Caveat lector

A Comparative Analysis of Veterinary and Human Medicine: Evaluating Deregulation Proxies in the United States Healthcare System

By Google Gemini 3.5 Pro, under supervision of Miloš Miljković, MD

The United States human healthcare system is fundamentally defined by highly rigid regulatory frameworks, third-party payer mandates, and strict statutory obligations regarding the provision of emergency medical care. These layers of regulation, while originally designed to ensure equitable access and protect patient safety, have generated massive administrative overhead, distorted price transparency, and fostered a legal environment dominated by defensive medicine. In sharp contrast, veterinary medicine in the United States operates as a largely deregulated, cash-driven, free-market economy. Within this system, the provider-patient (or more accurately, the provider-surrogate) relationship forms the primary, unobstructed economic and clinical nexus.

By systematically examining the operational, legal, and economic frameworks of veterinary medicine, health economists and policy analysts can project the potential structural, financial, and clinical outcomes of a deregulated human medical system. This report isolates the specific variables of deregulation—evaluating them across four distinct phases: regulatory baselines, stakeholder experiences, overarching economic architectures, and final market synthesis. The objective is to determine whether veterinary medicine serves as a valid proxy for human medical deregulation and to outline the profound consequences such a paradigm shift would yield regarding clinical efficiency, technological innovation, and sociological health equity.

Defining the Regulatory and Legal Baselines

To establish a scientifically sound comparison between the two healthcare environments, we will first define the specific regulatory voids that shape the veterinary landscape, contrasting them directly with the federal and state mandates that govern human healthcare delivery.

The Absence of Third-Party Payer Mandates and Administrative Overhead

The human healthcare system is almost entirely mediated by third-party payers comprising private managed care organizations, Medicare, and Medicaid. This structure necessitates a colossal administrative infrastructure dedicated to medical billing, coding, claims adjudication, and prior authorization management. Research and macroeconomic estimates indicate that administrative spending accounts for between 15% and 30% of total medical spending in the United States.[1] To contextualize the scale of this financial drain, even at the conservative lower bound, the United States spends twice as much annually on healthcare administrative costs as it does on the entirety of clinical care for cardiovascular disease, and three times as much as it spends on comprehensive cancer care.[1]

The operational friction imposed by this system on individual patient encounters is staggering. A seminal time-driven activity-based costing study analyzing a large academic healthcare system utilizing a certified electronic health record (EHR) system quantified the exact temporal and financial burdens of physician billing activities.[2] The study revealed that processing an insurance claim requires immense personnel resources, significantly diminishing the percentage of revenue actually retained for clinical operations. For a standard primary care visit, administrative processing consumes 13 minutes of staff time, costing the practice $20.49, which represents 14.5% of the total professional revenue for that visit.[2] As the complexity of the encounter increases, the administrative tax scales exponentially. A discharged emergency department visit requires 32 minutes of processing at a cost of $61.54 (25.2% of revenue); an ambulatory surgical procedure requires 75 minutes at $170.40 (13.4% of revenue); and a general inpatient surgical procedure demands 100 minutes of pure administrative processing, costing the hospital system $215.10 per claim.[2] Furthermore, human physicians spend an average of 8.7 hours per week—accounting for 16.6% of their total working hours—strictly on administrative and non-clinical tasks.[4]

Veterinary medicine operates in a fundamentally different paradigm. It is primarily a point-of-care, fee-for-service transaction model where the client pays the provider directly at the time of service. Without the friction of claims adjudication, the need for specialized medical coding departments, or the delays of managed care network negotiations, the administrative overhead within a veterinary clinic is drastically reduced. In financially optimized veterinary practices, total support staff expenses (which include wages and benefits for all non-veterinary personnel, including management and custodial staff) are typically maintained below 23% to 25% of gross revenues.[5] The cost of goods sold (COGS), which encompasses the direct costs for delivering medical services and pharmaceuticals, is highly regulated by market demand and typically accounts for 22% to 24% of revenue.[6] Non-owner management costs, such as hospital administrators or inventory managers, are optimized to consume merely 2% to 3% of total revenues.[5] This streamlined administrative profile allows the average veterinary practice to generate approximately $1.5 million in gross revenue with an incredibly lean support staff ratio, averaging nearly 4 full-time equivalent (FTE) non-veterinarian staff per veterinarian in companion animal practices, and as low as 0.7 FTE in food animal practices.[7]

The downstream efficiency of this cash-based, low-overhead model is most visible when analyzing pharmaceutical pricing. Because human drug prices must account for the bloated administrative apparatus, pharmacy benefit manager (PBM) rebates, and opaque insurance negotiations, retail prices for humans are artificially inflated far beyond their basic market value. A comprehensive cross-sectional study by University of Minnesota researchers analyzed 120 medications with identical active ingredients that are commonly prescribed to both humans and companion animals.[9] The findings demonstrated that the retail price of human medications is, on average, 5.5 times higher than the identical veterinary medications.[9] Even when applying aggressive human discount programs or coupons, the discounted prices for humans remained 1.4 to 1.5 times higher than the standard cash prices offered to pet owners for over 60% of the medications.[10]

