

Index

- Abbott Laboratories, 78, 99–100, 130
 Abbreviated New Drug Applications (ANDAs), 137–138, 171, 174, 195
 AbbVie, 172, 182, 187
 ACA. *See* Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA)
 Actavis Pharma, Inc., 81, 147, 188–189
 Administrative services only (ASO) contracts, 420
 Advanced practice registered nurses (APRNs), 248–249
 Aetna, 216, 420
 Affordable and Safe Prescription Drug Importation Act (proposed), 55
 Affordable Care Act. *See* Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA)
 Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Through Promoting Competition Act of 2019 (proposed), 92
 Agreements not to compete
 generic pharmaceutical firms (*See* Fair-share agreements, generic pharmaceutical firms)
 hospitals, 126–127
 no-poaching agreements (*See* No-poaching agreements)
 reverse payment settlements compared, 173
 Agreements to exclude rivals, 127–128
 Alabama Dental Board, 240–241
 Allensworth, Rebecca Haw, 238–240, 242
 American Medical Association (AMA), 273–274
 American Society for Reproductive Medicine (ASRM), 347–348, 352–353, 358–359, 365
 Amgen, 189
 Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC, 427–431
 AndroGel, 78, 172, 180–182, 187
 Andrx Pharmaceutical Inc., 177–180
 Anthem, 419–424
 Anticompetitive effects
 generally, 480
 buyer cartels, 3, 324
 deterrence of, 480–481
 exclusionary product hopping, 92
 horizontal mergers, 368, 389, 405–406, 415–416
 monopoly, 3, 15–17, 108
 monopsony, 3, 17–19, 256
 no-poaching agreements
 generally, 368
 buying power, effect on, 378–379
 employee allocation compared, 377–378
 market with small number of employers, 377
 punishment of, 480 (*See also* Clayton Act of 1914; Sherman Act of 1890)
 seller cartels, 3, 109, 115
 vertical mergers
 generally, 448
 bundling, 454
 downstream foreclosure, 448–449
 empirical evidence, 454–455
 incentive to unnecessarily increase demand, 454
 input foreclosure, 448–449
 procompetitive effects, combined with, 449, 462, 464, 468, 471–472
 tying, 454
 Antitrust damages
 estimating damages, 340
 generic collusion, 151
 no-poaching agreements, 380–381
 nurse labor market
 generally, 336–337
 class actions, proving damages in, 340–341
 estimating, 340
 measurement of, 337–338
 standard of precision, 338–339
 oocyte collusion, 359–362
 patent infringement suits, 197–200

- Antitrust Division. *See* Justice Department (DOJ)
- Antitrust injury, 29–30, 336
- Antitrust policy
 - generally, 4, 14, 479
 - cartels and, 25–26
 - deterrence of anticompetitive effects, 480–481
 - economic rationale for
 - generally, 14–15
 - monopoly, welfare consequences of, 15–17
 - monopsony, welfare consequences of, 17–19
 - monopoly and, 23–25
 - political foundation of, 19–23
 - private enforcement (*See* Private enforcement actions)
 - punishment of anticompetitive effects, 480 (*See also* Clayton Act of 1914; Sherman Act of 1890)
 - tension with patent law, 37–38, 68–69, 177, 183
 - vigorous enforcement, 481
- Antitrust standing. *See* Standing
- Approval of drugs
 - generally, 39–41
 - generic drugs
 - approval process, 128, 171–172
 - 30 month stay of approval, 171–172, 178, 194–195
 - Phase I trials, 170
 - Phase II trials, 170
 - Phase III trials, 170
 - Phase IV trials, 170
 - pioneer drugs, 169–171
- Arbitrage, 52–56
- Areeda–Turner* test, 110
- Arrow, Kenneth J., 41, 47
- Assertio Therapeutics, Inc., 185–190
- Australia
 - Pharmaceutical Benefits Advisory Committee, 58
 - Pharmaceutical Benefit Scheme (PBS), 58
 - pharmaceutical industry, price negotiations and, 58
- Backward integration, 443–444
- Bayer HealthCare, 130
- Bayh–Dole Act of 1980, 50
- Benco Dental Supply Co., 26, 131, 309
- Bertrand oligopsony, 255–256, 272
- Biden, Joe
 - insulin pricing and, 214
 - on no-poaching agreements, 383
 - prescription drug pricing and, 52, 55, 57
 - on vertical mergers, 461
- Bilateral monopoly
 - generally, 9, 279–280
 - basic model, 281–284
 - caveats, 284–285
 - collective bargaining by physicians
 - resulting in, 289
 - defined, 279–280
 - indeterminacy of equilibrium price, 282–284
 - lawful monopoly, in response to, 285
 - profit motive, 280–281
 - Sherman Act §1 and, 284–285
 - unlawful monopoly, in response to, 284–285
- Blair, Roger D., 469
- Blue Cross–Blue Shield (BCBS), 103–105, 127–128, 132–133, 418, 420–421
- Boczar, Linda, 124–126
- Booker, Cory, 59
- Brown Shoe Co., 459–460
- Bundled discounts
 - generally, 8, 36, 95–96
 - antitrust concerns, 97–99
 - antitrust remedies
 - generally, 112
 - monopoly and, 109–110
 - Sherman Act §2, 109–110
 - unbundling discounts, 111–112
 - defined, 95–96
 - discount attribution test
 - generally, 101–102
 - anomalies, 105–109
 - case-by-case application, 111
 - discounts deemed exclusionary even where multiproduct seller
 - earning profit, 106–107
 - equally efficient rivals, 102–104
 - examples, 102–105
 - excluded rivals increasing product breadth, discounts not deemed exclusionary, 108

484 INDEX

- Bundled discounts (cont.)
 - exclusion of rivals even where multiproduct seller earning profit, 108–109
 - pattern of business, relevance of, 105–107
 - per se* analysis inappropriate, 109, 112
 - primary and secondary health care services, 103–105, 111
 - product breadth increasing, discounts deemed exclusionary, 107–108
 - rule of reason analysis, 109, 111–112
 - small bundled discounts deemed exclusionary, 107
 - success of rival, relevance of, 104
 - tertiary health care services, 110–111
 - when discounts exclusionary, 102–105
- example, 97–99
- group purchasing organizations (GPOs), exclusion of suppliers and, 307–308
- in health care sector
 - generally, 99
 - Ortho Diagnostics v. Abbott Labs*, 99–100
 - PeaceHealth* standard, 101–102
 - Smith Kline v. Eli Lilly*, 100
 - Sugartown Pediatrics LLC v. Merck & Co.*, 101
 - Suture Express, Inc. v. Owens & Minor Distribution, Inc.*, 100–101
- monopoly and, 109–110
- predatory pricing distinguished, 96
- procompetitive effects of, 95–96, 112
- Sherman Act §2 and, 99–100, 109–110
- unbundling discounts, 111–112
- Bureau of Labor Statistics, 326, 328
- Bush, George H.W., 461
- Buyer cartels
 - generally, 323
 - anticompetitive effects of, 3, 324
 - Clayton Act §4 and, 345
 - defined, 10
 - no-poaching agreements (*See* No-poaching agreements)
 - nurse labor market (*See* Nurse labor market, collusion in)
 - oocyte market (*See* Oocyte market, collusion in)
 - Sherman Act §1 and, 21–22, 345
- California
 - Dental Board, 240–241
 - Healthcare System, 417
 - no-poaching agreement legislation in, 383
 - Preserving Access to Affordable Drugs Act, 192–193
- Canada
 - Health Canada, 55
 - National Health Insurance, 53
 - Patented Medicine Prices Review Board (PMPRB), 59–60
 - pharmaceutical industry in
 - arbitrage, 52–53, 55
 - price regulation, 59–60
- Cardizem CD, 177, 179
- Cartels
 - antitrust policy and, 25–26
 - basic model, 117–121
 - buyer cartels (*See* Buyer cartels)
 - cartel profit function, 118–120
 - seller cartels (*See* Seller cartels)
 - Sherman Act §1 and, 25–26
 - welfare loss from, 120–121, 150
- Cartia XT, 177–180
- Cellar-Kefauver Act of 1950, 458
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 207, 346
- Chamberlin, Edward, 224–225
- Chile, hospital-insurer mergers in, 450–451
- CHOICE Act (proposed), 58
- Cicilline, David, 92
- Cigna Corp., 149, 216, 419–424
- Class actions
 - generally, 31–33
 - class certification, 32, 335–336, 362–364
 - Clayton Act §4, 31–33
 - deterrence, 31–33
 - no-poaching agreements, 371
 - nurse labor market, collusion in, 335–336
 - proving damages in, 340–341
 - oocyte market, collusion in, 362–365
- Clayton Act of 1914
 - generally, 4
 - anticompetitive practices, 27

