

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Patient Preferences for Diagnostic Imaging Services: Decentralize or not?

Decentralizing Imaging Services

Eline M. van den Broek-Altenburg, Ph.D.¹ * ; Jamie S. Benson, BA²; Adam J. Atherly, Ph.D. ³;
Kristen K. DeStigter, MD¹

¹University of Vermont, Larner College of Medicine

²University of Pennsylvania, Perelman School of Medicine

³ Virginia Commonwealth University, College of Health Professions

*Corresponding author

111 Colchester Avenue

Burlington, VT 05401

Eline.altenburg@med.uvm.edu

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

30 **Abstract (250)**

31 The objective of this study was to identify patient preferences for outpatient diagnostic
32 imaging services and analyze how patients make trade-offs between attributes of these
33 services using a discrete choice experiment (DCE).

34 We used a DCE with 14 choice questions asking which imaging locations patients would
35 prefer. We used latent class analysis to analyze preference heterogeneity between different
36 patient groups and to estimate the relative value they assign to different attributes of
37 imaging services.

38 Our analysis showed that the “Experienced Patients” subgroup generally value diagnostic
39 imaging services in both acute and chronic situations and had a strong preference for
40 hospital outpatient radiology departments (HORD) that would provide services at lower
41 costs, where their images would be interpreted by a specialty radiologist, the clinic would be
42 recommended by their PCP, online scheduling would be available, service rating were higher,
43 and travel and wait times would be shorter. New Patients significantly valued the service
44 rating of the hospital outpatient radiology departments (HORD) and online scheduling.

45 HORDs can be more competitive by providing services that live up to expectations better
46 than available retail radiology clinics (RRCs). Most RRCs do not currently offer online
47 scheduling so ease of use may also steer patients towards HORDs. HORDs have the
48 advantage of being linked to the main medical center which has the reputation of having
49 clinical expertise and more sophisticated technology. We conclude that there is room for
50 medical centers to build HORDs that provide an appealing and competitive alternative to
51 current RRC.

52

53

54

55 **Introduction**

56 An important challenge for many hospitals and clinics is addressing the escalating diagnostic
57 imaging demands for hospital outpatient radiology departments (HORDs)¹. HORDs have
58 struggled to keep up with the increasing need for imaging, with MRI and CT imaging rates for
59 adults more than doubling from 2006 to 2016 ². This escalating demand for services, coupled
60 with an increase in patient complexity not only leads to increased costs, but also reduced
61 accessibility and quality. Delays in imaging at HORDs can also lead to delayed care delivery,
62 which can negatively impact patient outcomes.

63
64 Retail radiology clinics (RRCs) emerged from the general retail health clinics' market boom as
65 a potential solution to the imaging bottleneck effect of HORDs. RRC offer a variety of
66 diagnostic imaging services, typically at lower cost, at a decentralized clinic ³⁻⁵. RRCs have
67 gained popularity by cutting wait-times, increasing accessibility, and reducing costs ³⁻⁵.
68 Despite the increase in RRC utilization, price variability and unreliable quality of the
69 technology used, imaging interpretation and reporting of images have led RRCs to be labeled
70 as low-value substitutes to HORD services ⁶⁻⁸. For example, one study found significant
71 variability in diagnostic reports from 10 different RRCs performing an MRI scan of the lower
72 back on the same patient within a 3-week period ⁵. Another study reported that radiology
73 departments in tertiary care centers are frequently asked to perform secondary interpretations
74 of imaging studies, finding that discrepancy rates vary widely ⁶.

75
76 In parallel, hospital networks are struggling with care integration and coordination, as well as
77 maintaining quality standards across all departments and campuses within their network.
78 Some hospital systems are now looking at options to develop their own RRCs to provide
79 convenient and efficient locations, without sacrificing the technological or interpretation
80 quality, while leveraging the existing trust patients may have with their hospital system. This
81 is a potentially valuable innovation for patients, as they would be able to receive the “specialty
82 read” quality at locations with shorter wait times and lower out-of-pocket costs.

83

84 To successfully decentralize imaging services at a larger scale, however, it is important to
85 define value not just from the perspective of the healthcare system, but also from the
86 perspective of the patient. Despite widespread encouragement to incorporate the patient voice
87 in healthcare, developments such as RRCs are usually done without meaningful input from
88 patients ⁷. In the push for patient-centeredness, CMS recommends hospital departments
89 incorporate patient insight into their service quality measures ⁸.