The pricing disparities can occasionally reach extreme multiples. For example, levamisole, originally introduced as a veterinary antiparasitic medication, was later found to have efficacy in treating human colon cancer.[11] Upon its introduction to the human market under the brand name Ergamisol, the drug

was priced at $5 per 50-mg tablet, which was precisely 100 times higher than the concurrent veterinary price of $0.05 for the exact same chemical equivalent.[9] Similarly, during the 2021 surge in demand for ivermectin, human formulations were priced at 15 times the cost of veterinary formulations, driving consumers to seek out agricultural supply chains.[9] This stark divergence highlights a critical second-order effect of a deregulated, cash-based system: when consumers pay entirely out-of-pocket, pharmaceutical manufacturers and healthcare providers are forced to price their services and goods according to actual market elasticity and the consumer's strict ability to pay, effectively neutralizing the hyper-inflationary pressures generated by third-party intermediaries.

EMTALA vs. "Good Samaritan" Obligations and the Spectrum of Care

Perhaps the most significant regulatory divergence between human and veterinary medicine lies in the statutory obligations surrounding emergency care. In the human healthcare system, the Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act (EMTALA) of 1986 serves as the ultimate federal safety net.[12] EMTALA mandates that any hospital participating in Medicare must provide a medical screening examination and stabilizing treatment to any patient presenting to an emergency department with a life-threatening condition, regardless of their insurance status, citizenship, or ability to pay.[12] While ensuring universal access to emergency care, EMTALA functions as a massive, unfunded congressional mandate. It shifts the entire financial burden of indigent and uninsured care directly onto the balance sheets of local hospitals, forcing these institutions to engage in complex internal cross-subsidization to remain solvent.[12]

Veterinary medicine operates entirely outside the bounds of EMTALA. Veterinary clinics are private commercial enterprises, and veterinarians possess the legal right to decline service if a pet owner faces absolute financial constraints upfront.[14] This creates profound operational, ethical, and clinical challenges, particularly in emergency settings. A cited demographic study indicates that 56% of pet owners report being completely unable to afford sudden emergency veterinary care, and 74% struggle to afford comprehensive sick care.[14] When a critically ill veterinary patient—such as a cat with a life-threatening urethral obstruction requiring a "gold standard" treatment protocol that can easily exceed $1,000—presents to an emergency room and the owner lacks immediate liquidity or credit access, the clinic is not legally obligated to assume the financial loss of treatment.[14]

To bridge the chasm between a patient's biological medical needs and the owner's stark financial reality, the veterinary profession has organically engineered a clinical philosophy known as the "Spectrum of Care".[14] Rather than rigidly adhering to a singular, academic "gold standard" of care—which is heavily incentivized in human medicine to avoid malpractice liability—the spectrum of care framework embraces a continuum of acceptable, evidence-based interventions that are actively scaled down to match the client's budgetary constraints.[14]

This framework represents a fundamental operational shift away from algorithmic perfection toward pragmatic resolution. In a total spectrum of care implementation, lower-cost medical options frequently rely on empirical diagnosis based solely on patient history, physical examinations, and simplified in-house tests, deliberately bypassing expensive diagnostics like advanced imaging, MRI, or extensive outsourced pathology panels.[16] Treatments are initiated to minimize or resolve symptoms empirically. For example, if a patient presents with a complex, comminuted fracture and the owner cannot afford the thousands of dollars required for surgical orthopedic plating and pinning, amputation is offered as a medically acceptable, curative, lower-cost alternative.[16]

To formalize assistance for clients facing total financial barriers, some veterinary institutions are attempting to construct novel economic models. Initiatives such as "AlignCare" are currently being piloted to test models functionally similar to a Medicare system for veterinary services, pooling resources to subsidize care for impoverished families.[14] However, these remain fractional, philanthropic endeavors rather than systemic mandates.

The veterinary framework provides a direct projection of how a deregulated human system would respond to uninsured or under-resourced emergency patients. In the complete absence of an EMTALA equivalent, a deregulated market necessitates the institutionalization of tiered clinical triage. Medical interventions would be dynamically downgraded to match available capital at the point of care, fundamentally altering the baseline standard of medical execution based entirely on a patient's socioeconomic status.