- class actions, 31–33
- generic drugs, collusion and, 151
- horizontal mergers and, 390
 - enforcement of, 407–408
 - health insurance, 422–423
 - physician practice groups, 424
 - as preventive rather than remedial provision, 390, 406–407
- mergers and, 27
- price discrimination, 26–27
- private enforcement actions, 27–31, 153, 336, 349, 357–358
- Section 2, 26–27
- Section 3, 27
- Section 4
 - class actions, 31–33
 - generic drugs, collusion and, 151
 - private enforcement actions, 27–31, 153, 336, 349, 357–358
 - standing, 28–31, 357–358, 361
 - treble damages, 151, 345, 349
- Section 7
 - horizontal mergers and, 390, 406–408, 422–424
 - mergers and, 27
 - standing, 28–31, 357–358, 361
 - treble damages, 151, 345, 349
- Coase, Ronald H., 434–435
- Collective bargaining by physicians
 - generally, 9, 256, 279–280, 286, 298–299
 - Alaska
 - generally, 290
 - active state supervision requirement, 294
 - clear articulation requirement, 290–293
 - competitive concerns regarding, 297–298
 - bargaining representative, 295–296, 298
 - bilateral monopoly resulting from, 288–289
 - competitive concerns regarding, 289, 296–298
 - as countervailing power against monopsony, 288–289
 - decreased availability of services as result of unequal bargaining power, 287
 - decreased reimbursement rates as result of unequal bargaining power, 287
- FTC and
 - generally, 299
 - market power and, 297–298
 - viewed as price fixing, 289, 296
- health insurance and
 - market dominance leading to calls for, 287–288
 - periodic appraisal of market, 297
- Herfindahl–Hirschmann Index (HHI) and, 297–298
- hub-and-spoke system, 298
- legislative proposals, 280, 290
- monopoly power, preventing, 296–297
- New Jersey
 - generally, 290
 - active state supervision requirement, 294
 - bargaining representative, 295–296
 - clear articulation requirement, 290–293
- New York, proposals in, 290, 299
- physician market, restrictions on, 297
- price fixing, danger of, 289, 296, 298
- Sherman Act §1 and, 290
- state action doctrine and
 - active state supervision requirement, 290, 293–295
 - clear articulation requirement, 290–293
- Texas
 - generally, 290
 - active state supervision requirement, 293–295
 - clear articulation requirement, 290–293
 - competitive concerns regarding, 298
- unequal bargaining power as perceived problem, 286–288
- unions, exclusion from right to organize, 279–280
- Washington, proposals in, 290, 299
- Collusion
 - by buyers (*See* Buyer cartels)
 - cartel profit function, 118–120
 - generic drugs (*See* Generic drugs, collusion and)
 - health care sector generally, 113–114, 117
 - insulin (*See* Insulin)
 - by sellers (*See* Seller cartels)
 - welfare loss from, 120–121, 150

486 INDEX

- Competitive bidding, 350–351
- Competitive concerns in health care market, 3–4
- Competitive distribution
 - generally, 439–442
 - backward integration, 443–444
 - numerical example, 442–443
- Competitive DRUGS Act of 2019 (proposed), 193–194
- Conglomerate mergers, 453
- Connecticut, proposals regarding collective bargaining by physicians, 290, 299
- Countervailing power
 - generally, 9
 - collective bargaining by physicians (*See* Collective bargaining by physicians)
 - monopsony, as remedy to, 277
 - unions
 - dentists excluded from right to organize, 121
 - increased bargaining power of, 286
 - independent contractors excluded from right to organize, 279–280, 286
 - physicians excluded from right to organize, 279–280, 286
 - right to organize, 286
- Cournot effect, 452–453
- Cournot oligopoly, 220–223, 469
- Cournot oligopsony, 255–256, 270–272
- Criminal Fines Improvement Act of 1987, 23
- Criminal sanctions, 342–343
- CVS Caremark, 218–219
- CVS Health Corp., 130, 215–216, 219
- DaVita Medical Group, 409, 469–472
- Demand elasticity, 42–45
- Dental hygienists, 246–248
- Deterrence
 - anticompetitive effects, 480–481
 - class actions, 31–33
 - deterrent function, 152–154
 - generic drugs, price fixing, 152–154
 - sanctions, 152, 480–481
- Diabetes
 - collusion in diabetes care, 130–131
 - glucose test strips, 130–131
 - insulin (*See* Insulin)
 - insulin (*See* Insulin)
 - statistics, 207
- Digital animators, no-poaching agreements, 370–371
- Discount attribution test
 - generally, 101–102
 - anomalies, 105–109
 - discounts deemed exclusionary even where multiproduct seller earning profit, 106–107
 - excluded rivals increasing product breadth, discounts not deemed exclusionary, 108
 - exclusion of rivals even where multiproduct seller earning profit, 108–109
 - product breadth increasing, discounts deemed exclusionary, 107–108
 - small bundled discounts deemed exclusionary, 107
 - equally efficient rivals, 102–104
 - examples, 102–105
 - pattern of business, relevance of, 105–107
 - per se* analysis inappropriate, 109, 112
 - primary and secondary health care services, 103–105, 111
 - rule of reason analysis, 109, 111–112
 - success of rival, relevance of, 104
 - when discounts exclusionary, 102–105
- DOJ. *See* Justice Department (DOJ)
- Dominant buyer model
 - generally, 255, 267
 - antitrust treatment, 277
 - basic model, 267–269
 - Lerner Index and, 269–270
 - nurse labor market and, 267–268
- Doryx, 78–81, 84–86
- Douglas, William O., 349
- Doxycycline, 27–28, 146
- Duke University, 323–324, 373–380
- Economies of scale, 385, 453
- Economies of scope, 453
- Egg donation. *See* Oocyte market, collusion in
- Eli Lilly
 - bundled discounts and, 100
 - insulin and, 130, 204–210, 214, 219–220, 226