90

91 Existing research on patient preferences in diagnostic imaging services is sparse, however, and
92 what exists is often contradictory ⁹⁻¹⁵. Though survey studies have explored from whom
93 patients prefer to learn their results and how (e.g., by phone, e-mail, or in-person), findings to
94 date have been inconsistent ^{9-11,16}. For example, one study found a majority preference for
95 learning results in-person and from a radiologist¹⁰ while another found that most patients
96 prefer to learn results from their primary care provider, over the phone ¹¹.

97

98 The objective of this study is to identify patient preferences for outpatient diagnostic imaging
99 services and analyze how patients make trade-offs between attributes of these services using
100 a stated choice experiment. In this study, we analyze patient's individual preference
101 heterogeneity for these services and study how preferences vary among and within different
102 patient populations.

103

104 **Methods**

105 ***Discrete Choice Experiment***

106 In this study, we used a Discrete Choice Experiment (DCE) to explore which attributes of
107 imaging services matter to patients and how they make trade-offs between these attributes. A
108 DCE provides the opportunity to estimate pair-wise choices and analyze marginal values for
109 the total value of a health service or good ¹⁷. The unique contribution of a DCE is that it allows
110 researchers to analyze the trade-offs that patients are willing to make, including options that

111 may not currently exist but could in the future. We do this by using a survey in which patients
112 answer a repeated set of choice tasks. In these choice tasks, they are asked to choose their
113 preferred option of three locations offering imaging services. The imaging locations vary by
114 different attributes and levels of those attributes. We explain this further in the paragraph
115 about the experimental design.

116

117 With the DCE, we can estimate the utilities that patients assign to different attributes of
118 imaging services. Utilities represent the total satisfaction or benefit derived from consuming
119 a good or service and the capacity of a service to satisfy patients' wants. To estimate the relative
120 utilities patients assign to different aspects of services, the DCE included 14 choice tasks. The
121 experimental design of the DCE was based on "prior" estimates of the utilities for attributes of
122 the choice which are calculated by using expectations on what the model parameters will be.
123 These numbers are based on sample data from a pilot and from the literature.

124

125 ***Qualitative Research***

126 To understand which aspects or attributes of imaging services are important to patients and
127 should therefore be included in the choice experiment, we first performed qualitative research
128 to identify key aspects of value to patients. This qualitative work defined the most important
129 attributes of imaging services to patients and provided the base for a DCE. We performed two
130 focus groups, each with 12 patients over the age of 18 who had received outpatient imaging
131 services in 2019 from a medium-sized academic medical center, at the main campus of a six-
132 hospital, two-state network in the Northeastern part of the United States. A question guide
133 aimed at understanding how patients perceive their radiology experiences led participants
134 through their focus group session. Questions were intended to be exploratory and were
135 sometimes followed by probes to allow differences between patient insights and experiences
136 to emerge. From the thematic analysis of the focus groups, we learned that important themes
137 included: overarching trust in system and referring providers; preference for transparent and

138 informative communication; personal interaction and compassionate bedside manner from
139 staff; and accessibility of radiology services and the facility. We also performed qualitative
140 research among leaders in the radiology department of the medical center who were asked
141 what they considered to be important to patients. Their suggestions provided additional input
142 for the stated choice design, such as the potential importance of wait time to be seen and
143 whether or not the location for getting imaging was recommended by patient's primary care
144 provider.

145

146 ***Experimental Design***

147 Two discrete choice experiments were designed to represent an acute patient's need (X-ray
148 service), and a sub-acute need using Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI service). Participants
149 were asked to imagine a situation where they were hurt and needed imaging services.
150 Participants were randomized between two arms with the following descriptions of the choice
151 situation:

152 • *Situation 1): "For the purpose of this study, suppose you hurt your arm and*
153 *your primary care provider wants to send you for an X-ray. You have three*
154 *options of locations where you can have your imaging done."*

155 • *Situation 2): "For the purpose of this study, suppose you hurt your back a*
156 *while ago, and are having persistent pain. Your primary care provider wants to*
157 *send you for an MRI. You have three options of locations where you can have*
158 *your imaging done."*

