manual and electronic processes is immense.

A. Analyzing the Transaction: The True Cost of Manual vs. Automated PA

The industry-standard benchmark for the administrative costs of healthcare transactions is the annual Index report from the Council for Affordable Quality Healthcare (CAQH), a non-profit alliance of health plans and other stakeholders. The CAQH Index meticulously tracks the time and labor costs associated with manual, partially electronic (e.g., web portals), and fully electronic transactions. For prior authorization, the data reveals a stark and compelling case for automation.

According to the 2024 CAQH Index, the cost to a **payer** for processing a single PA transaction varies dramatically by method [28]:

- **Fully Manual (Phone/Fax):** $3.41 per transaction
- **Fully Electronic (HIPAA Standard):** $0.05 per transaction

This represents a staggering **98% cost reduction** for the payer when a transaction is fully automated. The savings for **providers** are also substantial, though their baseline costs are much higher, reflecting the greater labor involved in initiating requests [28]:

- **Fully Manual (Phone/Fax):** Approximately $11 per transaction, requiring an average of 24 minutes of staff time.
- **Partially Electronic (Web Portal):** Approximately $4 per transaction, requiring 16 minutes.
- **Fully Electronic (HIPAA Standard):** $1.88 per transaction, requiring just 4 minutes.

Despite this clear and overwhelming financial incentive for automation, the adoption of fully electronic PA has been frustratingly slow. As of 2019, only 13% of PA transactions were conducted via the electronic standard, though this number is gradually increasing.[29] This slow adoption, driven by a lack of standardized processes and provider workflow integration challenges, remains a primary source of the system-wide administrative waste and friction that defines the PA experience.[30]

B. The Macro View: CAQH Index Insights on System-Wide Spend and Savings

Zooming out from the individual transaction to the national level, the CAQH Index paints a picture of enormous financial stakes. The U.S. healthcare system spends approximately **$90 billion** annually just on the set of administrative transactions that

CAQH tracks.[31] The analysis identifies a potential annual savings opportunity of

$20 billion if the industry were to transition all remaining manual and partially electronic processes to fully automated, electronic ones.[31]

Prior authorization, alongside claim status inquiry, consistently ranks as one of the most time-consuming and costly administrative burdens for providers, representing a significant portion of this untapped savings potential.[33] The positive impact of automation is already being felt. In 2023, existing automation helped the healthcare industry avoid an estimated

$222 billion in administrative spending, a 15% increase in avoided costs from the previous year, demonstrating the accelerating power of technology to bend the administrative cost curve.[32] Recent data also shows a 3% reduction in the total volume of prior authorizations, potentially due to payers removing requirements for certain services, a trend that further contributes to reducing system-wide burden.[32]

Table 1: The Economics of Prior Authorization: Manual vs. Automated Transactions

Transaction Mode	Payer Cost per Transaction	Provider Cost per Transaction	Provider Staff Time per Transaction	Data Source(s)
Fully Manual (Phone, Fax)	$3.41	~$11.00	24 minutes	[28]
Partially Electronic (Web Portal)	*Not specified*	~$4.00	16 minutes	[28]
Fully Electronic (HIPAA Standard)	$0.05	$1.88	4 minutes	[28]

C. Impact on the Payer P&L: Connecting PA to SG&A Costs and the Medical Loss Ratio (MLR)

To fully understand the payer's perspective, it is essential to connect the operational costs of PA to the health plan's core financial statements, specifically the Profit and Loss (P&L) statement. The costs and benefits of a UM program directly impact two key financial metrics that are scrutinized by investors, regulators, and employer clients: the Selling, General & Administrative (SG&A) expense ratio and the Medical Loss Ratio (MLR).

- **Selling, General & Administrative (SG&A) Costs:** This category includes all of a health plan's non-medical operating expenses. The costs of running a UM department—including the salaries of nurses and physician reviewers, licensing fees for technology like MCG and InterQual, and administrative support—are booked as SG&A expenses. In a payer's public financial filings (e.g., Form 10-K), this is often reported as the "operating cost ratio".[35]
- **Medical Loss Ratio (MLR):** The MLR is a measure of the percentage of premium revenue that a payer spends on medical claims and quality improvement activities. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) established minimum MLR requirements, mandating that individual and small group plans spend at least 80% of premiums on care, and large group plans spend at least 85%. This rule effectively caps a payer's administrative spending and profit margin.

The entire financial justification for prior authorization rests on the trade-off between these two metrics. A payer makes a deliberate investment in SG&A (the cost of the PA program) with the explicit goal of reducing medical expenses (which lowers the MLR). For the program to be profitable, every dollar spent on SG&A for PA must prevent more than one dollar in medical claims. A 2019 study of Medicare Advantage plans confirmed this logic, finding that the financial savings generated by their PA programs exceeded the administrative costs to run them.[38]

This dynamic explains why payers are constantly analyzing utilization patterns to decide which drugs, procedures, and services warrant the administrative cost of being placed on the PA list.[5] It also illuminates the immense financial incentive for automation. The 98% cost reduction per transaction achieved through electronic PA [28] represents a direct, massive savings on the SG&A line item. This efficiency gain allows the payer to achieve the same or better medical cost control (MLR management) for a fraction of the administrative expense, thereby improving the overall operating margin within the constraints set by the ACA. The constant pressure to manage both the benefit expense ratio (MLR) and the operating expense ratio (SG&A), clearly visible in the quarterly and annual reports of major payers like UnitedHealth Group and