- Elimination of double marginalization (EDM), 464, 468, 471–472
- Employee allocation, 377–378
- Employment in health care sector, 3
- Empowering Medicare Seniors to Negotiate Drug Prices Act (proposed), 58
- Epinephrine auto-injectors, 27–28
- Epi-Pens, 27–28, 218
- European Union
 - excessive pricing in, 51–52
 - generic drugs in, 195–196
 - pharmaceutical industry, arbitrage and, 53–54
- Exclusionary product hopping
 - anticompetitive effects of, 92
 - defined, 77
 - examples, 77–78
 - generic substitution, preventing, 74–75
 - litigation, 78–79
- Exclusive dealing and, 27
- Executive Order on Promoting Competition in the American Economy, 383
- Expenditures on health care
 - by health insurers, 2
 - prescription drugs, 37–38
 - statistics, 2, 5–6
- Express Scripts Holding
 - glucose test strips and, 130
 - insulin and, 130, 212–213, 215–216, 218–219
- Externalities
 - market failure and, 14, 230
 - market imperfections, 1
 - negative externalities, 452–453
 - price regulation and, 61
 - vertical mergers and, 476
- FAIR Drug Pricing Act (proposed), 62–70
- Fairness to Contact Lens Consumers Act of 2004, 242–243
- Fair-share agreements, generic pharmaceutical firms
 - curbing production, 145
 - increased prices resulting from, 146–147
 - market allocation, 145–148
 - monopoly pricing, 145
 - reasons for, 143–145
- Fast food franchises, no-poaching agreements, 371–372
- FDA. *See* Food and Drug Administration (FDA)
- Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs), 60
- Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, 32, 362–364
- Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914 (FTC Act)
 - group purchasing organizations (GPOs) and, 309, 370
 - reverse payment settlements and, 181–182
 - unfair methods of competition, 88, 91–92
- Federal Trade Commission (FTC)
 - generally, 4
 - Antitrust Guidance for Human Resources Professionals*, 341–343
 - collective bargaining by physicians and generally, 299
 - market power and, 297–298
 - viewed as price fixing, 289, 296
 - group purchasing organizations (GPOs) and, 300, 309, 315–318
 - on high market concentration, 273–274
 - Horizontal Merger Guidelines* (2010), 394, 396–397, 403, 409–410, 413–414
 - horizontal mergers and
 - Amneal–Impax merger, 429–431
 - Clayton Act §7, enforcement of, 390, 407–408
 - divestment, 409, 429–431
 - efficiencies and, 396, 399–400
 - review of mergers, 387
 - Sanford Health–Mid-Dakota Clinic merger, 424–427
 - monopoly and, 36
 - no-poaching agreements and, 368–369, 381–382
 - North Carolina Dental* case and, 236–239
 - nurse labor market, collusion in, 341–343
 - occupational licensing and, 231, 235–237, 246, 248–249
 - pharmaceutical industry and, 63
 - physician practice groups and, 122–123
 - product hopping and, 78, 92
 - reverse payment settlements and, 176–187, 190
 - Statements of Antitrust Enforcement Policy in Health Care*, 315–318

488 INDEX

- Federal Trade Commission (FTC) (cont.)
 - vertical mergers and
 - ability and incentive, consideration of, 463, 466–468, 471
 - balancing anticompetitive and procompetitive effects, 462, 464, 468, 471–472
 - divestment, 464–465
 - elimination of double
 - marginalization (EDM), 464, 471–472
 - evidence considered, 462–463
 - Illumina–GRAIL merger, 466–469
 - market concentration, 463
 - market definition, 463
 - review of mergers, 387
 - St. Luke’s–Saltzer merger, 474–476
 - UnitedHealth Group–DaVita merger, 470–472
- Florida, no-poaching agreement legislation in, 383
- Folk Theorem, 224
- Food and Drug Administration (FDA)
 - arbitrage and, 54–55
 - generic drugs and
 - Abbreviated New Drug Applications (ANDAs), 137–138
 - approval process, 128, 171–172
 - therapeutic equivalence, 137
 - 30 month stay of approval, 171–172, 178, 194–195
 - orphan drugs and, 67–68
 - Phase I trials, 170
 - Phase II trials, 170
 - Phase III trials, 170
 - Phase IV trials, 170
 - pioneer drugs, approval process, 169–171
 - product hopping and
 - Doryx, approval of, 84
 - Namenda XR, approval of, 82
 - OxyContin OP, approval of, 87–88
 - regulatory reform, 88
- Forest Laboratories, 81–82
- Franchise agreements, no-poaching
 - agreements, 369, 371–372
- Friedman, Milton, 64, 231, 233–235, 245
- FTC. *See* Federal Trade Commission (FTC)
- FTC Act. *See* Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914 (FTC Act)
- Galleri test, 465–466, 468
- Game theory, 224
- G&W Laboratories, 429
- Geisinger and Evangelical Community Hospital, 373
- Generic drugs
 - Abbreviated New Drug Applications (ANDAs), 137–138, 171, 174, 195
 - competitive promise of, 138–139
 - encouraging use of, 75–76
 - in European Union, 195–196
 - expedited entry of, 168, 171–172
 - FDA approval process, 128, 171–172
 - health insurance and, 139
 - incentives to use, 139
 - increased prices of, 140
 - insulin, 226
 - lower prices of, 136
 - mandatory substitution laws, 139
 - New Drug Applications (NDAs), 137–138
 - 180 day exclusivity period, 171, 195
 - patent infringement (*See* Patent infringement)
 - pioneer drugs compared, 75–76, 128
 - presumed consent laws, 139
 - prevalence of, 137
 - reverse payment settlements (*See* Reverse payment settlements)
 - “skinny label,” 76–87
 - state substitution laws and, 75–76
 - therapeutic equivalence, 76, 137, 171
 - 30 month stay of approval, 171–172, 178, 194–195
- Generic drugs, collusion and
 - generally, 8–9, 114, 137, 154
 - allegations of, 136–137, 142–144, 165
 - antitrust remedies
 - Clayton Act §4 and, 151
 - damages, 151
 - standing, 151
 - fair-share agreements
 - curbing production, 145
 - increased prices resulting from, 146–147
 - market allocation, 145–148
 - monopoly pricing, 145
 - reasons for, 143–145
 - incentive to collude, 140–141
 - price collusion, 140–141

- price fixing
 - allegations of, 148–149
 - deterrence of, 152–154
 - deterrent function, 152–154
- private actions, 149–150
- settlements, 152
- welfare loss from, 150
- Georgia Dental Board, 236, 240–241
- Germany
 - Federal Association of Sickness Funds, 57
 - National Association of Statutory Health Insurance Funds, 57
- pharmaceutical industry, price negotiations and, 57–59
- GPOs. *See* Group purchasing organizations (GPOs)
- GRAIL, 465–469
- Group purchasing organizations (GPOs)
 - generally, 9–10, 242, 301
 - antitrust enforcement
 - generally, 315
 - collusion and, 317
 - countervailing power and, 317–319
 - monopsony power and, 316–317
 - code of conduct, 309
 - collusion and, 317
 - competitive concerns, 319–320
 - countervailing power and, 317–319
 - DOJ and, 300, 309, 315–318
 - exclusion of suppliers
 - antitrust concerns regarding, 300
 - bundled discounts and, 307–308
 - competitive concerns, 309–310, 312
 - requirements contracts and, 307
 - sole-source contracts and, 307, 310–311
 - volume-based discounts and, 311–312
 - FTC on, 300, 309, 315–318
 - funding mechanisms
 - generally, 312
 - administrative fees, 313–315
 - anti-kickback rule, 314–315
 - antitrust concerns regarding, 300–301
 - membership fees, 312–313
 - hospitals and, 300
 - monopsony power
 - generally, 302–303
 - antitrust concerns regarding, 300
 - antitrust enforcement, 316–317
 - caveat, 306–307
 - GPO monopsony with competitive supply, 304–306
 - GPO with no monopsony power, 303–304
 - pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs)
 - compared, 216
 - prevalence of, 301–302
 - procompetitive effects of, 302, 319–320
 - statistics, 301–302
- Hart–Scott–Rodino (HSR) Act, 408–409, 416, 461–462
- Hatch–Waxman Act of 1984
 - generally, 110, 168–169
 - drawbacks of, 168
- generic drugs and
 - Abbreviated New Drug Applications (ANDAs), 137–138, 171, 174, 195
 - expedited entry of, 168, 171–172
 - 180 day exclusivity period, 171, 195
 - patent infringement (*See* Patent infringement)
 - reverse payment settlements (*See* Reverse payment settlements)
 - 30 month stay of approval of generic drugs, 171–172, 178, 194–195
- pioneer drugs and
 - challenging patents of, 168
 - extending patent life of, 168, 170–171
 - proposals to amend, 194–196
- Health and Human Services Department
 - group purchasing organizations (GPOs)
 - and, 314–315
 - pharmaceutical industry and
 - insulin, 60
 - price negotiations, 57–58, 61
- Health care reform, 6, 481
- Health Industry Group Purchasing Association (HIGPA), 309
- Health insurance
 - collective bargaining by physicians and market dominance leading to calls for, 287–288
 - periodic appraisal of market, 297
 - collusion in, 132–134
 - expenditures on health care, 2
 - “filed-rate” doctrine, 132
 - fragmentation of, 2, 4–5