System Characteristic	Human Healthcare Market	Veterinary Healthcare Market

Primary Economic Nexus	Third-party payers (CMS, private insurance)	Direct provider-surrogate point-of-sale
Administrative Billing Burden	15% to 30% of total industry spending [1]	< 25% of gross revenue for all support staff [5]
Pharmaceutical Retail Pricing	Artificially inflated (5.5x higher on average) [9]	Suppressed by consumer out-of-pocket limits [9]
Emergency Care Mandate	EMTALA (Universal stabilization required) [12]	None (Service contingent on payment/credit) [14]
Clinical Standard Approach	Uniform "Gold Standard" to avoid liability	"Spectrum of Care" scaled to available capital [14]

Malpractice and Liability Asymmetry

The landscape of tort law and professional liability constitutes another massive divergence between the two paradigms, fundamentally altering how clinicians approach risk, diagnostics, and patient interactions. In human medicine, medical malpractice payouts are actuarially calculated based on a combination of economic damages (lost future wages, lifelong medical care, rehabilitation) and non-economic damages (pain and suffering, loss of consortium). To mitigate exposure to these catastrophic, multi-million dollar judgments, human physicians engage heavily in the practice of defensive medicine. Defensive medicine is broadly defined as the ordering of tests, diagnostic procedures, specialist consultations, and other medical services solely to reduce the risk of a malpractice claim, rather than to alter the clinical outcome.[17]

The economic footprint of defensive medicine in the human sector is massive. A landmark study published in the BMJ, led by researchers at Harvard Medical School, analyzed data from 18,352,391

hospital admissions across Florida, encompassing the malpractice histories of 24,637 physicians.[17] The findings confirmed the financial rationale behind the practice: in six out of seven medical specialties, higher-spending physicians faced demonstrably fewer malpractice claims.[17] This dynamic incentivizes physicians to over-utilize resources to signal to courts and attorneys that care was exhaustively thorough. Consequently, defensive medicine is estimated to cost the U.S. healthcare system up to $50 billion annually.[17]

In stark contrast, under the common law of all 50 states, domestic companion animals are legally classified as personal property, or "chattel".[18] Therefore, when a veterinarian commits professional malpractice that results in the severe injury or death of an animal, the plaintiff is strictly limited to recovering the "fair market value" of the property—essentially the cost to replace the animal with one of similar characteristics.[18] The courts historically and routinely exclude non-economic damages, such as emotional distress, mental pain and suffering, and loss of companionship, from veterinary malpractice cases.[18] Even in the minority of jurisdictions that allow emotional distress recovery for the destruction of highly personal property, harm inflicted specifically by a veterinarian is usually explicitly excluded from such statutes.[18]

Because the fair market value of an average mixed-breed companion animal is nominally low, the financial cost of retaining legal counsel and litigating a veterinary malpractice suit almost universally exceeds the potential financial recovery.[18] This creates a high barrier to litigation, leaving pet owners without substantial legal recourse and effectively capping the liability exposure of the veterinary practitioner. The veterinary industry actively lobbies to maintain this property status, arguing that expanding compensation to include non-economic damages would cause professional liability insurance premiums to skyrocket, which would subsequently inflate the overall cost of veterinary care, harming the very animals the laws seek to protect.[18] Critics point out a profound hypocrisy in this stance: the veterinary industry financially capitalizes on promoting the "human-animal bond" and encouraging clients to view pets as literal family members, yet simultaneously demands strict legal immunity via property-status limits when negligent treatment occurs.[18]

This strict cap on liability acts as a powerful structural suppressant against traditional, legally-motivated defensive medicine in veterinary practice. Because the threat of catastrophic tort

judgments is functionally non-existent, veterinarians are not legally compelled to order exhaustive diagnostic panels purely for courtroom protection.[18] However, recent qualitative data suggests a modern paradox within the field. While legally-driven defensive medicine is minimized, veterinary practitioners still report intense pressures to over-test.[20] This new iteration of veterinary defensive medicine is driven by a complex matrix of psychological fear regarding peer judgment, the pressure to meet the academic "gold standard" instilled during veterinary medical school, and the increasing corporate mandates to maximize average transaction fees through diagnostic upselling.[20]

Evaluating the Stakeholder Experience

The absence of rigid regulatory frameworks, combined with the realities of a cash-based market, dictates the daily psychological and financial realities of the primary actors within the healthcare ecosystem. Analyzing the experiences of the provider, the guarantor, and the patient reveals the intricate operational mechanics of medical deregulation.

1. The Veterinarian (The Provider Experience)

Clinical Autonomy vs. Algorithmic Medicine Contemporary human medical practice is increasingly algorithmic. Treatment pathways are frequently dictated by insurance formularies, mandatory step-therapy protocols, and the grueling administrative hurdles of prior authorizations. Conversely, the veterinary provider experience is characterized by a remarkably high degree of absolute clinical autonomy. Because third-party managed care networks rarely dictate the clinical pathway, veterinarians possess the freedom to pivot immediately to off-label drug use, utilize novel compounded therapies, or initiate immediate surgical interventions based entirely on their independent clinical judgment, requiring only the informed consent of the pet owner.[22]

The use of drugs "off-label" (using a medication for an unapproved indication, dosage, or species) is codified and protected in veterinary medicine under the Animal Medicinal Drug Use Clarification Act (AMDUCA) of 1994, which authorizes the extra-label use of approved human and animal drugs under specific veterinary conditions.[24] While off-label prescribing is also prevalent in certain sectors of human medicine—most notably in human pediatrics, where a systematic review of 31 studies and local chart reviews demonstrated that 30.9% to 38.1% of all pediatric prescriptions are off-label due to a systemic lack of pediatric-specific clinical trial data [25]—the veterinary reliance on off-label human

formulations is structurally embedded across every discipline, from oncology to internal medicine. This autonomy accelerates care delivery, as the provider is entirely unencumbered by pharmacy benefit manager restrictions.

