The Globalization of Managerial Innovation in Health Care

In 1983, the first patient classification system to be used on a national basis, the Diagnosis Related Groups (DRGs), was adopted as part of the Prospective Payment System in the United States. This system caught the attention of health policy makers in other countries, and a number of them began to implement similar approaches. What motivated them to adopt these systems? What similarities and differences were there among their experiences in implementing these systems? What can we learn about introducing change into national health systems by comparing their experiences?

The Globalization of Managerial Innovation in Health Care answers these and other questions by examining patient classification systems in fifteen different countries throughout the world. The result is a remarkable collection of case studies of how change can be introduced effectively into national health systems as well as a careful synthesis of what can be learned from them.
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