159

160 The DCE included 14 choice tasks where patients were asked to choose the imaging clinic they
161 preferred. Each choice task had three different clinics which varied by 10 different attributes,
162 which were determined by prior qualitative research. These selected attributes included:
163 whether the interpreting radiologist is a general or sub-specialty radiologist; whether the clinic
164 was recommended by their primary care physician (PCP); time to results; out of pocket cost;

165 wait time to an appointment; travel time to the clinic; parking costs; parking accessibility;
166 service; and whether or not online scheduling is available. Service is a multifactorial attribute
167 (e.g., staff attentiveness and facility amenities) combined into a star rating. The rating scale is
168 between one and five stars, with a five-star rating representing an excellent service and a one-
169 star rating suggesting a poor service, as rated by other hypothetical patients. Figure 1 shows
170 an example of a choice task.

171

172 Following the DCE choice tasks, we asked patients attitudinal questions on a 1–5-point Likert
173 scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. These questions were borrowed from and
174 validated by the national Medical Expenditures Panel Survey (MEPS) ¹⁹, a set of large-scale
175 surveys of families and individuals, their medical providers, and employers across the United
176 States. The questions focused on perceived need for healthcare, need for insurance, risk-
177 aversion, and perceived personal health status.

178

179 ***Data Source, Participants and Study Size Estimation***

180 Our data were sampled from an online Centiment panel between April 11, 2021 through
181 November 19, 2021, with a second sample between May 16, 2022, and June 24, 2022.
182 Centiment contacted approximately 472 individuals in the catchment area of a moderate size
183 academic medical center in a rural Northeastern part of the United States. Participants
184 completed written consent before continuing to the online survey questions. All data were fully
185 anonymized before shared with the study team. The Institutional Review Board at the
186 University of Vermont reviewed the study and determined it was exempt from full review.

187 Of the total sample, 268 finished the survey and met initial inclusion criteria (Age \geq
188 18): 134 were assigned to the arm X-ray group, 134 to the back MRI group. We excluded 98
189 subjects for failing consistency criteria, qualifying for a closed quota, failing a bot-behavior
190 check, or failing an attention (response quality) check, leaving a final sample of 170: 84 in X-
191 ray, 86 in MRI. As each subject answered 14 choice tasks, we obtained an effective sample size

192 of n=2,380 for modeling. We used NGene 1.2.1 (ChoiceMetrics, 2018) to estimate the
193 minimum sample size required for this study.

194

195 ***Statistical Methods***

196 We used a mixed logit model (ML) to estimate the probability of a choice alternative being
197 chosen, depending on the characteristics of the choice (attributes and levels) and the
198 characteristics of the chooser. We used latent class analysis (LCA) which addresses the issue
199 of unobserved preferences of patients by probabilistically segmenting a sample population
200 into different groups or “classes” based on a latent variable²⁴. Class membership is first defined
201 by a membership function including the indicator variables, after which the utility functions
202 of different classes can be estimated. All statistical analyses were conducted using Stata 18
203 (StataCorp LLC, 2023).

204

205 ***Latent Class Analysis***

206 The latent class conditional logit (LCL) model further extends the ML model by incorporating
207 a discrete representation of unobserved preference heterogeneity within groups in a
208 population. The LCL model might explain, for example, that patients who had previous
209 imaging services are more likely to fall into the class that is more sensitive to appointment wait
210 time, while older patients might be more likely to fall into the class that is more sensitive to
211 PCP recommendation.

212

213 **Results**

214 ***Descriptive Results***

215 A total of 84 patients answered questions about preferences for attributes of an X-ray; 86
216 people responded to the MRI choice questions. The summary statistics are reported in Table
217 1. On average, patients answering choice questions on X-ray tended to be female (60%),
218 white (91%) and live in rural areas (58%); about half had private insurance (46%) and

219 relatively few had met their insurance deductible (21%). Patients answering the choice
 220 questions on the MRI were generally similar, with 67% female, 96% white, 69% in rural
 221 areas, 45% with private insurance, 22% had met their insurance deductible. Patients
 222 receiving the X-ray choice questions had had an average of 4.8 previous images while MRI
 223 patients had had 2.9 .