Elevance Health, places PA and its automation at the very center of health plan financial strategy.[35]

IV. The Automation Wave: From Electronic PA to Intelligent Interoperability

The healthcare industry is at a technological and regulatory inflection point that is forcing the long-overdue modernization of the prior authorization process. Decades of slow, voluntary progress are being supplanted by a powerful wave of change, driven by landmark federal rulemaking and the maturation of interoperability standards. The era of fax machines and phone calls is definitively ending, replaced by a new paradigm of real-time, integrated, and automated data exchange. For payers, this is not just a compliance exercise; it is the realization of a long-sought efficiency goal that promises to dramatically lower administrative costs and reshape their relationships with providers.

A. The Tipping Point: The 2024 CMS Interoperability and Prior Authorization Final Rule

Finalized in January 2024, the CMS Interoperability and Prior Authorization Final Rule is the single most significant catalyst for PA transformation in a generation.[39] It applies to a broad swath of the industry, including Medicare Advantage plans, state Medicaid and CHIP programs (both FFS and managed care), and Qualified Health Plans (QHPs) on the Federally-Facilitated Exchanges.[40] The rule establishes a new, mandatory "floor" for PA performance and technology adoption.

The rule's key mandates create a clear timeline for change:

- **Firm Decision Timelines (Effective Jan. 1, 2026):** Payers will be required to make PA decisions and notify providers no later than **7 calendar days** for standard (non-urgent) requests and **72 hours** for expedited (urgent) requests. This replaces a patchwork of state laws and payer policies with a consistent federal standard.[39]
- **Specific Denial Reasons (Effective Jan. 1, 2026):** Payers must provide a

specific, electronic reason for any denied PA request, regardless of how the request was submitted. This is intended to end vague denials and give providers actionable information for appeals or resubmissions.[39]

- **Public Reporting of Metrics (Beginning 2026):** Impacted payers must publicly report specific PA metrics on their websites annually. This includes data on approval and denial rates, processing times, and appeals, creating a new layer of transparency and a basis for comparison among plans.[41]
- **Mandatory API Implementation (Effective Jan. 1, 2027):** The rule's most technically significant provision mandates that payers implement and maintain a suite of secure, standards-based Application Programming Interfaces (APIs). A central component is the **Prior Authorization Requirements, Documentation and Decision (PARDD) API**, which must be built using the Health Level 7 (HL7®) Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (FHIR®) standard.[40]

These mandates are transformative because they make automation a practical necessity. It is operationally infeasible for a large health plan to consistently meet a 72-hour decision deadline at scale using manual, fax-based workflows. By mandating the use of FHIR-based APIs, CMS has effectively picked a winning technology standard, ending years of industry debate and compelling payers and Electronic Health Record (EHR) vendors to align their technology roadmaps. Furthermore, the public reporting of metrics will introduce a new competitive dynamic; plans with slower turnaround times or higher denial rates will be at a disadvantage when employers and consumers choose coverage.[41]

Table 2: Key Provisions of the CMS Interoperability & Prior Authorization Final Rule (2024)

Provision	Requirement	Affected Payers	Compliance Deadline
Decision Timelines	Return PA decisions within 7 calendar days for standard requests and 72 hours for urgent requests.	MA, Medicaid/CHIP (FFS & MCO), QHPs	January 1, 2026
Denial Reason Specificity	Provide a specific reason for all denied PA requests, regardless of	MA, Medicaid/CHIP (FFS & MCO), QHPs	January 1, 2026

	submission method.		
Public Reporting	Annually post specific PA metrics (e.g., approval/denial rates, processing times) on a public website.	MA, Medicaid/CHIP (FFS & MCO), QHPs	Metrics for 2025 must be posted by March 31, 2026
PARDD API	Implement and maintain a FHIR-based API to support electronic PA requests and decisions.	MA, Medicaid/CHIP (FFS & MCO), QHPs	January 1, 2027
Provider & Payer APIs	Implement FHIR-based APIs to allow providers to access patient data and for payers to exchange data when a member changes plans.	MA, Medicaid/CHIP (FFS & MCO), QHPs	January 1, 2027

Source:

39

B. Building the Digital Highway: The Da Vinci Project and FHIR APIs

The CMS rule did not emerge from a vacuum. It heavily leverages and codifies the pioneering work of the **HL7 Da Vinci Project**, a private-sector collaborative initiative involving leading payers, providers, and health IT vendors.[15] The project's mission is to accelerate the adoption of the FHIR standard to support the data exchange needs of value-based care and to reduce administrative burden.[15]

For prior authorization, the Da Vinci Project developed a suite of FHIR "Implementation Guides" (IGs) that define a new, intelligent workflow designed to be embedded directly within a provider's EHR. This workflow moves beyond simply digitizing the old process to creating a truly interactive and automated system. The three key IGs are:

1. **Coverage Requirements Discovery (CRD):** This IG allows a provider's EHR, at the moment a physician orders a service, to automatically send a real-time query to the payer's system asking a simple question: "Does this specific service, for this specific patient with this specific coverage, require a prior authorization?" The payer's system instantly responds "yes" or "no".[45]
2. **Documentation Templates and Rules (DTR):** If the CRD response is "yes," the payer's system doesn't just confirm the requirement; it sends back a machine-readable "smart questionnaire" based on the DTR IG. This questionnaire tells the EHR exactly what clinical data points (e.g., lab values, diagnostic codes, prior treatments) are needed to support the request for that specific service.[45]
3. **Prior Authorization Support (PAS):** Armed with the DTR questionnaire, the provider's EHR can then use the PAS IG to automatically pull the required structured data directly from the patient's electronic record, populate the form, and submit the complete, accurate PA request to the payer electronically. This eliminates manual data entry and ensures the payer receives all necessary information on the first pass.[45]

This three-step process represents a paradigm shift. It transforms PA from an opaque, retrospective administrative chore into a transparent, real-time clinical workflow event. The true value is not merely in automating the submission of the form, but in automating the discovery and documentation process itself, and most importantly, in preventing unnecessary work from ever beginning.

C. Case Studies in Interoperability: Early Results from FHIR-Based Implementations

The theoretical benefits of this new workflow are now being validated by real-world implementations. A landmark pilot project involving **Humana (payer), athenahealth (EHR vendor), and Availity (health information network)** demonstrated the profound impact of implementing the Da Vinci IGs.[50] The collaboration focused on creating an end-to-end, FHIR-based PA process integrated directly into the provider's

workflow.

The results of the pilot were striking [50]:

- **Massive Burden Reduction:** The CRD "real-time check" revealed that an average of **54%** of the orders that providers initiated PA for *did not actually require an authorization*. This single step saved provider staff an estimated **4,396 hours per month** that would have been wasted pursuing unnecessary PAs.
- **High "Touchless" Resolution:** For the authorizations that *were* required and submitted through the integrated PAS workflow, a monthly average of **70% were auto-approved** by Humana's system without any human intervention.
- **Drastic Time Savings:** The average time from submission to a final decision (approval or denial) for requests processed through the new system was just **26 hours**. This is a dramatic improvement over typical industry averages that can range from several days to weeks.

This case study provides powerful evidence that the Da Vinci workflow delivers on its promise. The greatest efficiency gain comes not from simply making submissions faster, but from using the CRD step to provide immediate clarity and eliminate more than half of the potential workload upfront. This addresses a core source of provider frustration—the opacity of payer rules—by making those rules transparent and machine-readable at the point of care.[45] It shifts the industry's focus from "How can we process PAs faster?" to the more intelligent question, "How can we avoid initiating a PA unless it is absolutely necessary and confirmed to be required?"

V. The Next Frontier: AI and Generative AI in Prior Authorization

While FHIR-based interoperability is building the new digital highways for prior authorization, Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Generative AI are providing the high-performance engines that will run on them. Payers are increasingly turning to AI to move beyond simple automation and tackle the complex, cognitive tasks at the heart of the PA process. This technological leap promises unprecedented efficiency but also introduces a new layer of controversy and a critical need for transparency and regulatory oversight.

A. Current State: AI for Automating Rules, Intake, and Document Analysis

For several years, payers have been deploying "traditional" AI—primarily machine learning (ML) and Natural Language Processing (NLP)—to automate the more structured and repetitive aspects of the PA workflow.[21] These applications form the foundation of modern PA technology platforms:

- **Intelligent Intake and Routing:** AI systems can ingest PA requests submitted through various channels, including faxes (using optical character recognition), web portals, and increasingly, FHIR APIs. The system can automatically classify the request, verify member eligibility and benefits, and route it to the appropriate clinical review queue.[52]
- **Automated Rules Adjudication:** An AI-powered rules engine can instantly check the CPT and ICD-10 codes in a request against the payer's vast library of medical policies and payment rules. This allows for the immediate, "touchless" approval of requests that clearly meet predefined criteria, effectively automating the logic of the CRD and DTR steps.[21] A recent McKinsey report estimated that this type of AI-enabled process can automate 50-70% of manual tasks, and one MCG client reported a 200-333% increase in PA processing productivity after implementation.[52]
- **Clinical Document Analysis:** NLP technology can scan unstructured clinical documents, such as physician chart notes or lab reports, that are submitted with a request. The NLP models are trained to identify and extract the specific key words, phrases, and clinical data points (e.g., "failed conservative treatment," "ejection fraction of 35%") needed to satisfy the payer's policy criteria, significantly reducing the manual chart review time for UM nurses.[21]

B. The Generative AI Leap: NLP, LLMs, and RAG for Clinical Interpretation and Denial Management

The emergence of powerful Generative AI, particularly Large Language Models (LLMs), represents a quantum leap in capability, moving from data extraction to data interpretation and generation.[53] Payers and technology vendors are now exploring use cases that target the most complex and labor-intensive parts of the PA lifecycle:

- **Clinical Summarization:** An LLM can be fed lengthy, unstructured clinical

documents and, in seconds, generate a concise, coherent summary that highlights the information most relevant to the specific medical policy being applied. This allows a human clinical reviewer to grasp the essence of a complex case almost instantly, dramatically improving their efficiency.[55]

