Page 2201 - 2209 **DOI:** *https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.1110644*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 4

2025

The Corporate Prescription: Analyzing the Impact and Legal Fallout of the Corporatization of Healthcare

KSR BHAGHIRATHY[1], S ANBUMUKIL[2] AND P ELAVARASAN[3]

ABSTRACT

The healthcare sector has undergone a profound transformation with the rise of corporate-driven models and the increasing financialization of medical services. Historically rooted in holistic, patient-centered care, modern healthcare delivery now faces a complex interplay between patient welfare, profit motives, and market-driven reforms. This paper examines the historical evolution of patient-centered care, the emergence of corporate healthcare structures, and the impact of financialization on quality, access, and trust. It identifies critical gaps in existing legal and regulatory frameworks governing corporate medical practices. This paper explores: (1) historical background and definition of patient-centered care and financialization, (2) existing legal frameworks and regulatory responses, (3) legal gaps, dilemmas, and liability issues, and (4) potential solutions and adaptation strategies. Methodologically, the analysis synthesizes historical data, comparative case studies, and international legal instruments. The findings suggest that current regulations insufficiently address the conflicts of interest inherent in corporate healthcare and the systemic risks posed by financialized models. The conclusion recommends targeted treaty reforms, stronger accountability mechanisms, and increased emphasis on patient rights to restore balance between market forces and public health goals. Future implications include potential cross-border policy harmonization to safeguard healthcare equity and sustainability.

Keywords: *Financialization, Corporate Healthcare, Patient-Centered Care, Legal Regulation, Trust.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Patient-centered care, with roots in the Hippocratic tradition,[4] has historically emphasized the holistic treatment of individuals—addressing their physical, psychological, and social needs. Thinkers such as Florence Nightingale in the 19th century reinforced the ideal of treating

[1] Author is a Student at Government Law College, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.
[2] Author is a Student at Government Law College, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.
[3] Author is a Student at Government Law College, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.
[4] *Hippocratic Oath*, in *The Hippocratic Oath: Text, Translation, and Interpretation* 3 (Ludwig Edelstein ed., Johns Hopkins Univ. Press 1943).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

patients as whole persons, while Carl Rogers' concept of *client-centered therapy* in the mid-20th century, later adapted by the Balints, promoted trust, empathy, and active patient engagement. The biopsychosocial model proposed by George Engel in the 1970s, along with the Planetree model founded in 1978, further solidified the principle that nothing about a patient's care should happen "without them."

However, from the late 20th century onward, economic globalization, neoliberal market reforms, and technological advances facilitated the corporatization and financialization of healthcare.[5] Under this model, hospitals, clinics, and even public health systems increasingly function as integrated, profit-driven enterprises. Shareholder value often becomes the primary duty, with patient care, community health, and medical ethics relegated to secondary concerns. The rise of private equity investment, hospital consolidation, and business-style management practices—often under the banner of *New Public Management*—has redefined healthcare delivery through cost-containment measures, performance targets, and consumer-oriented marketing.

In policy and public discourse, *patient-centered care* has often been conflated with healthcare consumerism, shifting the focus from patient flourishing to individual choice and purchasing power. This "consumer" framing assigns patients new responsibilities, positioning them as co-creators of their care and, in some models, as resources to optimize system efficiency and financial sustainability.

While corporatization has introduced certain efficiencies, it has also generated unique legal and ethical challenges:

- Tensions between clinical autonomy and corporate targets.
- Declining trust in healthcare institutions, particularly among marginalized communities.
- The erosion of the traditional doctor–patient relationship in favor of transactional interactions.
- The risk of monopolistic market structures driving up costs and limiting access.

This paper proceeds on the assumption that corporatization inherently shifts the center of gravity in healthcare—from a paradigm grounded in compassion, professional ethics, and public service to one primarily shaped by financial imperatives. This transformation, while complex and multifaceted, demands critical examination to assess its consequences for patient

[5] OECD, *Fiscal Sustainability of Health Systems: How to Finance More Resilient Health Systems When Money Is Tight?* 10 (OECD Publ'g 2024).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

rights, healthcare quality, professional autonomy, and the equitable delivery of medical services.