Burnout and Moral Injury The drivers of professional burnout diverge sharply between the two professions. As previously established, administrative burden, bureaucracy, and electronic health record fatigue are cited as the primary drivers of burnout among human physicians.[4] However, veterinarians experience a distinct, severe pathology of occupational trauma known as compassion fatigue and moral injury.[27] This psychological toll is rooted directly in the brutal economics of the deregulated, cash-based market.

Veterinarians frequently suffer from the phenomenon of "economic euthanasia"—a uniquely distressing clinical scenario where the practitioner possesses the precise medical skills, advanced technology, and facility resources to save a highly curable patient, but is forced to deliberately end the patient's life because the owner cannot afford the out-of-pocket cost of the intervention.[29] This dynamic is historically unparalleled in modern healthcare; while human medicine features extensive end-of-life palliative care, economic limitations do not result in the direct, legally mandated administration of lethal injection by the attending physician.[29]

The prevalence of this moral distress is staggering. In emergency veterinary practice, nearly 95% of veterinarians report encountering cases where financial limitations directly impact the care of a pet at least weekly, and nearly 75% report seeing conditions that could have been easily prevented with regular veterinary care.[31] This relentless exposure to preventable death due to capital constraints creates overwhelming psychological friction. According to the 2020 Merck Animal Health Veterinarian Wellbeing Study, 92% of respondents considered chronic stress to be the most critical issue facing the profession, and data from the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) indicates that 40% of all veterinarians are actively considering leaving the profession entirely due to lack of work-life balance and the psychological burden of the work.[32]

Debt-to-Income Disparities The educational pipelines for both human and veterinary medicine require comparable investments of rigorous academic time and capital, yet the economic return on investment (ROI) diverges sharply due to the differing market architectures. The average medical

school graduate in the human sector carries an educational debt burden ranging from $150,000 to over $270,000, with the four-year cost of attendance stretching between $250,222 for public schools and $330,180 for private institutions.[33] However, the debt-to-income (DTI) ratio for human physicians rests at a highly manageable 1.2.[35] Because human physicians enter a heavily subsidized market with exceptionally high starting salaries—routinely scaling from $350,000 for mid-range specialties (like hospitalists) to over $550,000 for high-end procedural specialties—their peak earning potential rapidly neutralizes the initial debt burden.[34]

Veterinarians face an educational debt burden roughly equivalent to human medical graduates (with mean student debt at graduation hovering around $150,000 to $183,000), but they enter a consumer-direct market with substantially lower starting salaries.[33] Throughout the 2010s, the veterinary DTI ratio frequently exceeded 2.0, meaning new graduates consistently carried mortgage-sized debt that was double their starting salaries.[38] While recent market adjustments and a surge in demand have improved the average DTI ratio to 1.4 for the graduating class of 2024, the structural disparity remains profound.[37] This high DTI ratio severely restricts the ability of young veterinarians to access the commercial capital required to launch independent, solo-practitioner clinics, inadvertently accelerating the transition of the industry toward corporate employment models, where consolidators offer signing bonuses of $30,000 to $50,000 to offset the financial strain.[37]

2. The Pet Owner (The Surrogate/Guarantor Experience)

Price Transparency and Consumer Behavior In the standard human healthcare system, price opacity is the accepted norm; patients rarely know the true, final cost of a medical intervention until an Explanation of Benefits (EOB) is generated by their insurer weeks after the procedure has occurred. Veterinary medicine, operating as a free market, models radical price transparency. Owners are presented with detailed, high-low financial estimates that must be reviewed and legally approved before any diagnostics or treatments are initiated.[14]

This transparency shifts the entire psychological and financial burden of care directly onto the consumer in real-time, forcing an immediate cost-benefit analysis at the point of emotional distress. When macroeconomic pressures cause veterinary prices to escalate, consumer behavior adjusts with brutal efficiency. Recent polling data from a PetSmart Charities-Gallup State of Pet Care Study

revealed that 52% of pet owners in the U.S. have either skipped needed veterinary care entirely or declined one or more care recommendations in the past year.[41] Among those who declined care, an overwhelming 71% attributed their decision directly to finances—stating that the care was either unaffordable or that they simply did not believe the intervention was worth the financial cost.[41]

This extreme price sensitivity acts as a natural, highly responsive market brake. As consumers decline care due to inflation, overall veterinary clinic visits demonstrably decrease (down 4.6% year-over-year in recent trackers), forcing clinics to either lower their prices, offer alternative financing, or adjust their spectrum of care offerings to maintain operational case volume.[41] A purely deregulated human market would likely replicate this exact effect: it would drastically lower systemic national health expenditures by forcing patients to decline interventions they deem financially inefficient, but at the severe, hidden cost of deferred medical maintenance and significantly worsened clinical outcomes for the economically disadvantaged.