490 INDEX

- Health insurance (cont.)
 - generic drugs and, 139
 - government-sponsored insurance, 2
 - horizontal mergers, 419–424
 - hospitals, mergers with, 450–451
 - market allocation in, 132–134
 - Medicaid (*See* Medicaid)
 - Medicare (*See* Medicare)
 - monopsony and
 - generally, 256–258
 - consolidation and, 274
 - economies of scale and, 274
 - high market concentration, 273–275
 - leverage power of insurers, 273
 - manipulation of market, 274–275
 - policy coverage, relevance of, 275
 - pharmaceuticals, effect on pricing of, 46–47
 - physician practice groups, mergers with, 469–472
 - price fixing in, 133
 - private insurance, 2
- Herfindahl–Hirschmann Index (HHI)
 - collective bargaining by physicians and, 297–298
 - horizontal mergers and, 413–415, 418, 426
 - monopsony and, 273–274
- High-tech firms, no-poaching agreements, 368–371
- Hold-up problem, 438
- Horizontal mergers
 - generally, 11, 385–386, 390, 406
 - Amneal–Impax merger, 427–431
 - Anthem–Cigna merger, 419–424
 - anticompetitive effects of, 368, 389, 405–406, 415–416
 - buyers, mergers to realize efficiencies, 397–401
 - competitive markets before and after merger, 398
 - Kaldor–Hicks efficiency and, 400
 - social welfare standard, 401
 - Williamson welfare trade-off, 398–400
- Clayton Act §7 and
 - enforcement of, 407–408
 - health insurance, 422–423
 - physician practice groups, 424
 - as preventive rather than remedial provision, 390, 406–407
 - defined, 389
- DOJ and
 - Clayton Act §7, enforcement of, 390, 407–408
 - efficiencies and, 396, 399–400
 - review of mergers, 387
- efficiencies of
 - generally, 385–386, 389–390
 - buyers, mergers to realize efficiencies, 397–401
 - increased quality, merger efficiencies resulting in, 401–403
 - sellors, mergers to realize efficiencies, 393–394
- evaluation of, 404
 - consumer welfare standard, 396–397, 403–404
 - social welfare standard, 401, 403–404
- FTC and
 - Amneal–Impax merger, 429–431
 - Clayton Act §7, enforcement of, 390, 407–408
 - divestment, 409, 429–431
 - efficiencies and, 396, 399–400
 - review of mergers, 387
 - Sanford Health–Mid-Dakota Clinic merger, 424–427
- Hart–Scott–Rodino (HSR) Act and, 408–409, 416
- in health care sector
 - generally, 431
 - examples, 405
- health insurance, 419–424
- Herfindahl–Hirschmann Index (HHI) and, 413–415, 418, 426
- Horizontal Merger Guidelines* (2010), 394, 396–397, 403, 409–410, 413–414
- increased market concentration resulting from, 389
- increased quality, merger efficiencies resulting in, 401–403
- increased market power and, 403
- quality defined, 401–403
- market definition
 - generally, 407
 - geographic market, 407, 410–411
 - product market, 407, 410
 - SSNIP test, 412

- market structure
 - generally, 412–413
 - Horizontal Merger Guidelines*, thresholds under, 413–414
 - market concentration, measuring, 413
 - sample calculation, 414
- monopoly, merger to, 390–393
- pharmaceutical industry, 427–431
- physician practice groups, 424–427
- pre-merger notification, 408–409
- Sanford Health–Mid-Dakota Clinic merger, 424–427
- sellers, mergers to realize efficiencies, 393–394
 - competitive markets before and after merger, 393
 - consumer welfare standard, 396–397
 - Kaldor–Hicks efficiency and, 395–396
 - non-competitive pricing below pre-merger price, 393–394
 - Williamson welfare trade-off, 394
- Supreme Court precedent, 406
- Sutter Health merger, 416–419
- Hospitals
 - acute care hospital services, monopsony and, 259–261
- collusion in
 - generally, 126
 - agreements not to compete, 126–127
 - agreements to exclude rivals, 127–128
- group purchasing organizations (GPOs)
 - and, 300 (*See also* Group purchasing organizations (GPOs))
- health insurers, mergers with, 450–451
- mergers of, 416–417
- physician practice groups, mergers with, 451–452, 472–476
- Hovenkamp, Herbert, 302
- Humalog, 209, 214, 219, 226
- Illumina Inc., 465–469
- Impax Laboratories, Inc., 427–431
- Importance of health care sector, 1–2
- Insulin
 - collusion and
 - generally, 9, 96, 129–130, 204, 220
 - circumstantial evidence, 223
 - Cournot oligopoly and, 220–223
 - Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs) and, 60
 - monopoly pricing and, 222–223
 - pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs) and, 204, 219–220, 226
 - Sherman Act §1 and, 222–224, 226
 - tacit versus overt collusion, 224–225
- discovery of, 205
- generic drugs, 226
- improvements in, 206
- patenting of, 205
- recombinant DNA insulin, 206–207
- US market
 - generally, 207
 - barriers to entry, 209–210
 - market structure, 207–210
 - net payments, 211–213
 - pricing patterns, 213–215
 - product distribution, 210–211
- International Reference Pricing (IRP), 59–62
- In vitro fertilization (IVF), 346–347
- Johnson & Johnson, 100, 130
- Justice Department (DOJ)
 - generally, 4
 - Antitrust Guidance for Human Resources Professionals*, 341–343
- generic drugs, allegations of collusion, 136–137, 142–143
- group purchasing organizations (GPOs)
 - and, 300, 309, 315–318
- on high market concentration, 273–274
- Horizontal Merger Guidelines* (2010), 394, 396–397, 403, 409–410, 413–414
- horizontal mergers and
 - Clayton Act §7, enforcement of, 390, 407–408
 - efficiencies and, 396, 399–400
 - review of mergers, 387
- monopoly and, 35–36
- no-poaching agreements and, 368–372, 381–382
- nurse labor market, collusion in, 341–343
- Statements of Antitrust Enforcement Policy in Health Care*, 315–318

492 INDEX

- Justice Department (DOJ) (cont.)
 - vertical mergers and
 - ability and incentive, consideration of, 463
 - balancing anticompetitive and procompetitive effects, 462, 464
 - divestment, 464–465
 - elimination of double
 - marginalization (EDM), 464
 - evidence considered, 462–463
 - market concentration, 463
 - market definition, 463
 - review of mergers, 387
- Kaldor–Hicks efficiency, 395–396, 400, 404
- Kansas, nurse practitioners (NPs), 249
- Kinetic Concepts, Inc., 308
- Lantus, 209–213, 219, 226
- Legal services, minimum fees, 350
- LePage, 97–99, 103
- Lerner Index
 - dominant buyer model and, 269–270
 - monopoly, 65
 - monopsony and, 262–263, 316–317
 - no-poaching agreements and, 378
 - supply elasticity and, 263
- Licensing of health care professionals
 - generally, 9, 109–111, 232
 - advanced practice registered nurses (APRNs) and, 248–249
 - dental hygienists and, 246–248
 - exclusion of competition through, 242–245
 - licensing boards
 - FTC and, 231
 - as self-regulation, 231
 - state regulation of, 230–231
 - statistics, 230–231
 - North Carolina Dental* case, 236–239
 - active state supervision requirement, 237–239
 - clear articulation requirement, 237
 - lack of active supervision negating antitrust immunity, 231
 - as self-regulation, 238–239
 - nurse anesthetists (NAs) and, 246, 248–249
 - nurse practitioners (NPs) and, 248–249
 - physician assistants and, 246
 - post-*North Carolina Dental* reforms, 241–242
- Licensing of patents
 - generally, 47–48
 - compulsory licensing, 49–51
 - lump sum license fee, 48
 - per unit licensing fee, 48–49
- Lower Cost Drugs Now Act (proposed), 57–58, 61–62
- Lower Costs, More Cures Act (proposed), 62–63
- Lupin Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 147, 185–190
- Macleod, James R., 205
- Maine, no-poaching agreement legislation in, 383
- Malpractice, 233
- Managerial diseconomies, 438–439
- Market allocation
 - generally, 113–114
 - generic drugs, fair-share agreements, 145–148
 - in health insurance, 132–134
- Massachusetts
 - Noncompetition Agreement Act, 382–383
 - nurse anesthetists (NAs) in, 248
 - nurse practitioners (NPs) in, 248–249
- McKenzie Willamette Hospital, 101–105, 111
- Medicaid, 2–5
- Medical devices
 - artificial joints, 64–66
 - catheters, 66
 - collusion in, 131
 - heart arrhythmia machines, 66
 - high market concentration, 131–132
 - monopoly and, 64–66
 - price fixing and, 132
- Medicare
 - generally, 2–5
 - Medicare Advantage, 469–471
 - Part D, 56, 58
 - pharmaceutical industry, price negotiations and, 56–57
- Medicare and Medicaid Patient Protection Act of 1987, 313–314
- Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Act (proposed), 57–58
- Medicare Modernization Act of 2003, 56–57