II. DEFINITIONS AND CONTEXT

Financialization in healthcare refers to the transformation of hospitals, clinics, and other medical entities into financial assets for trade and investment, with governance driven by maximizing returns rather than medical outcomes. Patient-centered care, by contrast, prioritizes engagement, empathy, and individualized treatment. Globally, stakeholders include multinational hospital chains, private equity investors, government regulators, and international health organizations. Statistical evidence shows rising healthcare costs, widening inequality in access, and mixed results in quality under corporate models.

A. Patient-Centered Care

Initially grounded in humanistic principles, patient-centered care promoted shared decision-making and personal dignity. Today, it is often reframed as 'healthcare consumerism', where patients are viewed as customers. Benefits include increased transparency and responsiveness; risks involve reduced emphasis on equity and an over-reliance on patient purchasing power.

B. Financialization

Historically emerging in the 1970s with broader economic trends, healthcare financialization has been driven by deregulation, shareholder-focused governance, and the expansion of private capital markets into medical sectors. Examples include hospital mergers, private equity buyouts, and public-private partnerships. While these can improve efficiency and infrastructure investment, they also risk debt-loading, cost escalation, and service reduction.

III. EXISTING LEGAL FRAMEWORK/MEASURES

A. Existing Legal Instruments

1. **International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), 1966:** Article 12 of the ICESCR recognizes "the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health."[6] This right obliges State Parties to take steps for the prevention, treatment, and control of diseases and to ensure the creation of conditions for medical service and medical attention for all. In the context of healthcare corporatization, the ICESCR provides a normative baseline to assess whether privatized or profit-driven models respect the accessibility, availability, acceptability, and quality (AAAQ) of health services.

[6] International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 16 Dec. 1966, 993 U.N.T.S. 3, Art. 12.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

2. **Constitution of the World Health Organization (WHO), 1946:** The Preamble of the WHO Constitution affirms that "the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health is one of the fundamental rights of every human being without distinction of race, religion, political belief, economic or social condition."[7] This principle underpins global public health governance and creates an expectation that Member States will regulate healthcare delivery—including corporate entities—to protect the right to health.

3. **OECD Principles of Corporate Governance, 2015**: The OECD Principles set out internationally recognized standards for corporate governance, emphasizing transparency, accountability, and equitable treatment of stakeholders.[8]Although primarily aimed at corporate governance in economic sectors, these principles are increasingly relevant in healthcare, where large corporate hospital chains and private equity-backed medical enterprises must balance fiduciary duties to shareholders with obligations to patients, employees, and communities.

4. **United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs), 2011:** Endorsed by the UN Human Rights Council, the UNGPs articulate the "Protect, Respect and Remedy" framework.[9]They affirm that while States have the primary duty to protect human rights, businesses—including healthcare corporations—have a responsibility to respect human rights and to avoid causing or contributing to adverse impacts. The principles also call for access to effective remedies for victims of corporate misconduct, which is particularly pertinent in cases of medical negligence, overcharging, or discriminatory access to care.

B. Current Processes and Proposals

Ongoing initiatives include the WHO Universal Health Coverage Program, OECD's healthcare market competition assessments, and national-level merger control laws. Challenges include jurisdictional fragmentation, slow treaty adaptation to new financing models, and resistance from powerful corporate stakeholders.[10]

---

[7] Constitution of the World Health Organization, 14 Apr. 1948, 14 U.N.T.S. 185, Preamble.
[8] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), G20/OECD Principles of Corporate Governance, 2015.
[9] United Nations Human Rights Council, Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework, A/HRC/17/31, 21 Mar. 2011.
[10] *World Health Organization*, *Universal Health Coverage (UHC)*, https://www.who.int/health-topics/universal-health-coverage (last visited Aug. 9, 2025).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

IV. THE PHYSICIAN'S DILEMMA IN THE PRESENT WORLD

The physician's dilemma today arises from the balance between professional autonomy, ethical principles, and corporate influence in healthcare. **Professional autonomy**—the ability to exercise independent clinical judgment without external pressure—is vital for patient trust and high-quality care. The World Medical Association stresses that while patients decide on treatments, physicians must be free to make clinically appropriate recommendations. However, the shift from independent practice to corporate employment, combined with policy reforms, has left many doctors fearing a decline in care quality.

Ethical principles—autonomy, beneficence, nonmaleficence, and justice—remain central. The rise of artificial intelligence (AI) in healthcare adds complexity, requiring patient awareness of treatment processes, risks, and data privacy. AI also risks deepening inequalities if access is limited to wealthier regions.