The Rise of Pet Insurance To insulate themselves against sudden, catastrophic out-of-pocket costs, consumers have driven a rapid expansion in the adoption of pet insurance. Critically, pet insurance operates fundamentally differently than human health insurance. It functions almost exclusively as a property-and-casualty reimbursement model rather than a managed care network model.[45]

Because the vast majority of pet insurance policies require the owner to pay the veterinarian directly at the time of service and then file a claim for reimbursement, the market is devoid of restricted "in-network" or "out-of-network" provider limitations.[45] There are no open enrollment periods, and standard human-style copays are rarely utilized.[45] Premium costs are significantly lower than human equivalents, averaging around $49 per month for dogs and $28 per month for cats.[45] Because the insurer acts strictly as a financial reimburser rather than a medical manager, they do not dictate clinical pathways or require prior authorizations for specific surgical approaches, thereby preserving the absolute clinical autonomy of the veterinarian.[46]

However, because these policies universally exclude pre-existing conditions and still require the owner to possess the upfront capital to float the initial invoice (often reimbursing at a rate of 70% to 90% only after deductibles are met), the model fundamentally fails to act as a true safety net for the impoverished.[45] It merely alters the price sensitivity for middle- and high-income clients, allowing them

to access high-tier specialty care without hesitation, further widening the gap in outcomes.

3. The Pet (The Patient Experience)

Stratification of Care The ultimate clinical output of a cash-driven, deregulated medical market is an extreme bimodal distribution of patient outcomes. For well-resourced guarantors—particularly millennials, 90% of whom report they care about their pet's health equally to their own—veterinary medicine provides immediate access to cutting-edge interventions identical to top-tier human care.[49] This includes access to linear accelerator radiation therapy for tumors, targeted biological therapies, advanced MRI diagnostics, and complex orthopedic implants.[14] Conversely, for under-resourced guarantors, the lack of a public safety net or EMTALA equivalent dictates that highly treatable conditions frequently and rapidly result in rudimentary palliation, amputation, or economic euthanasia.[14] A deregulated human system would inevitably institutionalize this exact stratification, mapping patient mortality and morbidity directly to the availability of liquid capital.

Quality of Life vs. Longevity A profound philosophical and clinical distinction exists between human and veterinary medical endpoints. Human oncology and intensive care disciplines heavily index on extending life—frequently utilizing Overall Survival (OS) or Progression-Free Survival (PFS) as the primary, immutable metrics for clinical success, even when the interventions result in immense toxicity and only marginal survival extensions.[50] A comprehensive analysis of 791 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) in human oncology, representing over 555,000 patients, found that while many new treatments met alternative surrogate endpoints, only 28% actually improved the time patients lived, and a dismal 11% demonstrably improved the patient's self-reported quality of life.[51]

Veterinary medicine is legally, culturally, and ethically anchored to Quality of Life (QoL) as the ultimate metric of clinical success.[50] Because animals cannot comprehend the concept of future time, treatments in veterinary oncology are explicitly tailored to minimize toxicity and maintain normal daily function. Owners are frequently willing to trade absolute longevity to preserve the patient's immediate comfort.[52] To quantify this, the field increasingly utilizes validated, psychometrically sound QoL instruments to measure subjective well-being in clinical trials, recognizing that a treatment is only scientifically valuable if it subjectively improves the patient's experience.[52] This suggests that a deregulated, consumer-driven medical system, unburdened by institutional mandates to preserve life at

all costs, naturally optimizes for subjective quality metrics and comfort over the rigid pursuit of absolute longevity.

Economic Architecture and Corporate Consolidation

A central hypothesis advanced by proponents of human medical deregulation is that stripping away bureaucratic red tape would attract massive institutional capital, which would in turn drive down consumer costs through ruthless free-market competition and economies of scale. The evolution of veterinary medicine over the last decade provides a pristine, real-world blueprint of how private equity behaves in a deregulated, cash-driven medical sector.