- Medicare Negotiation and Competitive Licensing Act of 2019 (proposed), 58
- Medicare-X Choice Act (proposed), 58
- Merck & Co., 45, 101
- Mergers
 - generally, 11, 385, 479
 - ACA, hospital mergers after enactment of, 416–417
 - Clayton Act §7 and, 27
 - conglomerate mergers, 453
 - horizontal mergers (*See* Horizontal mergers)
 - hospitals, 416–417
 - monopsony, rejection of mergers as remedy to, 277
 - statistics, 385
 - vertical mergers (*See* Vertical mergers)
- Mid-Dakota Clinic, 424–427
- Monopoly
 - generally, 479
 - anticompetitive effects of, 3, 15–17, 108
 - antitrust policy and, 23–25
 - bilateral monopoly
 - generally, 9, 279–280
 - basic model, 281–284
 - caveats, 284–285
 - collective bargaining by physicians resulting in, 289
 - defined, 279–280
 - indeterminacy of equilibrium price, 282–284
 - lawful monopoly, in response to, 285
 - profit motive, 280–281
 - Sherman Act §1 and, 284–285
 - unlawful monopoly, in response to, 284–285
 - bundled discounts (*See* Bundled discounts)
 - consumer surplus and, 16–17
 - defined, 6–7, 35
 - DOJ and, 35–36
 - FTC and, 36
 - Grinnell* test, 24
 - Lerner Index, 65
 - limitations on monopoly power, 42–43
 - medical devices and, 64–66
 - monopsony, economic objections compared, 276–277
 - orphan drugs and, 66–68
 - patents and, 7, 35
 - pharmaceutical industry and (*See* Pharmaceutical industry, monopoly pricing and)
 - producer surplus and, 16–17
 - product hopping (*See* Product hopping)
 - Sherman Act §2 and, 22, 36
 - successive monopoly
 - generally, 444–447
 - numerical example, 447–448
 - welfare consequences of, 15–17
- Monopsony
 - generally, 258, 479
 - acute care hospital services and, 259–261
 - anticompetitive effects of, 3, 17–19, 256
 - antitrust remedies, 275–277
 - countervailing power, 277
 - mergers, rejection of, 277
 - average cost, impact on, 265–267
 - basic model, 258–262
 - bilateral monopoly (*See* Bilateral monopoly)
 - burden of proof, 276–277
 - collective bargaining by physicians (*See* Collective bargaining by physicians)
 - cost functions, impact on, 263–264
 - countervailing power (*See* Countervailing power)
 - defined, 9, 243
 - dominant buyer model
 - generally, 255, 267
 - basic model, 267–269
 - Lerner Index and, 269–270
 - nurse labor market and, 267–268
 - group purchasing organizations (GPOs) (*See* Group purchasing organizations (GPOs))
 - health insurance and
 - generally, 256–258
 - consolidation and, 274
 - economies of scale and, 274
 - high market concentration, 273–275
 - leverage power of insurers, 273
 - manipulation of market, 274–275
 - policy coverage, relevance of, 275
 - Herfindahl–Hirschmann Index (HHI) and, 273–274
 - Lerner Index and, 262–263, 316–317
 - marginal cost, impact on, 264–265

494 INDEX

- Monopsony (cont.)
 - monopoly, economic objections compared, 276–277
 - negative effects of, 261–262
 - nurse labor market and, 255, 257, 259–261
 - oligopsony
 - generally, 255
 - Bertrand oligopsony, 255–256, 272
 - Cournot oligopsony, 255–256, 270–272
 - predatory bidding and, 276
 - price, effect on, 17–19
 - Sherman Act §2 and, 276
 - supply elasticity and, 263
 - wages in, 376
 - welfare consequences of, 17–19
- Moral hazard, 47
- Most Favored Nation pricing, 223–225
- Multi-cancer early detection (MCED) test, 465–469
- Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
 - Epi-Pens, 27–28, 218
 - exclusive dealing and, 27–28
 - fair-share agreements and, 146–147
 - insulin and, 43, 209–210, 226
 - product hopping and, 84–86
- Namenda IR, 81–84
- Namenda XR, 82–83
- National Association of Teachers of Singing, 239
- National Labor Relations Act of 1935 (NLRA), 286
- National Organ Transplant Act, 353–354
- National Society of Professional Engineers, 350–351
- Negative externalities, 452–453
- Negotiation and enforcement costs, 435–436
- New Hampshire, no-poaching agreement
 - legislation in, 383
- New York Medical Society, 287–288
- Next-generation sequencing (NGS), 465
- No-poaching agreements
 - generally, 10, 323–324, 368–369, 383
 - anticompetitive effects of
 - generally, 368
 - buying power, effect on, 378–379
 - employee allocation compared, 377–378
 - market with small number of employers, 377
 - antitrust damages, 380–381
 - Antitrust Guidance for Human Resources Professionals*, 341–343
 - buyer cartels compared, 376–377
 - class actions, 371
 - digital animators, 370–371
 - DOJ and, 368–372, 381–382
 - fast food franchises, 371–372
 - franchise agreements, 369, 371–372
 - FTC Act and, 370
 - FTC and, 368–369, 381–382
 - high-tech firms, 368–371
 - Lerner Index and, 378
 - private enforcement actions, 371
 - professional sports, 369
 - registered nurses (RNs), 373
 - Seaman v. Duke University*, 373–378
 - Sherman Act §1 and, 377
 - state legislation, 382–383
 - wages, effect on, 379–380
 - wage-setting distinguished, 377
- North Carolina Dental Board, 236–237, 239, 294
- North Dakota, no-poaching agreement
 - legislation in, 383
- Novolog, 219
- Novo Nordisk, insulin and, 130, 204–210, 219–220
- Nurse anesthetists (NAs), 246, 248–249
- Nurse labor market
 - advanced practice registered nurses (APRNs), 248–249
 - collusion in (*See* Nurse labor market, collusion in)
 - dominant buyer model and, 267–268
 - monopsony and, 255, 257, 259–261
 - nurse anesthetists (NAs), 246, 248–249
 - nurse practitioners (NPs), 248–249
 - registered nurses (RNs), 326, 373
 - shortage
 - generally, 325–326, 343
 - ACA, effect of, 328
 - aging population as cause of, 327
 - consequences of, 328–329
 - monopsony power as cause of, 325–326
 - reorganization of health care as cause of, 327
 - statistics, 325, 328
 - turnover rate, 328
 - supply elasticity and, 333