- **Denial Analysis and Appeal Generation:** This is a powerful and rapidly emerging use case, particularly for providers but also for payers seeking to improve their denial processes. An LLM can analyze a denial letter, cross-reference it with the specific clinical policy cited, and then review the patient's entire clinical record to find evidence to support an appeal. It can then auto-draft a detailed, evidence-based appeal letter, complete with citations to the medical record and the payer's own policies. This has the potential to automate a significant portion of the highly manual, resource-intensive appeals and denials management process.[56]
- **Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG):** A critical advancement for ensuring accuracy and trust in healthcare AI is RAG. To prevent the "hallucinations" (factually incorrect outputs) that LLMs are prone to, a RAG-based system does not rely solely on its general training data. Instead, before generating a response, it actively retrieves factual information from a specific, trusted knowledge base—such as the payer's complete library of medical policies, the specific patient's EHR data, or MCG/InterQual guidelines. It then uses this retrieved, factual context to "ground" its generated output, making the response more accurate, verifiable, and trustworthy.[56]

The return on investment for these advanced AI applications is driven by their ability to automate the most expensive component of the PA process: the time of licensed clinical reviewers.[1] While basic automation handles data entry, AI and GenAI target the cognitive labor of reading, interpreting, synthesizing, and comparing complex clinical information against complex policy rules.[21] This frees up expensive human experts to focus only on the most complex, ambiguous cases that truly require their judgment.

Table 3: Use Cases for AI and Generative AI in the Prior Authorization Lifecycle

PA Lifecycle Stage	Technology	Payer Use Case / Benefit	Relevant Sources
Request Intake & Triage	Robotic Process Automation (RPA), Optical Character	Automate data extraction from faxes and portals; route	[22]

	Recognition (OCR)	requests to the correct clinical queue.	
Rules Adjudication	Machine Learning (ML) Rules Engines	Instantly check requests against eligibility, benefit, and medical policy rules for "touchless" auto-approvals.	[21]
Clinical Review Support	Natural Language Processing (NLP)	Extract key clinical concepts and data points from unstructured physician notes to pre-populate review criteria.	[21]
Clinical Review Support	Generative AI (LLMs with RAG)	Generate concise summaries of lengthy clinical records, highlighting information relevant to the PA request.	[55]
Decision Communication	Generative AI (LLMs)	Auto-draft clear, specific, and policy-compliant approval or denial notification letters for members and providers.	[52]
Denial & Appeal Management	Generative AI (LLMs with RAG)	Analyze denial reasons, cross-reference with policy and clinical data, and identify grounds for appeal.	[56]

C. Navigating the Controversy: Addressing Concerns of AI-Driven "Batch Denials"

The rapid deployment of AI in utilization management has not been without significant controversy. There is a growing and profound fear among providers that payers are using these powerful new tools not just for efficiency, but as a mechanism to systematically deny care with little or no meaningful human oversight.[13]

This concern is backed by alarming data. A 2025 AMA survey found that **61% of physicians** believe that payers' use of unregulated AI is leading to an increase in PA denials.[13] This sentiment was amplified by a 2024 U.S. Senate committee report which cited instances of AI tools producing care denial rates

16 times higher than what is typical.[13] These statistics fuel a narrative of AI being used to create "systematic batch denials" that override sound medical judgment and harm patients.[13]

This has created a major trust deficit and a new regulatory battleground. The core of the issue is the "black box" problem: providers feel they are arguing with an opaque algorithm whose logic they cannot understand, question, or appeal effectively. The key distinction, often lost in the debate, is *how* the AI is being applied. Provider-side AI is typically designed to help build a complete and accurate submission that is more likely to be approved. Payer-side AI, however, is often perceived as a tool designed to find any possible reason, however minor, to deny a request.[21]

Regulators are moving swiftly to address this. The CMS Final Rule contains provisions that are a direct response to these concerns, requiring impacted payers to publicly disclose their use of AI and other technologies in making PA determinations and to report specific metrics on AI-driven denials.[41] This is a watershed moment. It signals the end of the era of unaccountable AI in utilization management. Payers now face a new compliance burden and a significant strategic challenge: they must be able to explain and defend the logic of their algorithms, not just the final clinical decision. This will inevitably drive the industry toward more "explainable AI" (XAI) and RAG-based systems, which can provide clear, auditable citations for their outputs, opening the black box to regulatory and provider scrutiny.[56]

VI. The Path Forward: Reimagining Payer-Provider Collaboration

The intense pressure from providers, patients, and policymakers is forcing a strategic evolution in how payers approach utilization management. Beyond pure technological automation, payers are increasingly exploring policy-based and collaborative models designed to reduce friction, build trust, and align incentives with their provider networks. This path forward involves a multi-pronged strategy that includes rewarding high-performing providers, embracing value-based payment models, and making good on public pledges to reduce the overall PA burden.