Private Equity Roll-ups and Market Dominance

The veterinary sector has experienced historically aggressive corporate consolidation orchestrated by private equity (PE) firms, wealthy family offices, and multinational retail conglomerates.[54] Entities such as Mars, Inc. (which acquired vast networks including VCA, Banfield, and BluePearl) and private equity firm JAB Holding Company (which acquired National Veterinary Associates, Compassion-First, and Ethos Veterinary Health) have poured tens of billions of dollars into veterinary acquisitions.[21] According to Pitchbook intelligence, private equity injected an astonishing $51.6 billion into the veterinary sector, followed by an additional $9.3 billion in just the first four months of 2024 alone.[54]

This strategy, known as "serial roll-ups," targets highly profitable, mid-to-large clinics, leveraging them with debt to extract rapid, outsized returns for shareholders.[21] The scale of this consolidation is staggering. As of 2023, approximately 25% of all general veterinary practices and up to 75% of lucrative specialty and emergency veterinary hospitals in the United States were corporately owned.[21] Mars Petcare alone currently controls roughly 3,000 clinics and dominates nearly half of the entire corporate-owned veterinary market.[21] The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) has repeatedly recognized the anti-competitive nature of these acquisitions, intervening to force divestitures (e.g., forcing Mars to divest 12 clinics in 10 localities, and requiring JAB to divest 11 clinics prior to further acquisitions) to prevent total localized monopolies, yet the overarching pace of PE consolidation remains unchecked.[21]

Economy of Scale vs. Pricing Power

Theoretical free-market economics suggests that corporate consolidation should benefit the consumer by driving down costs through supply-chain efficiencies, centralized administrative services, and immense economies of scale. The empirical data from the veterinary sector directly contradicts this theory. Instead of utilizing their massive scale to lower consumer costs, corporate consolidators have leveraged their localized monopolies to exercise extreme, unchecked pricing power.

Since April 2014, the cost of veterinary services has increased by an unprecedented 60%, an inflation rate widely attributed by lawmakers to corporate consolidation and the exploitation of the "recession-proof" inelasticity of the human-animal bond.[21] Vertical integration severely exacerbates this dynamic; because conglomerates like Mars also own the largest diagnostic laboratories and over 50 popular pet food brands (including Royal Canin and Iams), they capture revenue across the entire supply chain, effectively boxing out independent competitors and forcing prices upward without fear of consumer attrition.[21]

Furthermore, corporate management fundamentally alters the clinical culture at the ground level. Veterinarians operating within these corporate structures report worsening working conditions, including intense pressure from non-medical corporate managers to "do more and see more patients," meet specific monthly revenue quotas, and upsell clients on expensive and potentially unnecessary diagnostics to satisfy debt obligations.[21] To protect their market share and ensure high practitioner retention despite these conditions, these corporations frequently deploy aggressive non-compete and non-solicitation agreements, legally preventing veterinarians from opening independent practices nearby and artificially suppressing labor mobility.[21] This data definitively indicates that in a deregulated medical market, institutional capital prioritizes relentless profit extraction and margin expansion over consumer cost-savings or provider well-being.

Cross-Subsidization and Margin Structure

In the highly regulated human healthcare market, the provision of uncompensated care (such as level-one trauma, indigent care, and psychiatric services) is financially sustained through a complex, hidden mechanism of cross-subsidization. Human hospitals intentionally overcharge for highly profitable, elective services—such as cardiac or orthopedic surgeries—to cover the immense financial losses mandated by EMTALA and community charity care obligations.[13] Economic models proposed

by Faulhaber (1975) and Peltzman suggest that non-profit hospitals act essentially as regulated entities, bowing to community pressure to provide uncompensated care, and funding it through their profitable service lines.[58] When specialized, for-profit single-specialty cardiac hospitals enter a human market, they siphon off these lucrative procedures, forcing the incumbent general hospitals to drastically reduce their provision of unprofitable community services. Studies in Arizona and Colorado demonstrated that incumbent hospitals reduced their provision of psychiatric and trauma care by one admission for every four cardiac admissions they lost to new specialty entrants.[13]

Because veterinary medicine has no EMTALA mandate, no legal obligation to stabilize the indigent, and no statutory requirement to provide charity care to maintain tax-exempt status, veterinary specialty centers do not need to engage in cross-subsidization. Consequently, their margins reflect a pure, unadulterated free-market structure. Veterinary specialty and emergency clinics routinely achieve exceptional net profit margins ranging from 15% to 25%, compared to 10% to 15% for standard general practices.[61] They achieve these robust margins by optimizing their overhead—keeping it 8% to 10% lower than standard practices by sharing centralized facility costs and ward staff among different specialists—and by strictly limiting their exposure to low-margin ancillary services.[65]

When veterinary charity care is provided, it is not absorbed by the massive specialty centers. Instead, it is usually sequestered into entirely separate 501(c)(3) non-profit organizations or highly subsidized community clinics. Unsurprisingly, these organizations are perpetually overwhelmed by demand and starved for resources. A recent survey indicated that 91% of animal sheltering organizations face severe surgical backlogs (amounting to over 18,600 animals awaiting basic procedures), and 72% of access-to-care clinics are critically short-staffed, resulting in care delays exceeding two months.[66] This stark architectural division proves that a deregulated medical market naturally segregates highly profitable, elite specialty care from unprofitable indigent care, effectively starving the safety net of the internal cross-subsidies required to sustain broad population health.