- Nurse labor market, collusion in
 - generally, 10, 323, 326, 329, 343
 - antitrust damages
 - generally, 336–337
 - class actions, proving damages in, 340–341
 - estimating, 340
 - measurement of, 337–338
 - standard of precision, 338–339
 - antitrust litigation, 333–335
 - class actions, 335–336, 340–341
 - collusive monopsony, 330–332
 - welfare loss from, 331–332
 - competitive benchmark, 330
 - criminal sanctions, 342–343
 - DOJ and, 341–343
 - empirical evidence, 333
 - FTC and, 341–343
 - hospital costs, impact on, 332–333
 - Sherman Act §1 and, 326, 335, 341–343
- Nurse practitioners (NPs), 248–249
- Obama, Barack
 - ACA and, 5
 - on occupational licensing, 235
- Obamacare. *See* Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA)
- Occupational licensing. *See also specific occupation*
 - generally, 250–251
 - alternative sources of services resulting from, 245–246
 - economic concerns regarding, 233–234
 - effects of restrictions, 234–235
 - empirical evidence, 249–250
 - FTC and, 231, 235–237, 246, 248–249
 - physicians and surgeons (*See* Licensing of health care professionals)
 - scholarly treatment, 242
 - as self-regulation, 231, 238–239
 - state action doctrine and
 - generally, 233
 - active state supervision requirement, 230, 232–233, 237–239
 - clear articulation requirement, 230, 232–233, 237
 - costs and benefits, 231–232
 - licensing of health care professionals (*See* Licensing of health care professionals)
 - Sherman Act exemption, 232–233, 237
 - welfare loss from, 248
- Ohio, nurse practitioners (NPs) in, 249
- Oklahoma, no-poaching agreement
 - legislation in, 383
- Oligopsony
 - generally, 255
 - Bertrand oligopsony, 255–256, 272
 - Cournot oligopsony, 255–256, 270–272
- Oocyte market, collusion in
 - generally, 10, 323, 345–346, 365
 - antitrust damages, 359–362
 - compensation of donors
 - allegation of collusion, 347–348
 - ethical rationale for limiting, 353–355
 - “quality,” restrictions on paying for, 356–357
 - as taxable income, 354
 - egg donation process, 346–347
 - Kamakahi* case, 362–365
 - class certification, 362–365
 - expert witnesses, 362–364
 - lack of economic coercion, 355–356
 - price ceilings
 - conditions of lawfulness, 358–359
 - economic effects of, 351–352
 - price fixing, 348
 - rule of reason analysis
 - prima facie* case, 352–353
 - rebuttal of *prima facie* case, 353
 - weighing by court, 353
 - Sherman Act §1 and, 346, 348, 352–353, 365
 - in vitro fertilization (IVF) and, 346–347
- Opportunity costs, 436
- OptumRx
 - glucose test strips and, 130
 - insulin and, 130, 215–216, 218–219
 - vertical mergers and, 469
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), 223–225
- Orphan Drug Act of 1983, 67
- Orphan drugs, monopoly and, 66–68
- OxyContin, 86–88
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO)
 - generally, 168
 - Patent Trial and Appeal Board, 197
 - review of validity of patents, 196–197
 - validity of patents issued by, 174, 183

496 INDEX

- Patent infringement
 - generally, 114–115, 168
 - antitrust damages, 197–200
 - certification of no infringement, 171
 - reverse payment settlements (*See* Reverse payment settlements)
 - 30 month stay of approval of generic drugs, 171–172, 178, 194–195
 - validity of patent at issue, 183
- Patents
 - copying prohibited, 43
 - economic rationale for, 38–39
 - incentive to invest, providing, 41–42
 - infringement
 - generally, 114–115, 168
 - certification of no infringement, 171
 - reverse payment settlements (*See* Reverse payment settlements)
 - 30 month stay of approval of generic drugs, 171–172, 178, 194–195
 - validity of patent at issue, 183
 - insulin, patenting of, 205
 - licensing
 - generally, 47–48
 - compulsory licensing, 49–51
 - lump sum license fee, 48
 - per unit licensing fee, 48–49
 - low demand elasticity and, 42–45
 - markups and, 42–45
 - misuse of, 480
 - monopoly and, 7, 35
 - opportunistic competition, shielding from, 42
 - pharmaceutical industry, monopoly pricing and
 - generally, 7
 - low demand elasticity and, 42–45
 - markups, 42–45
 - procompetitive rationale for, 22
 - pioneer drugs and, 75
 - product hopping and (*See* Product hopping)
 - tension with antitrust law, 37–38, 68–69, 177, 183
- Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA)
 - enactment of, 5
 - hospital mergers after enactment of, 416–417
 - individual mandate, 5
 - Medicaid, expansion of, 5
 - nursing shortage, effect on, 328
 - state-based health insurance marketplaces, 5
 - young adults eligible to remain on parents' plans, 5
- Patient Right to Know Drug Prices Act of 2018, 62
- Pay-for-delay settlements. *See* Reverse payment settlements
- PeaceHealth, 101–105, 110–111
- Perrigo Co., plc, 148, 429
- Pfizer Inc., 51, 100, 172, 209
- Pharmaceutical industry
 - approval of drugs (*See* Approval of drugs)
 - collusion in
 - generally, 128–129
 - diabetes care, 130–131
 - numerical example, 129–130
 - price fixing, 130
 - refusal to deal, 130–131
 - FDA approval process (*See* Approval of drugs)
 - FTC and, 63
 - generic drugs (*See* Generic drugs)
 - horizontal mergers, 427–431
 - incentive to invest, patents providing, 41–42
 - insulin (*See* Insulin)
 - monopoly pricing and (*See* Pharmaceutical industry, monopoly pricing and)
 - opportunistic competition, patents shielding from, 42
 - patent infringement (*See* Patent infringement)
 - pioneer drugs (*See* Pioneer drugs)
 - R&D investment in, 39–41
 - risks of investing, 41
 - vertical mergers in, 451
- Pharmaceutical industry, monopoly pricing and
 - generally, 7, 39
 - antitrust remedies, 51–52, 69
 - effect on price, 68
 - expenditures on prescription drugs, 37–38
 - extreme prices, examples of, 37
 - government policy proposals
 - generally, 52
 - arbitrage, 52–56

- International Reference Pricing (IRP), 59–62
- price negotiations, 56–59
- price regulation, 59–62, 69
- health insurance, effect on pricing, 46–47
- orphan drugs and, 66–68
- patent licensing
 - generally, 47–48
 - compulsory licensing, 49–51
 - lump sum license fee, 48
 - per unit licensing fee, 48–49
- patents and
 - generally, 7
 - low demand elasticity and, 42–45
 - markups, 42–45
 - procompetitive rationale for, 22
- price-access tradeoff, 63–64
- Pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs)
 - generally, 215
 - Arkansas Act 900, 218
 - consolidation of, 216
 - emergence of, 216
 - group purchasing organizations (GPOs)
 - compared, 216
 - insulin, collusion and, 204, 219–220, 226
 - negotiation of drug prices, 216–217
 - Pharmacy Benefit Manager Rebate Rule, 216–220
 - rebates, criticism regarding, 217–218
 - reimbursement, criticism regarding, 218
 - revenue sources, 217
- Physician assistants, 246
- Physician practice groups
 - collusion and, 123–131
 - FTC and, 122–123
 - health insurers, mergers with, 469–472
 - horizontal mergers, 424–427
 - hospitals, mergers with, 451–452, 472–476
 - Sherman Act §1 and, 123
- Physicians and surgeons
 - collusion
 - generally, 121
 - FTC and, 122–123
 - practice groups, 123–131
 - staff privileges, 123–126
 - licensing (*See* Licensing of health care professionals)
 - malpractice, 233
- Pioneer drugs
 - challenging patents of, 168
 - extending patent life of, 168, 170–171
 - FDA approval process, 169–171
 - generic drugs compared, 75–76, 128
 - patents and, 75
 - product hopping and, 75–76, 90–92
 - therapeutic equivalence, 76, 137, 171
- Predatory bidding, 276
- Predatory pricing, 96, 110
- Prescription Drug Affordability and Access Act (proposed), 59
- Prescription Drug Price Relief Act (proposed), 61
- Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act (proposed), 62
- Price discrimination, 26–27
- Price fixing
 - generally, 113–114
 - antitrust policy and, 20
 - collective bargaining by physicians,
 - danger of, 289, 296, 298
 - generic drugs
 - allegations of, 148–149
 - deterrence of, 152–154
 - deterrent function, 152–154
 - in health insurance, 133
 - medical devices and, 132
 - oocyte market, collusion in, 348
 - in pharmaceutical industry, 130
 - in physician practice groups, 122–123
 - Sherman Act §1 and, 134, 368
 - unlawful *per se*, 26
- Private enforcement actions
 - generally, 4, 27–28
 - antitrust injury, 29–30, 336, 358
 - business or property, 29
 - class actions (*See* Class actions)
 - Clayton Act §4, 27–31, 153, 336, 349, 357–358
 - damages not speculative, 337
 - direct injury requirement, 30–31, 336, 357–358
 - no-poaching agreements, 371
 - pass-on and, 30–31
 - person, 29
 - standing, 28–31, 357–358, 361