A. Reducing Friction Through Policy: The Rise of "Gold Carding"

One of the most prominent policy innovations is "gold carding," a concept that exempts providers with a proven track record of appropriate ordering from PA requirements for specific services.[58] The underlying principle, long advocated for by the AMA and other provider groups, is to shift the focus of UM from a universal requirement to a targeted intervention aimed at "outlier" providers whose ordering patterns differ significantly from their peers.[58]

This concept has rapidly moved from theory to practice:

- **State Legislation:** A wave of states has passed gold carding laws. As of late 2024, at least eight states—including Arkansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Texas, and West Virginia—have enacted such legislation, though the specific requirements and effective dates vary.[59] The Texas law, a frequently cited model, grants a 12-month PA exemption for a service to physicians who achieve a 90% approval rate for that service over a six-month period.[20]
- **Voluntary Payer Programs:** Recognizing the strategic value of reducing provider abrasion, major national payers have launched their own voluntary gold card programs. In 2024, UnitedHealthcare (UHC) rolled out a national program that applies across its Commercial, MA, and Medicaid plans. To qualify, a provider group must demonstrate a prior authorization approval rate of 92% or higher for eligible services over two consecutive years.[60] Highmark has also implemented a program, publishing a list of over 20,000 "Gold Carded Clinicians" and the specific procedures for which they are exempt.[59]

These programs represent a form of strategic appeasement and pre-emptive action by payers. The provider backlash against PA had reached a boiling point, fueling a cascade of state-level legislative efforts and the persistent threat of more restrictive

federal action.[58] By voluntarily creating gold card programs, payers can shape the narrative, appearing proactive and collaborative. This may head off the imposition of more rigid, one-size-fits-all government mandates. It is a calculated concession: payers relinquish PA oversight on their highest-performing providers—for whom the denial rates, and thus the cost-saving value of PA, are already minimal—in exchange for significant goodwill, improved provider relations, and reduced political pressure. However, a current limitation of many of these programs is the exclusion of most prescription drugs, which constitute a major source of PA volume and provider frustration.[59]

Table 4: A Comparative Look at "Gold Carding" Initiatives

Initiative	Approval Rate Threshold	Lookback / Volume Requirement	Exemption Duration	Scope / Exclusions	Data Source(s)
Texas (HB 1271)	90%	6-month period (min. 5 requests for a service)	12 months	Applies to state-regulated plans.	[20]
Arkansas (AR Code § 23-99-11)	90%	12-month period	12 months	Providers can be re-evaluated; plans can seek exemption from state if they have other volume-reducing programs.	[20]
UnitedHealthcare (National Program)	92%	Two consecutive years (min. 10 eligible PAs per year)	Not specified	Applies to Commercial, MA, Medicaid. Excludes delegated	[59]

				membership.	
Highmark (Regional Program)	99%	Not specified (min. 5 cases per modality)	Not specified	Applies to Commercial, ACA, MA plans. Publishes list of exempt clinicians and procedures.	[59]
West Virginia (Legislation)	90%	6-month period	12 months	Excludes prescription medications.	[59]

B. Aligning Incentives: The Role of Value-Based Care (VBC) Models

As established, prior authorization is fundamentally a mechanism to counteract the volume-driving incentives of FFS medicine. A more holistic and sustainable solution is to change the incentives themselves through Value-Based Care (VBC) models.[14]

In arrangements like Accountable Care Organizations (ACOs), bundled payments, or capitation, providers share financial risk with the payer for the total cost and quality of care for a defined population.[14] This creates a powerful, intrinsic motivation for providers to eliminate unnecessary tests, duplicative services, and low-value care on their own, without the need for an external, service-by-service check from the payer.[14] The focus shifts from authorizing individual transactions to co-managing population health.

Effective VBC fundamentally changes the payer-provider relationship from adversarial to collaborative. It necessitates robust, real-time data sharing to identify high-risk patients, coordinate care across different settings, and measure quality outcomes.[14] As this collaborative infrastructure matures, the traditional, confrontational UM processes become increasingly redundant.

This points to a bifurcated future for utilization management. For the large portion of the healthcare system that will remain fee-for-service for the foreseeable future, the

payer's optimal strategy is to make PA as automated, transparent, and frictionless as possible using the FHIR APIs and AI tools previously discussed. The goal is "intelligent gatekeeping." Concurrently, for the growing VBC segment of their business, the strategy shifts away from PA and toward partnership. The tools are no longer authorization portals but shared data analytics platforms, care coordination software, and joint governance committees that work together to manage risk and improve outcomes. A sophisticated payer's UM strategy cannot be monolithic; it must be tailored to the payment model and maturity of the provider network it is managing.

C. Industry Self-Regulation: Analyzing Payer Pledges to Reduce PA Volume

In the face of relentless pressure, the health insurance industry, led by AHIP, has made several high-profile public commitments to streamline prior authorization. A "Consensus Statement" was issued in 2018 with provider groups, and a new, more concrete set of pledges was announced in mid-2025, with signatories including UHC, Cigna, Humana, and the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association, covering some 257 million Americans.[10]

These pledges largely mirror the requirements of the CMS Final Rule, committing payers to [10]:

- Standardizing and accelerating the adoption of electronic prior authorization, with a goal of having FHIR API-based systems operational by 2027.
- Expanding real-time approvals, aiming for at least 80% of electronic PA approvals to be answered in real-time by 2027.
- Ensuring continuity of care by honoring existing PAs for 90 days when a patient changes health plans (effective 2026).
- Voluntarily reducing the scope of services and drugs that are subject to prior authorization (effective 2026).