224

225 *Table 1: Descriptive Statistics*

226

	X-ray		MRI	
Age (mean, sd)	46.0	(16.1)	47.8	(16.9)
Income (USD) (mean, sd)	\$48,425	(\$40,939)	\$47,444	(\$47,881)
Number of Previous Images (mean, sd)	4.8	(1.5)	2.9	(1.7)
Agreement: I don't need insurance (mean, sd)	1.5	(0.9)	1.7	(1.2)
Agreement: Insurance isn't worth the cost (mean, sd)	2.3	(1.3)	2.4	(1.4)
Agreement: I take more risks than others (mean, sd)	2.3	(1.2)	2.3	(1.2)
Agreement: I can fight illness without a doctor (mean, sd)	2.5	(1.3)	2.4	(1.2)
Agreement: I am healthier than others (mean, sd)	2.7	(1.1)	2.7	(1.1)
Gender Identity (% , n)				
Male	38.1%	32	32.6%	28
Female	59.5%	50	67.4%	58
Non-Binary	2.4%	2	0.0%	0
Race (% , n)				
White	91.7%	77	96.5%	83
Black	1.2%	1	0.0%	0
Asian	2.4%	2	2.3%	2
AIAN	3.6%	3	1.2%	1
Multiple	1.2%	1	0.0%	0

Ethnicity (% , n)				
Not Hispanic	92.9%	78	96.5%	83
Hispanic	7.1%	6	3.5%	3
Rurality (% , n)				
Urban	14.3%	12	14.0%	12
Suburban	27.4%	23	17.4%	15
Rural	58.3%	49	68.6%	59
Education Level (% , n)				
Less than High School	2.4%	2	1.2%	1
High school	27.4%	23	23.3%	20
Some college, no degree	25.0%	21	17.4%	15
Associate's: vocational	0.0%	0	3.5%	3
Associate's: academic	6.0%	5	2.3%	2
Bachelor's (BA, AB, BS, BBA)	23.8%	20	32.6%	28
Master's	11.9%	10	15.1%	13
Professional, Doctoral	3.6%	3	4.7%	4
Insurance Status (% , n)				
Insured - Private	46.4%	39	45.3%	39
Insured - Medicare	21.4%	18	24.4%	21
Insured - Medicaid	26.2%	22	23.3%	20
Uninsured	6.0%	5	7.0%	6
Deductible Status (% , n)				
Met	21.4%	18	22.1%	19
Unmet	44.0%	37	45.3%	39
No Deductible	34.5%	29	32.6%	28
Health Status (% , n)				
No Chronic Condition	50.0%	42	47.7%	41
Chronic Condition	50.0%	42	52.3%	45

227

228 **Mixed logit Results**

229 The results of the mixed logit model are shown in Table 2 where we separated results for X-
230 ray and MRI. We found that out-of-pocket costs, interpreting doctor specialty, whether or not

231 the clinic was recommended by the primary care provider, the wait time to results, the clinic
 232 service rating and online scheduling were all statistically significant and had the expected
 233 signs for both MRI and X-ray. Patients were less likely to choose a clinic if the out-of-pocket
 234 costs were higher and the wait time to results was longer, but more likely to choose it if images
 235 were interpreted by a specialty radiologist, the clinic was recommended to them by their
 236 primary care provider, the service rating was higher and if online scheduling was available.
 237 For X-ray, free parking was associated with a higher probability of choosing a clinic.

238

239 *Table 2: Results of the MMNL Model*

240

	(MRI)	(MRI)	(MRI)	(X-ray)	(X-ray)	(X-ray)	
	B	SE	95% CI	B	SE	95% CI	
Out of Pocket Cost	-0.004***	(0.001)	-0.005,-0.003	-0.006*	(0.002)	-0.010,-0.001	
Interpreting Doctor Specialty	0.732***	(0.116)	0.504,0.960	0.374**	(0.122)	0.135,0.614	
Clinic Recommended by PCP	0.626***	(0.112)	0.407,0.845	0.678***	(0.155)	0.374,0.982	
Wait Time to Results	-0.012*	(0.006)	-0.024,-0.001	-	0.013***	(0.004)	-0.020,-0.006
Travel Time to Clinic	-0.007	(0.006)	-0.004,-0.018	-0.018*	(0.008)	0.001,0.034	
Wait Time to Appointment	-0.014	(0.018)	-0.050,-0.022	-0.023*	(0.012)	0.000,0.047	
Clinic Service Rating	0.520***	(0.096)	0.332,0.708	0.451***	(0.126)	0.205,0.698	
Free Parking	0.150	(0.097)	-0.040,0.339	0.669***	(0.108)	0.457,0.881	
Clinic Parking Lot Distance	-0.041	(0.023)	-0.087,0.005	-0.011	(0.007)	-0.025,0.002	
Online Scheduling Availability	0.288*	(0.112)	0.068,0.508	0.375***	(0.089)	0.201,0.550	