498 INDEX

- Procompetitive effects
 - bundled discounts, 95–96, 112
 - group purchasing organizations (GPOs), 302, 319–320
 - vertical mergers, 449, 462, 464, 468, 471–472
- Product hopping
 - generally, 7–8, 22, 75
 - anticompetitive effects of, 92
 - antitrust remedies, 89–93
 - benefits of, 76–77
 - defined, 74
 - exclusionary product hopping
 - anticompetitive effects of, 92
 - defined, 77
 - examples, 77–78
 - generic substitution, preventing, 74–75
 - litigation, 78–79
- FTC Act and, 88, 91–92
- FTC and, 78, 92
- “hard switch” and, 90
- legal challenges
 - generally, 78–81
 - Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Warner Chilcott Pub. Co.*, 84–86
 - State of New York v. Actavis*, 81–84
- OxyContin, 86–88
- pioneer drugs and, 75–76, 90–92
- remedies
 - generally, 88
 - antitrust remedies, 89–93
 - “no economic sense” test, 91
 - regulatory reform, 88
 - unfair competition, 91–92
- Sherman Act §2 and, 75, 83–84, 86, 88–89, 92–93
- “soft switch” and, 90
- state substitution laws and, 75–76
- therapeutic equivalence and, 76
- Profit motive, 479–480
- Protecting Consumer Access to Generic Drugs Act (proposed), 63
- PTO. *See* Patent and Trademark Office (PTO)
- Reagan, Ronald, 461
- Recombinant DNA insulin, 206–207
- Refusal to deal, 130–131
- Registered nurses (RNs), 326, 373
- Relevant antitrust market
 - defining, 407, 410–412, 463
 - geographic market, 407, 410–411
 - product market, 407, 410
 - SSNIP test, 412
- Requirements contracts, 307
- Reverse payment settlements
 - generally, 114–115, 172, 200
 - Actavis* case, 182–186
 - anticompetitive effects of reverse payments, 183–184
 - efficiency issues, 186
 - evaluation of reverse payments, 184
 - justification on traditional settlement grounds, 184
 - nonexclusive method of settlement, 184
 - patentee power to cause harm, 184–202
 - rule of reason analysis, 182–183
 - threshold payments, lack of guidance regarding, 184–186
 - unanswered questions, 184–186
 - agreements not to compete compared, 173
 - AndroGel* litigation, 180–182
 - as antitrust violations, 174–177, 179–180
 - Cardizem CD* litigation, 177–180
 - economic considerations, 201
 - example, 175–176
 - form of payment, 173–174
 - FTC Act and, 181–182
 - FTC and, 176–187, 190
 - generic drug manufacturers refraining from entry, 173
- legislative remedies
 - generally, 192
 - federal legislation, 193–194
 - Hatch–Waxman Act, proposals to amend, 194–196
 - PTO review, 196–197
 - state legislation, 192–193
- as *per se* lawful, 180–182
- as *per se* unlawful, 177–180
- plaintiff paying defendant, 173
- post-*Actavis* experience
 - generally, 186–187
 - authorized generics, 187–189
 - loopholes, 189–192
 - non-monetary settlements, 176–187

- private damage actions, 197–200
- Sherman Act §1 and, 176–177, 179–183
- table of agreements, 191
- typical settlement compared, 172–173
- Revlimid, 43, 199–200
- Robinson–Patman Act, 26–27
- Rule of reason analysis
 - generally, 352
 - discount attribution test, 109, 111–112
 - oocyte market, collusion in
 - prima facie* case, 352–353
 - rebuttal of *prima facie* case, 353
 - weighing by court, 353
 - reverse payment settlements, 182–183
- St. Luke's Health System LTD, 472–476
- Saltzer Medical Group, P.A., 472–476
- Sanctions
 - collusion in labor market, 342–343
 - criminal sanctions, 342–343
 - deterrence, 152, 480–481
 - Sherman Act, 23
- Sandoz, 131
- Sanford Health, 424–427
- Sanofi
 - epinephrine auto-injectors, 27–28
 - insulin and, 204, 206–213, 219–220
 - Patient Assistance Connection Program, 212, 214
 - Valyou Savings Program, 214
- Sanofi Aventis, 130
- Seaman, Danielle, 373–374
- Search costs, 435
- Seller cartels
 - generally, 115
 - anticompetitive effects of, 3, 109, 115
 - antitrust remedies, 115
 - cartels, 8–9
 - defined, 8
 - generic drugs (*See* Generic drugs, collusion and)
 - health care sector generally, 113–114, 117
 - health insurance, 132–134
 - hospitals
 - generally, 126
 - agreements not to compete, 126–127
 - agreements to exclude rivals, 127–128
 - incentives for, 109
 - insulin (*See* Insulin)
 - medical devices, 131
 - patent infringement (*See* Patent infringement)
 - pharmaceutical industry
 - generally, 128–129
 - diabetes care, 130–131
 - numerical example, 129–130
 - price fixing, 130
 - refusal to deal, 130–131
 - physicians and surgeons
 - generally, 121
 - FTC and, 122–123
 - practice groups, 123–131
 - staff privileges, 123–126
 - reverse payment settlements (*See* Reverse payment settlements)
 - Sherman Act §1 and, 8–9, 109
- Semglee, 209–210
- Senate Finance Committee, 219–220
- Settlements
 - economic rationale, 201
 - reverse payment settlements (*See* Reverse payment settlements)
- Sherman Act of 1890
 - generally, 4, 19
 - bilateral monopoly and, 284–285
 - bundled discounts and, 99–100, 109–110
 - cartels and, 25–26
 - collective bargaining by physicians and, 290
 - collusion generally, 349
 - enactment of, 20–21
 - finest, 22–23
 - imprisonment, 23
 - insulin and, 222–224, 226
 - monopoly and, 22, 36
 - monopsony and, 276
 - nurse labor market, collusion in, 326, 335, 341–343
 - oocyte market, collusion in, 346, 348, 352–353, 365
 - penalties, 22–23
 - physician practice groups and, 123
 - presumption in favor of competition, 350–351
 - price fixing and, 134, 368
 - product hopping and, 75, 83–84, 86, 88–89, 92–93
 - reverse payment settlements and, 176–177, 179–183

500 INDEX

Sherman Act of 1890 (cont.)