Several major payers have already acted on this last point. In 2023, Cigna announced it was removing PA requirements from nearly 25% of its medical services, and UHC stated it had eliminated nearly 20% of its existing PAs.[59]

While these announcements are welcome signs of progress, provider organizations remain cautiously skeptical.[62] Groups like the AMA and the Medical Group Management Association (MGMA) point out that similar promises made in 2018 did not result in a significant reduction in the day-to-day administrative burden felt by

physician practices.[62] The ultimate measure of success for these initiatives will not be the press releases, but as the American Academy of Family Physicians noted, the "real changes in the day-to-day experiences of patients and the physicians who care for them".[10]

VII. Conclusion and Strategic Recommendations

Prior authorization, for all its controversy, is an entrenched and, from the payer's strategic viewpoint, rational response to the economic and clinical complexities of the U.S. healthcare system. It functions as a primary tool for managing medical costs, ensuring clinical appropriateness, and combating fraud and abuse within a fee-for-service framework that inherently incentivizes service volume. The payer's rationale, grounded in the pursuit of affordable, evidence-based care, has long been at odds with the provider's experience of administrative burden and care delays, creating a deep and persistent trust deficit.

However, the era of opaque, fax-based prior authorization is definitively over. A confluence of regulatory mandates, technological maturation, and intense market pressure is forcing a paradigm shift. The future of PA is not its elimination, but its transformation into a process that is automated, data-driven, transparent, and deeply integrated into the clinical workflow. The CMS Interoperability and Prior Authorization Final Rule has set an irreversible course, establishing firm deadlines and technical standards that make automation a prerequisite for participation in government health programs.

The central strategic challenge for payers is no longer *whether* to automate, but *how* to architect and implement this new generation of UM technology in a manner that rebuilds trust rather than deepens suspicion. The rise of AI, while offering profound efficiency gains, has also introduced valid fears of unaccountable, algorithm-driven denials. Navigating this new landscape requires a commitment to transparency, collaboration, and the adoption of policies that reward high-quality care.

Based on this analysis, the following strategic recommendations are proposed for health plan executives and strategists:

- **Aggressively Adopt FHIR-Based APIs:** Payers should view the 2027 compliance deadline for the CMS-mandated APIs not as a ceiling, but as a floor. Those who

move quickly to implement robust CRD, DTR, and PAS capabilities will gain a significant competitive advantage in provider network satisfaction and operational efficiency. Becoming the "easiest plan to work with" is a powerful differentiator in building high-performing networks.

- **Invest in "Explainable AI" (XAI):** The backlash against "black box" algorithms is real and growing. To counter this, payers must invest in AI systems, particularly those using Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG), that are transparent and defensible. The ability to provide a clear, auditable trail of how an AI-assisted decision was reached—citing specific medical policies and clinical data points—will be essential for regulatory compliance and for earning provider trust.
- **Proactively Expand "Gold Carding" and Reduce PA Lists:** Payers should not wait for state mandates to implement friction-reduction policies. Voluntarily expanding gold carding programs and regularly pruning PA lists of low-yield services are powerful strategic tools. They reduce administrative costs for both parties, improve critical provider relationships, and serve as a pre-emptive measure against more draconian government regulation.
- **Double Down on the Transition to Value-Based Care:** While intelligent automation can make FFS-based UM more tolerable, it does not solve the underlying misalignment of incentives. The most durable long-term solution is to accelerate the shift to VBC models. By sharing financial risk with providers, payers can foster a collaborative environment where the focus is on co-managing population health and total cost of care, making the adversarial, transaction-by-transaction oversight of prior authorization increasingly obsolete.

Works cited

1. UTILIZATION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM DESCRIPTION 2024 - Paramount Health Care, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.paramounthealthcare.com/-/media/ParamountHealth/Files/Providers/Documents-and-Forms/utilization-mgt-program.pdf
2. The Role of Utilization Management in Self-Funded Health Plans - MagnaCare, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.magnacare.com/blog/utilization-management-in-healthcare/
3. Utilization Management: A Cornerstone in Payer Efficiency - BHM Healthcare Solutions, accessed July 18, 2025, https://bhmpc.com/2024/01/utilization-management-review/
4. What is Healthcare Utilization Management? - Xsolis, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.xsolis.com/blog/healthcare-utilization-management-explained/
5. IMPACTS OF PRIOR AUTHORIZATION ON HEALTH CARE COSTS AND QUALITY, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.nihcr.org/wp-content/uploads/Altarum-Prior-Authorization-Review-November-2019.pdf