*** p<.001, ** p<.01, * p<.05

241

242

243 The attributes that mattered the most to patients for both MRI and X-ray were specialty
 244 radiologist reading (0.732, standard error= 0.116 for MRI; 0.374, se =0.122) for X-ray);
 245 recommendation by the primary care provider reading (0.626, se=0.112 for MRI; 0.678,
 246 se=0.155 for X-ray) and the clinic’s service rating reading (0.520, se=0.096 for MRI; 0.451,
 247 se=0.126 for X-ray).

248

249 ***Latent Class Analysis***

250 Table 3 shows the results of the Latent Class model where age, gender, education, income,
 251 whether someone had more than two previous scans, whether they considered themselves
 252 healthier than others, whether they had private insurance and whether they were more likely
 253 to take risks than others were the indicator variables estimating the probability of class
 254 membership. We found that 54.7 percent of patients were in class 1 and 45.3 percent in class
 255 2. We found that females, older patients, whether they had at least two previous scans and
 256 those who were less likely to take risks than others were highly predictive of being in class 2
 257 ($p < 0.02$) which we therefore labeled as the “Experienced Patients” class. Those who had fewer
 258 than two previous scans were more likely to be in class 2 (2.7111, $p < 0.01$) as were male patients
 259 (-0.8479, $p = 0.02$) and younger patients (-1.7197, $p = 0.02$), which we labeled “New Patients”.
 260 The results show that someone who had a 1-point increase in the Likert scale for “more likely
 261 to take risks than others” was significantly more likely to be in class 2 (-3.1354.7277, $p = 0.01$).
 262 they offer at the centralized location.

263 *Table 3: Results of the Latent Class Analysis*

264
 265

	Class membership	Standard error
Male	-0.84793**	(.3791)
Income (ref: lowest income category)	0.1477	(.3979)
Age (years)	1.7196**	(.7559)
More than 2 previous scans	2.7110***	(.9873)
Education (ref: no high school)	-12.9818	(3.6767)
More likely to take risk than others	-3.1353***	(1.2389)

Private insurance	-1.0671	(1.1982)
Healthier than others	-14.4012	(10.5153)
	Class 1 (Experienced Patients) B (SE)	Class 2 (New Users) B (SE)
Costs > current	-0.1774*** (0.0367)	-0.2783 (0.1764)
Specialty read	0.35123*** (0.0419)	0.0525 (0.2753)
PCP recommendation	0.3890*** (0.0432)	0.1641 (0.2178)
Online Scheduling	0.1240*** (0.0419)	4.7541*** (0.4703)
Service rating	0.3033*** (0.0509)	0.1148*** (0.2636)
Time to Results	-0.0225 (0.0340)	-0.0289 (0.1763)
Travel Time	-0.1473*** (0.0324)	-0.2649 (0.1618)
Wait Time	-0.1165*** (0.0447)	-0.1271 (0.1968)
Access to parking	-0.0308 (0.0254)	-0.0509 (0.1829)

266
267
268
269

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .10$

269 When decentralizing some services away from the main hospital, the focus should be
270 on passing on the medical center's high service rating to the HORD and offering online
271 scheduling. Indeed, patients value easier access, shorter wait times and lower out-of-
272 pocket costs which the growing popularity of RRCs has shown. HORDs can win in
273 popularity by making sure they attain and retain high star ratings while offering better
274 access than RRCs. Primary care providers can potentially play an important role in
275 directing patients to HORDs for their diagnostic imaging services.

276

277 For patients in class 1 ("Experienced Patients"), costs (-0.1774), specialty read (0.3512), PCP
278 recommendation (0.3890), travel time (-0.1474), wait time (-0.1165), service (0.3033) and
279 online scheduling (0.1240) all had significant effects ($p < 0.01$) and had the expected signs. For
280 example, patients in the "Experienced Patients" class will be more likely to choose a clinic
281 location if it is lower cost, takes less travel time, has shorter wait times for results, if results
282 are read by a specialty radiologists, the clinic is recommended by their PCP, service is better
283 and online scheduling is available. Patients in the "New Patients" class only cared about online
284 scheduling (4.7542) and service rating (1.1149), but the effect size was relatively high. None of
285 the other attributes of the service would affect their choice.