sanctions, 23

Section 1

bilateral monopoly and, 284–285

buyer cartels, 21–22

cartels and, 25–26

collective bargaining by physicians
and, 290

collusion generally, 349

insulin and, 222–224, 226

nurse labor market, collusion in, 326,
335, 341–343oocyte market, collusion in, 346, 348,
352–353, 365

physician practice groups and, 123

price fixing and, 134, 368

reverse payment settlements and,
176–177, 179–183

seller cartels and, 8–9, 109

staff privileges and, 126

unreasonable restraint of trade,
21–22, 348–349

Section 2

bundled discounts and, 99–100,
109–110

monopoly and, 22, 36

monopsony and, 276

product hopping and, 75, 83–84, 86,
88–89, 92–93

seller cartels and, 8–9, 109

staff privileges and, 126

state action doctrine exemption,
232–233, 237unreasonable restraint of trade and,
21–22, 348–349

SmileDirectClub, 240–241

Smith, Adam, 117

Social Security Act of 1935, 314

Society for Assisted Reproductive

Technology (SART), 347–348,
352–353, 358–359, 364–365

Sole-source contracts, 307, 310–311

Solvay Pharmaceuticals, 180–182, 185, 194

South Carolina

Board of Dentistry, 246

Board of Medical Examiners, 239

nurse practitioners (NPs) in, 249

Sovaldi, 7, 44–45, 138–139

Staff privileges, 123–126

Sherman Act §1 and, 126

Standing

Clayton Act §4, 28–31, 357–358, 361

generic drugs, collusion and, 151

pass-on and, 30–31

person, 29

private enforcement of antitrust law,
28–31, 357–358, 361

State action doctrine

generally, 230

collective bargaining by physicians and
active state supervision requirement,
290, 293–295clear articulation requirement,
290–293

occupational licensing and

generally, 233

active state supervision requirement,
230, 232–233, 237–239clear articulation requirement, 230,
232–233, 237

costs and benefits, 231–232

licensing of health care professionals
(*See* Licensing of health care
professionals)Sherman Act exemption, 232–233,
237

Strengthening Health Care and Lowering

Prescription Drug Costs Act
(proposed), 193

Suboxone, 77–78

Successive monopoly

generally, 444–447

numerical example, 447–448

Supply elasticity

Lerner Index and, 263

monopsony power and, 263

nurse labor market and, 333

Sutter Health, 4, 11, 385, 416–419

Takeda Pharmaceutical Co., 51, 199–200

Taro Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 148

Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd.

fair-share agreements and, 146–147

generic drugs and, 172, 187–196

price fixing and, 148–149

private actions against, 150, 199–200

reverse payment settlements and, 189,
199–200

Texas Medical Board, 240

3M, 97–99, 103, 107

- Tong, William, 142, 154
- Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), 50
- Transaction costs
- generally, 434
 - defined, 435
 - managerial diseconomies and, 438–439
 - negotiation and enforcement costs, 435–436
 - opportunity costs, 436
 - search costs, 435
 - transaction-specific assets, 438
 - hold-up problem and, 438
 - vertical integration reducing, 436–438
 - alteration of relationship of parties, 437
 - incentive and control options, 437
- Trump, Donald
- insulin pricing and, 214
 - Most Favored Nation pricing and, 223–225
 - Pharmacy Benefit Manager Rebate Rule, 216–220
 - prescription drug pricing and, 52, 55, 60, 62
- Tying, 27
- Unions
- dentists excluded from right to organize, 121
 - increased bargaining power of, 286
 - independent contractors excluded from right to organize, 279–280, 286
 - physicians excluded from right to organize, 279–280, 286
 - right to organize, 286
- United HealthCare Services Inc., 122–123, 149, 216, 409, 469, 472
- UnitedHealth Group Inc., 469–472
- United Kingdom, cancer drug availability in, 63
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 323–324, 373–380
- Unreasonable restraint of trade, 21–22, 348–349
- Vasquez, Ricardo, 127
- Vertical integration
- generally, 386, 434–435, 455, 457
 - competitive distribution and
 - generally, 439–442
 - backward integration, 443–444
 - numerical example, 442–443
 - in health care sector generally, 434–435
 - (*See also* Vertical mergers)
 - successive monopoly and
 - generally, 444–447
 - numerical example, 447–448
 - transaction costs
 - generally, 434
 - alteration of relationship of parties, 437
 - defined, 435
 - hold-up problem and, 438
 - incentive and control options, 437
 - managerial diseconomies and, 438–439
 - negotiation and enforcement costs, 435–436
 - opportunity costs, 436
 - search costs, 435
 - transaction-specific assets, 438
 - vertical integration reducing, 436–438
- Vertical mergers
- generally, 11–12, 457–458, 476
 - anticompetitive effects of
 - generally, 448
 - bundling, 454
 - downstream foreclosure, 448–449
 - empirical evidence, 454–455
 - incentive to unnecessarily increase demand, 454
 - input foreclosure, 448–449
 - procompetitive effects, combined with, 449, 462, 464, 468, 471–472
 - tying, 454
 - in biotech, 465–469
 - Brown Shoe* case, 459–460
 - Clayton Act §7 and, 458–459
 - complementary input suppliers, 451–453
 - DOJ and
 - ability and incentive, consideration of, 463
 - balancing anticompetitive and procompetitive effects, 462, 464
 - divestment, 464–465
 - elimination of double marginalization (EDM), 464
 - evidence considered, 462–463
 - market concentration, 463
 - market definition, 463
 - review of mergers, 387

502 INDEX

Vertical mergers (cont.)

efficiencies of, 386, 449, 453, 460–461, 463

elimination of double marginalization (EDM), 464, 468, 471–472

empirical evidence, 450–451

externalities and, 476

Ford (Autolite) case, 460–461

foreclosure of rivals and, 460–461

FTC and

ability and incentive, consideration of, 463, 466–468, 471

balancing anticompetitive and procompetitive effects, 462, 464, 468, 471–472

divestment, 464–465

elimination of double marginalization (EDM), 464, 471–472

evidence considered, 462–463

Illumina–GRAIL merger, 466–469

market concentration, 463

market definition, 463

review of mergers, 387

St. Luke's–Saltzer merger, 474–476

UnitedHealth Group–DaVita merger, 470–472

Hart–Scott–Rodino (HSR) Act and, 461–462

health insurers

hospitals, mergers with, 450–451

physician practice groups, mergers with, 469–472

hospitals

health insurers, mergers with, 450–451

physician practice groups, mergers with, 451–452, 472–476

hostility toward, 459

Illumina–GRAIL merger

generally, 465–466

ability and incentive, consideration of, 466–468

antitrust analysis, 466–469

balancing anticompetitive and procompetitive effects, 468

joint profits, maximization of, 386–387

market concentration, 463

market definition, 463

Merger Guidelines (1984), 462

negative externalities and, 452–453

in pharmaceutical industry, 451

physician practice groups

health insurers, mergers with, 469–472

hospitals, mergers with, 451–452, 472–476

pre-merger notification, 461–462

procompetitive effects of, 449, 462, 464, 468, 471–472

St. Luke's–Saltzer merger

generally, 472–474

antitrust analysis, 474–476

Sherman Act and, 457–458

UnitedHealth Group–DaVita merger

generally, 469–470

ability and incentive, consideration of, 471

antitrust analysis, 470–472

balancing anticompetitive and procompetitive effects, 471–472

elimination of double marginalization (EDM), 471–472

Vertical Merger Guidelines (2020)

generally, 461

promulgation, 462

rescission, 462

Virginia Board of Medicine, 239–240

Wages

in competitive market, 375–376

in monopsony, 376

no-poaching agreements, effect of, 379–380

Wage-setting, 377

Warner Chilcott, 84–86

Washington, no-poaching agreement

legislation in, 383

Watson Pharmaceuticals, 180–182, 189

The Wealth of Nations (Smith), 117

Welfare loss

collusion, from, 120–121, 150

generic drugs, collusion and, 150

nurse labor market, collusive monopsony, 331–332

occupational licensing, from, 248

Williamson, Oliver E., 397

Williamson welfare trade-off, 394, 398–400

World Trade Organization (WTO), 50