6. How to Optimize Utilization Management in Healthcare - ClickUp, accessed July 18, 2025, https://clickup.com/blog/utilization-management/
7. Prior Authorization in Medicaid | MACPAC, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.macpac.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/Prior-Authorization-in-Medicaid.pdf
8. Prior Authorization: Fast PATH - AHIP, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.ahip.org/prior-authorization-helping-patients-receive-safe-effective-and-appropriate-care
9. Prior Authorization - AHIP, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.ahip.org/issues/prior-authorization
10. Health Plans Take Action to Simplify Prior Authorization - AHIP, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.ahip.org/news/press-releases/health-plans-take-action-to-simplify-prior-authorization
11. Prior authorization delays care—and increases health care costs | American Medical Association, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/prior-authorization/prior-authorization-delays-care-and-increases-health-care
12. Don't fall for these myths on prior authorization - American Medical Association, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/prior-authorization/don-t-fall-these-myths-prior-authorization
13. How AI is leading to more prior authorization denials | American Medical Association, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/prior-authorization/how-ai-leading-more-prior-authorization-denials
14. Payer-Provider Collaboration: Key Strategies for Success - Atlas Systems, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.atlassystems.com/blog/payer-provider-collaboration
15. Da Vinci HL7 FHIR Project Implementation | Kodjin, accessed July 18, 2025, https://kodjin.com/blog/da-vinci-project-implementation-healthcare/
16. Medicare Program; Implementation of Prior Authorization for Select Services for the Wasteful and Inappropriate Services Reduction (WISeR) Model - Federal Register, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.federalregister.gov/public-inspection/2025-12195/medicare-program-implementation-of-prior-authorization-for-select-services-for-the-wasteful-and
17. CMS Launches New Model to Target Wasteful, Inappropriate Services in Original Medicare, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.cms.gov/newsroom/press-releases/cms-launches-new-model-target-wasteful-inappropriate-services-original-medicare
18. wiser-model-rfa.pdf - CMS, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.cms.gov/files/document/wiser-model-rfa.pdf
19. Prior Authorization Fraud Case Settles for $54 Million | Frohsin Barger & Walthall, accessed July 18, 2025,

https://frohsinbarger.com/medical-services-company-to-pay-54-million-to-settle-whistleblowers-prior-authorization-fraud-case/
20. 2024 Prior Authorization State Law Chart | AMA - American Medical Association, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.ama-assn.org/system/files/prior-authorization-state-law-chart.pdf
21. AI for Prior Authorization—How Does It Actually Work? - Jorie AI, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.jorie.ai/post/ai-for-prior-authorization--how-does-it-actually-work
22. [White Paper] Essential Guide for Prior Authorization Technology - Infinx Healthcare, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.infinx.com/white-paper/the-essential-guide-to-prior-authorization-technology/
23. MCG Health: Evidence-Based Care Guidance and Solutions, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.mcg.com/
24. Evidence-Based Criteria & Guidelines | InterQual® - Optum Business, accessed July 18, 2025, https://business.optum.com/en/operations-technology/clinical-decision-support/interqual.html
25. A Remote Nurse's Guide to MCG and InterQual, accessed July 18, 2025, https://nursefern.com/remote-nurses-guide-to-mcg-and-interqual/
26. Care Guidelines for Evidence-Based Medicine - MCG Health, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.mcg.com/care-guidelines/care-guidelines/
27. Best U.S. Healthcare Payer Care Management Workflow Applications Reviews 2025 | Gartner Peer Insights, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.gartner.com/reviews/market/us-healthcare-payer-care-management-workflow-applications
28. How Health Plans Can Improve Outcomes and Reduce Costs with Automated Prior Authorizations - HealthEdge, accessed July 18, 2025, https://healthedge.com/resources/blog/how-health-plans-can-improve-outcomes-and-reduce-costs-with-automated-prior-authorizations
29. Costs of prior authorizations increase for physician practices at an 'alarming' rate, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.katzbrunner.com/news/costs-of-prior-authorizations-increase-for-physician-practices-at-an-alarming-rate/
30. Most Expensive Administrative Cost for Providers? Prior Authorization. - Quadax Blog, accessed July 18, 2025, https://blog.quadax.com/the-single-most-expensive-administrative-cost-for-providers-is
31. CAQH Index Report, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.caqh.org/hubfs/Index/2024%20Index%20Report/CAQH_IndexReport_2024_FINAL.pdf
32. 2024 CAQH Index Foresees Major Opportunity for Health Care Savings, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.ajmc.com/view/2024-caqh-index-foresees-major-opportunity-for-health-care-savings