286 ***Marginal Rates of Substitution***

287 Table 4 shows an analysis of the trade-offs patients were willing to make, known as the
 288 marginal rates of substitution. We found that for patients in the Experienced Patient class,
 289 even though most attributes significantly affected their choice for clinic, the effect size was
 290 considerably smaller than for the New Patients class. Experienced Patients were willing to
 291 pay: \$2 more than what they currently pay (out-of-pocket) to have their images read by a
 292 radiologist specialist; \$2 more to go to a clinic that was recommended by their PCP; \$0.70
 293 more for online scheduling; \$1.70 more for a 1-point higher star rating; \$0.80 more to have a
 294 clinic that would be 1 minutes closer than their current one; \$0.65 more for a clinic that had a
 295 1-hour shorter wait and \$0.17 more for a clinic that would decrease their walk-up time by 1
 296 minute. The New Patients were willing to pay \$17 more for online scheduling and \$4 more for
 297 a higher star rating.

298

299 *Table 4: Willingness-to-Pay (MRS)*

300

WTP for Attribute (\$\$)	Class 1 (Experienced Patients)	Class 2 (New Patients)
Radiologist Specialty	1.980	0.189
PCP Recommendation	2.192	0.590
Time to Results	-0.127	-0.104
Travel Time to Clinic	-0.831	-0.952
Wait Time to Appointment	-0.657	-0.457
Service Quality	1.709	4.005
Parking Accessibility	-0.174	-0.183
Online Scheduling Available	0.699	17.079

301

302

303

304 ***Attribute Importance***

305 Patients were also asked to rank-order the attributes in how they prioritized them when
306 making a choice for a clinic. This is usually consistent with the magnitude of the coefficients
307 in the choice models, but also allows us to see if there was any attribute non-attendance. This
308 means that when processing the attributes, some patients may not consider particular
309 attributes at all. The violin plot in Figure 2 shows the results of the question on attribute
310 importance. We see that the results are consistent with the ML results: the most important
311 attributes included interpreting doctor specialty level, PCP recommendation, and costs. There
312 was a small difference between the X-ray and MRI arms: among X-ray patients, service rating
313 and parking access also ranked highly.

314

315 **Discussion**

316 In this paper, we sought to identify patient preferences for outpatient diagnostic imaging
317 services. We analyzed how patients make trade-offs between attributes of services using a
318 discrete choice experiment. We explored patient's individual preference heterogeneity for
319 these services and reported how preferences vary among and within different groups of
320 patients.

321

322 In our base analysis, we found that specialty reading of images, PCP recommendation, lower
323 costs, travel time and wait time, as well as higher star rating (representing better service or
324 reputation) and online scheduling are all significant predictors of choice regarding where to
325 get diagnostic imaging services. However, when we segmented the sample population
326 deterministically, we found that males, younger people and more likely to take risks than
327 others only We termed this group "New Patients" as they had significantly fewer previous
328 scans and generally do not highly value health services. Insurance status, health status and
329 chronic conditions, education and income did not define class membership.

330

331 These results suggest that decision-makers looking to decentralize imaging services while
332 incorporating patient preferences for attributes of those services should differentiate between
333 the different patient sub-populations they are serving. This requires careful consideration of
334 patient characteristics as well as preferences. Overall, we found in this study that New Patients
335 care about the reputation or star rating of a clinic and online scheduling availability. But
336 additionally, Experienced Users – who will be the majority of radiology users – are focused on
337 wait time, price and recommendations from primary care providers. This is a concrete
338 message to medical centers seeking to decentralize their services away from the main hospital:
339 patients will want to know that the new location offers the same service level in addition to
340 convenience and will be relying on their primary care providers for advice, suggesting outreach
341 to primary care providers will be important for success.

342

343 ***Limitations***

344 Although Centiment used a quota sampling approach, the gender balance may not be reflective
345 of the total population, although we do not believe this is a major threat to external validity.
346 However, while our sample is largely representative of the larger population, we measure
347 intention for hypothetical choices and cannot say for sure that these consistently translate to
348 real-life behavioral trade-offs, especially in acute situations. More work needs to be done to
349 further explore factors that affect decision-making and preferences in these circumstances.