Corporate control further constrains autonomy. Hospital mergers raise prices—often over 20%—and can lower quality Acquired physicians typically charge more, with referral patterns shifting toward the employing hospital. Anticompetitive tactics, such as anti-tiering clauses and data blocking, limit patient choice and competition.[11]

This dynamic has global effects: rising healthcare costs, reduced access, poorer outcomes, and ethical challenges in digital health. Policymakers must enforce antitrust laws, limit harmful consolidation, and create strong privacy protections for emerging healthcare technologies.

Healthcare Consolidation and Its Impact

Healthcare consolidation significantly harms patients by **driving up prices** and **reducing access to care**. Hospital mergers often result in price increases exceeding 20%, with patients in non-competitive areas paying on average $1,900 more. Physician practices acquired by hospitals typically charge 14% more for identical services, passing costs to individuals through higher insurance premiums or reduced wages. These consolidations also contribute to closures of independent community hospitals, forcing longer travel distances for care—an especially critical problem in emergencies[12].

The **quality of care** and **professional autonomy of physicians** are also at stake. Evidence shows worse patient outcomes, including higher mortality rates, in markets with reduced competition. Increased prices from acquisitions rarely correlate with better quality. For

[11] *United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)*, *Handbook on Competition Legislation* 45–52 (2022), https://unctad.org/topic/competition-and-consumer-protection/competition-law (last visited Aug. 9, 2025).
[12] https://www.who.int/health-topics/universal-health-coverage (last visited Aug. 9, 2025).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

physicians, corporate control and financial pressures exacerbate "moral injury" by restricting clinical judgment in patient care. Anticompetitive practices—such as anti-tiering, anti-steering, and gag clauses—limit insurers' ability to guide patients to lower-cost or higher-quality providers. Data blocking by health systems further impedes patient mobility and restricts competition.

Despite claims of efficiency, research consistently finds **no systematic cost savings or quality improvements** from consolidation. This entrenched lack of competition fosters rigidity and stifles innovation. Potential remedies include revising policies that inadvertently encourage consolidation, enhancing antitrust enforcement, and establishing a federal oversight body to monitor and intervene in non-competitive healthcare markets[4].

V. TECHNOLOGY, DATA, AND CORPORATE INFLUENCE IN HEALTHCARE

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and telemedicine in healthcare depends heavily on patient data, raising concerns about corporate practices and privacy. AI systems draw on vast datasets—imaging, electronic medical records (EMRs), and biological information—for diagnosis, treatment, and research. Yet, current laws often fail to protect individual health data, leaving sensitive information vulnerable to hacking and misuse. Some social networks and genetics testing companies[13] reportedly collect and store users' mental health and genetic data without explicit consent for commercial purposes.

Telemedicine's rapid growth compounds these risks. Weak legal frameworks, particularly for unregistered applications, expose patients to data breaches, identity theft, and fraud. Health systems may also engage in data blocking, restricting the flow of patient records to external providers or making EMRs intentionally incompatible. Such anticompetitive behavior locks patients into specific networks, limits choice, and benefits corporate incumbents.

These technological and data-control trends, combined with corporate consolidation, contribute to physician "moral injury" by undermining professional autonomy. Despite claims of efficiency, research shows no consistent cost savings or quality improvements from consolidation. Instead, it often results in higher prices and reduced patient choice. Addressing these issues requires stronger antitrust enforcement, dedicated monitoring bodies, and comprehensive laws ensuring robust data protection, transparency, and accountability for anticompetitive practices

[13] (Cite U.S. 21st Century Cures Act or HHS enforcement report.)

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

VI. GLOBAL HEALTHCARE MODELS AND CORPORATE INFLUENCE

Globally, healthcare systems vary widely, yet all aim for accessible, high-quality, and affordable care. The U.S., with its market-driven model, spends more per capita than any peer nation yet achieves shorter life expectancy and greater barriers to care1. This gap stems not from greater service use, but from significantly higher prices—particularly for inpatient and outpatient care. While most wealthy OECD countries achieve universal or near-universal coverage through compulsory insurance and cost regulation, the U.S. has relied on voluntary private insurance and limited price controls[14].