Economic Metric	**Human Hospitals (Regulated)**	**Veterinary Hospitals (Deregulated)**
Consolidation Driver	Health system mergers	Private equity roll-ups

	for negotiating power	for rapid ROI [21]
Indigent Care Funding	Internal cross-subsidization of profitable services [13]	Segregated to overwhelmed 501(c)(3) non-profits [66]
Pricing Strategy	Obscured by Chargemasters and PBM rebates	Aggressively inflated by corporate monopolies (+60%) [21]
Specialty Net Margins	Suppressed by charity care requirements [59]	Optimized at 15% to 25% (no charity mandate) [61]

Synthesis—Testing the Hypothesis

By accurately mapping the extensive data generated by the veterinary paradigm onto the human healthcare system, policy analysts can synthesize a highly precise projection of what a deregulated human medical system would entail. The results present a profound, inescapable dichotomy between rapid technological innovation and severe sociological inequity.

The Innovation Translation: Bench to Bedside

A primary, undeniable benefit of deregulation is the removal of bureaucratic friction, which radically accelerates the pace of clinical innovation. The current human drug development pipeline is defined by astronomical financial costs, glacial timelines, and dismal failure rates. Developing a single novel anticancer drug takes an average of 12 years and costs an estimated median of $648 million.[67] Despite these massive investments, 90% to 95% of oncological drugs that demonstrate safety in preclinical animal models (such as lab mice) ultimately fail to show efficacy when translated into human Phase I, II, and III clinical trials.[67]

Veterinary medicine, specifically the rapidly expanding field of comparative oncology, entirely bypasses this regulatory bottleneck. Because the 6 million companion dogs diagnosed with cancer annually in

the U.S. develop naturally occurring tumors with striking genetic, biological, and physiological concordance to human cancers—and do so at an incidence rate roughly 10 times higher than humans—they serve as ideal, real-world translational models.[68] Furthermore, because veterinary clinical trials are legally perceived as pilot laboratory studies and are not constrained by the rigid, multi-phased FDA trial designs required for humans, veterinary oncologists possess the ultimate regulatory flexibility. They can immediately administer investigational precision medicines to canine patients if early data suggests it might be beneficial for that specific dog's cancer.[68]

This deregulated, agile environment allows veterinary researchers to collect genomic and clinical outcome data up to 10 times faster than equivalent National Cancer Institute (NCI) consortiums.[68] The translational benefits for humans are immense. For example, data generated rapidly at the veterinary point-of-care successfully confirmed the efficacy of the breast cancer drug Eribulin for canine angiosarcoma, allowing the drug to bypass years of preliminary red tape and be fast-tracked directly into Phase II human trials.[68] Similarly, novel surgical devices like the Vetlen Pouch—a localized antibiotic reservoir—were rapidly iterated and proven effective on severe infections in companion animals, providing immediate proof-of-concept for human orthopedic applications.[73] This dynamic proves that without the heavy friction of human trial bureaucracy and CMS coverage determinations, clinical specialists can iterate faster, repurpose drugs dynamically, and drastically reduce the time to market for novel, life-saving therapies. However, this magnificent efficiency relies entirely upon a paradigm where the clinical subject and the end-user are treated in a commercial market devoid of standard human oversight protocols.

The Equity Question: Projecting the Model

If the United States human healthcare system were to be broadly deregulated to mirror veterinary medicine—eliminating EMTALA, dismantling third-party managed care networks, transitioning to upfront cash or strict reimbursement-style insurance, and capping malpractice liabilities—the systemic architecture of the nation's health would fundamentally and permanently transform.

The immediate, tangible result would be a massive reduction in administrative waste. The billions of dollars currently consumed by medical coding, billing departments, and prior authorization battles would evaporate, returning approximately 15% to 30% of total health expenditures back into the

system.[1] This would increase the time providers spend on direct patient care and dramatically lower the raw retail cost of pharmaceuticals and routine medical interventions, aligning them closer to their true manufacturing costs.[9] Clinical autonomy would reach unprecedented heights, unburdened by algorithmic insurance pathways, and the pace of medical innovation from bench to bedside would accelerate exponentially.