350

351 **Conclusions**

352 In this study, we analyzed the trade-offs patients make between attributes of radiology
353 services to inform decision-making around designing optimal HORDs. Our analysis showed
354 that a patient population can and should be segmented into subgroups that evaluate the value
355 of imaging services differently. The “Experienced Patients” subgroup generally value
356 diagnostic imaging services in both acute and more chronic situations and they had a strong
357 preference for a HORD that would provide services at lower costs, where their images would
358 be interpreted by a specialty radiologist, the clinic would be recommended by their PCP, online

359 scheduling would be available, service rating were higher, and travel and wait times would be
360 shorter. HORDs can therefore be more competitive by providing services that live up to these
361 expectations better than available RRCs.

362

363 New Patients significantly valued the service rating of the HORD and online scheduling. Most
364 RRCs do not currently offer online scheduling so ease of use may also steer these potential
365 future patients towards HORDs. More importantly, HORDs have the advantage of being
366 linked to the main medical center which has the reputation of having clinical expertise and
367 more sophisticated technology. We conclude that there is room for medical centers to build
368 HORDs that provide an appealing and competitive alternative to the current RRC. RRCs have
369 the risk of unreliable quality in the technology and imaging interpretation and it is therefore
370 desirable that HORDs provide the same or more benefits while maintaining the quality care

371

372 **References**

- 373
- 374 1. Levin DC, Parker L, Rao VM. Recent trends in imaging use in hospital settings:
375 Implications for future planning. *J Am Coll Radiol Internet*. Elsevier Inc;
376 2017;14:331–6. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jacr.2016.08.025>
- 377 2. Smith-Bindman R, Kwan ML, Marlow EC, Theis MK, Bolch W, Cheng SY, et al.
378 Trends in use of medical imaging in US health care systems and in Ontario, Canada,
379 2000-2016. *JAMA*. 2019;322:843–56.
- 380 3. Boland GWL. Diagnostic imaging centers for hospitals: A different business
381 proposition for outpatient radiology. *J Am Coll Radiol*. 2007;4:581–3.
- 382 4. Iglehart JK. The new era of medical imaging - Progress and pitfalls. *N Engl J Med*.
383 2006;354:2822–8.
- 384 5. Scott Ashwood J, Reid RO, Setodji CM, Weber E, Gaynor M, Mehrotra A. Trends in
385 Retail Clinic Use Among The Commercially Insured Internet. Available from:
386 www.ajmc.com
- 387 6. Herzog R, Elgort DR, Flanders AE, Moley PJ. Variability in diagnostic error rates of
388 10 MRI centers performing lumbar spine MRI examinations on the same patient
389 within a 3-week period. *Spine J Internet*. Elsevier Inc.; 2017;17:554–61. Available
390 from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.spinee.2016.11.009>
- 391 7. Kostrubiak, D.E., DeHay, P.W., Ali, N., D'Agostino, R., Keating, D.P., Tam, J.K. and
392 Akselrod, D.G., 2020. Body MRI subspecialty reinterpretations at a tertiary care
393 center: discrepancy rates and error types. *American Journal of Roentgenology*,
394 215(6), pp.1384-1388.
- 395 8. Johnson FR, Beusterien K, Özdemir S, Wilson L. Giving patients a meaningful voice
396 in United States regulatory decision making: The role for health preference research.
397 *Patient*. 2017;10:523–6.
- 398 9. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. CMS quality measure development plan:
399 Supporting the transition to the Merit-based Incentive Payment System (MIPS) and
400 Alternative Payment Models (APMs) Internet. 2016. Available from:
401 [https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Quality-Initiatives-Patient-Assessment-](https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Quality-Initiatives-Patient-Assessment-Instruments/Value-Based-Programs/MACRA-MIPS-and-APMs/Final-MDP.pdf)
402 [Instruments/Value-Based-Programs/MACRA-MIPS-and-APMs/Final-MDP.pdf](https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Quality-Initiatives-Patient-Assessment-Instruments/Value-Based-Programs/MACRA-MIPS-and-APMs/Final-MDP.pdf)
- 403 10. Basu PA, Ruiz-Wibbelsmann JA, Spielman SB, Van Dalsem VF, Rosenberg JK, Glazer
404 GM. Creating a patient-centered imaging service: Determining what patients want.
405 *Am J Roentgenol*. 2011;196:605–10.
- 406 11. Pahade J, Couto C, Davis RB, Patel P, Siewert B, Rosen MP. Reviewing imaging
407 examination results with a radiologist immediately after study completion: Patient
408 preferences and assessment of feasibility in an academic department. *Am J*
409 *Roentgenol*. 2012;199:844–51.
- 410 12. Cabarrus M, Naeger DM, Rybkin A, Qayyum A. Patients prefer results from the
411 ordering provider and access to their radiology reports. *J Am Coll Radiol Internet*.
412 Elsevier Inc; 2015;12:556–62. Available from:
413 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jacr.2014.12.009>
- 414 13. Mangano MD, Bennett SE, Gunn AJ, Sahani D V., Choy G. Creating a patient-
415 centered radiology practice through the establishment of a diagnostic radiology
416 consultation clinic. *Am J Roentgenol*. 2015;205:95–9.
- 417 14. Woolen S, Kazerooni EA, Wall A, Parent K, Cahalan S, Alameddine M, et al. Waiting
418 for radiology test results: Patient expectations and emotional disutility. *J Am Coll*
419 *Radiol Internet*. Elsevier Inc; 2018;15:274–81. Available from:
420 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacr.2017.09.017>
- 421 15. Kleij KS, Tangermann U, Amelung VE, Krauth C. Patients' preferences for primary
422 health care - A systematic literature review of discrete choice experiments. *BMC*
423 *Health Serv Res*. *BMC Health Services Research*; 2017;17:1–12.
- 424 16. Mühlbacher AC, Bethge S, Reed SD, Schulman KA. Patient preferences for features of
425 health care delivery systems: A discrete choice experiment. *Health Serv Res*.
426 2016;51:704–27.