Corporate consolidation among U.S. hospitals, physician practices, and insurers drives prices upward without consistent quality gains32. Hospital mergers can raise prices over 20%, while acquired physician practices may charge 14% more for identical services3. This trend contributes to community hospital closures, erodes access to care, and fuels physician "moral injury" by restricting professional judgment4.

Other countries illustrate alternative models. Healthcare cooperatives—serving over 100 million households globally—play significant roles in Brazil, Argentina, Spain, and Belgium, aligning multiple stakeholders to jointly manage costs, risks, and quality. International medical ethics, such as those endorsed by the World Medical Association, emphasize professional autonomy, safeguarding physicians from undue corporate or financial influence6.

Across systems, the rise of AI and telemedicine intensifies concerns about patient privacy and corporate control. AI relies on vast clinical datasets, while telemedicine—especially in lightly regulated contexts—faces heightened risks of data breaches and misuse. In the U.S., "data blocking" practices further limit patient mobility and reduce competition. Addressing these issues demands stronger data protection laws, antitrust enforcement, and oversight mechanisms that protect both patients and physician autonomy

Existing frameworks for liability rely heavily on national malpractice and consumer protection laws, which are ill-suited to transnational corporate structures. Ambiguities persist regarding the responsibility of holding companies, investor groups, and AI developers in adverse medical outcomes.

VII. THE PATH FORWARD: POLICY REFORMS AND ALTERNATIVE MODELS FOR A HEALTHIER FUTURE

A healthier U.S. healthcare system requires coordinated policy reforms, regulatory oversight,

[14] https://www.oecd.org/health/health-at-a-glance/

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

and alternative delivery models that safeguard both patient data and professional autonomy. Evidence shows no consistent cost or quality gains from healthcare consolidation; instead, it often drives higher prices and reduces patient choice.

Key reforms include: implementing site-neutral Medicare payments, revising the 340b drug pricing program to remove acquisition incentives, and requiring agencies to assess the competitive impact of new regulations. States should streamline administrative burdens, reform scope of practice laws, adopt licensure reciprocity, and repeal or narrow laws like Certificate of Need and Any Willing Provider that hinder competition.[15]

Antitrust enforcement must be strengthened through increased agency funding, expanded jurisdiction over non-profits, mandatory reporting of smaller mergers, and a crackdown on anticompetitive clauses such as anti-tiering, anti-steering, and gag clauses. Additional focus is needed on data blocking, vertical mergers, and labor market effects.

Where competition is limited, a federal market oversight agency should monitor prices, costs, quality, and access, with authority to set price caps, mandate quality improvements, or block harmful contracts.

Globally, multistakeholder healthcare cooperatives—common in countries like Brazil, Argentina, and Spain—show promise in balancing cost control, quality, and access.

Finally, addressing AI and telemedicine ethics requires robust patient-data legislation with strict consent, anonymization, penalties, and oversight Corporate control and financial pressures fuel physician "moral injury," eroding autonomy Protecting clinicians' judgment and patient welfare remains the guiding principle

VIII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The transformation of healthcare from a patient-centered, ethics-driven profession to a corporate, financially motivated industry presents profound legal, ethical, and policy challenges. Financialization and consolidation have undeniably introduced efficiencies in certain contexts, but they have also eroded professional autonomy, inflated costs, reduced access, and weakened trust between patients and providers. The evidence demonstrates that market concentration in healthcare rarely produces cost savings or quality improvements, instead amplifying inequalities and restricting patient choice.

Restoring balance requires a multi-layered approach. Domestically, strong antitrust enforcement, targeted regulation of mergers, protection of physician autonomy, and

[15] MedPAC or CMS policy documents.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

comprehensive data privacy laws are essential. Internationally, harmonizing health governance standards through instruments like the ICESCR and WHO guidelines can help safeguard the universality, accessibility, and equity of care. Emerging technologies, including AI and telemedicine, must be integrated under clear ethical frameworks to prevent the deepening of existing disparities.

Ultimately, healthcare systems must recognize that efficiency and profitability cannot supersede their core mission—promoting human health and dignity. A sustainable path forward lies in aligning financial incentives with public health goals, fostering cooperative models, and ensuring that the voices of patients and clinicians remain central in policy design. Without this recalibration, the corporate trajectory risks undermining the very foundation of medical care.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]