33. Administrative Transaction Costs by Provider Specialty - CAQH, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.caqh.org/hubfs/CAQH%20Insights_2023%20Index%20Report_Provider%20Specialty%20Issue%20Brief_Final.pdf
34. 2023 CAQH Index Report: Insights for Healthcare Providers - UHIN .org, accessed July 18, 2025, https://uhin.org/blog/caqh-index-2023-providers/
35. UnitedHealth Group Reports 2023 Results - Document, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/731766/000073176624000023/a2023q4exhibit991.htm
36. elevance health reports fourth quarter and full year 2024 results, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.elevancehealth.com/content/dam/elevance-health/documents/earnings/4Q2024_ELV_Earnings_Release.pdf
37. The Cigna Group Fourth Quarter 2023 Release, accessed July 18, 2025, https://s202.q4cdn.com/757723766/files/doc_earnings/2023/q4/earnings-result/the-cigna-group-fourth-quarter-2023-release.pdf
38. Comparison of prior authorization across insurers: cross sectional evidence from Medicare Advantage | The BMJ, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.bmj.com/content/384/bmj-2023-077797
39. CMS final rule establishes prior authorization requirements, reducing burden and increasing interoperability - American Society for Radiation Oncology (ASTRO), accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.astro.org/news-and-publications/what-is-happening-in-washington/2024/cms-final-rule-establishes-prior-authorization-requirements
40. CMS Finalizes Rule to Expand Access to Health Information and Improve the Prior Authorization Process, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.cms.gov/newsroom/press-releases/cms-finalizes-rule-expand-access-health-information-and-improve-prior-authorization-process
41. CMS Interoperability and Prior Authorization Final Rule, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.aaos.org/globalassets/advocacy/action-center/aaos-interoperability-and-prior-authorization-final-rule-summary.pdf
42. CMS Releases Interoperability and Prior Authorization Final Rule - Holland & Knight, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.hklaw.com/en/insights/publications/2024/01/cms-releases-interoperability-and-prior-authorization-final-rule
43. Prior Authorization Final Rule Summary - McDermott+, accessed July 18, 2025, http://www.mcdermottplus.com/pdf/prior-authorization-final-rule-summary/
44. Points of Light 2023 Case Study 2 - InterSystems, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.intersystems.com/klas-points-of-light-case-study.pdf/
45. MuleSoft Accelerator for Healthcare - Use case 6 - Prior Authorization, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.mulesoft.com/exchange/org.mule.examples/mulesoft-accelerator-for-healthcare/minor/2.24/pages/4bs-4tz/Use%20case%206%20-%20Prior%20Authorization/?no_navbar=1&no_cookie=1&embedded=1&is_marketing=1
46. Da Vinci Prior-Authorization Support Project, accessed July 18, 2025,

https://www.healthit.gov/sites/default/files/facas/2019-03-20_Da_Vinci_Prior-Authorization_Support_Robert_Dieterle_508_0.pdf
47. HL7® Da Vinci Project Burden Reduction (CRD/DTR/PAS) and Clinical Data Exchange (CDex) Implementation Guides, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.healthit.gov/sites/default/files/facas/2022-02-10_Da_Vinci_Project_IG_Presentation_0.pdf
48. Use Cases and Overview - Da Vinci Prior Authorization Support (PAS) FHIR IG v2.1.0, accessed July 18, 2025, https://build.fhir.org/ig/HL7/davinci-pas/usecases.html
49. HL7 Da Vinci Project – Prior Authorization – Let's Build!! - FHIR DevDays, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.devdays.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Lets-Build-Prior-Authorization-DevDays-2020-Virtual.pdf
50. End-to-End Prior Authorizations Using FHIR APIs - Availity, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.availity.com/case-studies/end-to-end-prior-authorizations-using-fhir-apis/
51. Manual Prior Authorization Vs Automated Prior Authorization | Practolytics, accessed July 18, 2025, https://practolytics.com/blog/manual-prior-authorization-vs-automated-prior-authorization/
52. Finding Answers to Prior Auth Burden Reduction: Regulation vs. Automation - MCG Health, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.mcg.com/blog/2024/01/09/prior-auth-burden-reduction-automation/
53. The Impact of Generative AI on Prior Authorization in Healthcare - Launch Consulting Group, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.launchconsulting.com/healthcare-ai-impact-of-generative-ai-prior-authorization
54. Generative AI in Healthcare: Use Cases, Benefits, Challenges of GenAI and Trends 2025, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.johnsnowlabs.com/generative-ai-healthcare/
55. Generative AI in Healthcare & Life Sciences - AWS, accessed July 18, 2025, https://aws.amazon.com/health/gen-ai/
56. AI-powered automation of appealing prior authorization denials with John Snow Labs' Medical LLM, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.johnsnowlabs.com/ai-powered-automation-of-prior-authorization-denials-with-john-snow-labs-medical-llm-as-a-judge/
57. How AI is Revolutionizing Prior Authorization in Healthcare | Thoughtful, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.thoughtful.ai/blog/how-ai-is-revolutionizing-prior-authorization-in-healthcare
58. New physician “gold card” law will cut prior authorization delays, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/prior-authorization/new-physician-gold-card-law-will-cut-prior-authorization

59. Gold Carding – A New Approach to Improving Prior Authorizations, accessed July 18, 2025, https://phslrx.com/gold-carding-a-new-approach-to-improving-prior-authorizations/
60. How the UnitedHealthcare Gold Card program helps modernize prior authorization, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.uhc.com/news-articles/newsroom/gold-card
61. Transforming Payer-Provider Relationships: How Collaboration Can Reduce Costs and Improve Care Quality | Simbo AI - Blogs, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.simbo.ai/blog/transforming-payer-provider-relationships-how-collaboration-can-reduce-costs-and-improve-care-quality-3535211/
62. Major health insurers agree to reduce prior authorization burden for imaging and other services - Radiology Business, accessed July 18, 2025, https://radiologybusiness.com/topics/healthcare-management/healthcare-policy/major-health-insurers-agree-reduce-prior-authorization-burden-imaging-and-other-services
63. Health insurers move to streamline prior authorization process, promising quicker care, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.cbsnews.com/news/health-insurers-prior-authorization-blue-cross-cigna-united-healthcare/
64. Inside payers' latest plans to streamline prior authorization - American Medical Association, accessed July 18, 2025, https://www.ama-assn.org/practice-management/prior-authorization/inside-payers-latest-plans-streamline-prior-authorization