- 427 17. van den Broek-Altenburg, E. and Atherly, A., 2020. Using discrete choice
428 experiments to measure preferences for hard to observe choice attributes to inform
429 health policy decisions. *Health economics review*, 10(1), pp.1-8.
- 430 18. AA. Hess, S., Rose, J.M. Should Reference Alternatives in Pivot Design SC Surveys be
431 Treated Differently?. *Environ Resource Econ* 42, 297–317 (2009).
- 432 19. Cohen, J.W., Cohen, S.B. and Banthin, J.S., 2009. The medical expenditure panel
433 survey: a national information resource to support healthcare cost research and
434 inform policy and practice. *Medical care*, pp.S44-S50.
- 435 20. McFadden, Daniel. "Conditional logit analysis of qualitative choice behavior." (1973).
- 436 21. Hensher DA, Greene WH. The mixed Logit model: the state of practice.
437 *Transportation*. 2003;30(2):133–76.
- 438 22. McFadden D, Train K. Mixed MNL models for discrete response. *J Appl Econ*.
439 2000;15(5):447–70.
- 440 23. van den Broek-Altenburg, E., et al., Exploring Heterogeneity in Moral Terminology in
441 Palliative Care Consultations. *BMC palliative care*, 2020.
- 442 24. Yoo HI. *lologit2*: An enhanced command to fit latent class conditional logit models.
443 *The Stata Journal*. 2020 Jun;20(2):405-25.
- 444 25. Train KE. EM algorithms for nonparametric estimation of mixing distributions.
445 *Journal of Choice Modelling*. 2008 Jan 1;1(1):40-69.

Figure 1 Example of a Choice Task in the DCE

	Clinic 1	Clinic 2	Clinic 3
Interpreting Radiologist	General Radiologist	Specialty Radiologist	General Radiologist
Primary Care Recommendation	Yes	No	Yes
Time to Results	18 hours	24 hours	30 hours
Cost	\$50	\$40	\$50
Wait Time	10 days	10 days	8 days
Travel Time	22 minutes	37 minutes	22 minutes
Parking Cost	Paid	Free	Paid
Parking Accessibility	7.5 minutes	12.5 minutes	7.5 minutes
Service	3 Star. ***	4 Star. ****	2 Star. **
Online Scheduling	Not Available	Available	Not Available
Which would you choose?	<input type="radio"/> Clinic 1	<input type="radio"/> Clinic 2	<input type="radio"/> Clinic 3

Figure 2: Attribute Importance