However, the sociological and moral cost of these operational efficiencies would be catastrophic for population health equity. The veterinary model effectively and unapologetically institutionalizes a tiered triage system based entirely on liquid capital. Without internal cross-subsidization to support indigent care or federal emergency mandates to ensure stabilization, medical outcomes would perfectly mirror socioeconomic status. The "Spectrum of Care" would become the default standard for the middle and lower classes, where empirical, lower-cost symptom management replaces definitive, technologically advanced curative interventions.[14]

For those without upfront cash or the credit required to float a reimbursement-style insurance claim, life-saving emergency care would be explicitly denied at the hospital door. This would introduce the grim human equivalent of economic euthanasia—where highly treatable, acute pathologies result in death strictly due to a lack of immediate personal funding. Furthermore, the influx of private equity into a deregulated human system would undoubtedly mirror the veterinary experience. Rather than passing the savings of reduced administrative overhead down to the patient, localized corporate monopolies would capture that newly freed margin, aggressively inflating the price of specialty procedures to maximize shareholder extraction, and deploying non-compete agreements to consolidate their control over the medical labor force.[21]

Ultimately, the hypothesis that veterinary medicine serves as a highly accurate proxy for human medical deregulation is remarkably robust. The comprehensive data confirms that stripping away third-party mandates, emergency care obligations, and unlimited tort liabilities yields a highly efficient, point-of-care transaction model that eliminates administrative bloat, enforces total price transparency, and accelerates clinical innovation. Yet, it simultaneously exposes the harsh, unyielding realities of a pure free-market health economy. The veterinary paradigm proves definitively that while deregulation optimizes the speed of scientific advancement and the profitability of specialty providers, it structurally

abandons the foundational concept of healthcare as a universal human right, replacing it entirely with a ruthless, capital-gated commodity market.

References

1. The Role Of Administrative Waste In Excess US Health Spending, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.healthaffairs.org/content/briefs/role-administrative-waste-excess-us-health-spending
2. Where Does all the Money Go? Estimated Administrative Costs Related to Physician Billing Activities - The ObG Project, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.obgproject.com/2018/03/27/money-go-estimated-administrative-costs-related-physician-billing-activities/
3. Administrative Costs Associated With Physician Billing and Insurance-Related Activities at an Academic Health Care System - PMC, accessed April 26, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5839285/
4. Administrative work consumes one-sixth of U.S. physicians' working hours and lowers their career satisfaction - PubMed, accessed April 26, 2026, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25626223/
5. Tips to Help You Manage the cost of Veterinary Staffing - Simmons, accessed April 26, 2026, https://simmonsinc.com/can-you-manage-veterinary-practice-staff-expenses/
6. Understanding Practice Expenses with the 100-Penny Exercise - FVMA, accessed April 26, 2026, https://fvma.org/understanding-practice-expenses-with-the-100-penny-exercise/
7. Benchmarking data plus elevating efficiency equals practice productivity, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.avma.org/news/benchmarking-data-plus-elevating-efficiency-equals-practice-productivity
8. Chart of the month: Optimizing staff-to-veterinarian ratios | American Veterinary Medical Association, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.avma.org/blog/chart-month-optimizing-staff-veterinarian-ratios
9. Price Comparison of Human and Veterinary Formulations of Common Medications - PMC,

accessed April 26, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9468944/

10. Similar medications cost more for humans compared to pets, accessed April 26, 2026, https://med.umn.edu/news/similar-medications-cost-more-humans-compared-pets
11. Human-Drug Prices Much Higher Than Pet Versions With Same Ingredients, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.uspharmacist.com/article/humandrug-prices-much-higher-than-pet-versions-with-same-ingredients
12. Is EMTALA That Bad? | Journal of Ethics | American Medical Association, accessed April 26, 2026, https://journalofethics.ama-assn.org/article/emtala-bad/2010-06
13. Do hospitals cross-subsidize? - PubMed - NIH, accessed April 26, 2026, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25062300/
14. The Cost of Caring Too Much? - Today's Veterinary Practice, accessed April 26, 2026, https://todaysveterinarypractice.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2022/03/TVP-2020-0102_FindingBalance.pdf
15. Embracing the Spectrum of Care: Because veterinary medicine isn't one size-fits all | VMG, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.myvmg.com/knowledge-center/embracing-the-spectrum-of-care-because-veterinary-medicine-isnt-one-size-fits-all/
16. business models used to improve access to veterinary ... - ASPCApro, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.aspcapro.org/sites/default/files/2022-05/business-models-used-to-improve-access-to-veterinary-care.pdf
17. Does Defensive Medicine 'Work'? | Harvard Medical School, accessed April 26, 2026, https://hms.harvard.edu/news/does-defensive-medicine-work-0
18. Detailed Discussion of Veterinarian Malpractice | Animal Legal ..., accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.animallaw.info/article/detailed-discussion-veterinarian-malpractice-0
19. modern trends in veterinary malpractice: how our evolving attitudes toward non, accessed April 26, 2026, https://law.lclark.edu/live/files/26558-10gnunalee
20. Defensive Medicine and the Confidence Gap: Rethinking How Vets Practise, accessed April 26, 2026,

https://theconsultroom.co.uk/defensive-medicine-and-the-confidence-gap-rethinking-how-vets-practise/

21. Letter from Senators Warren and Blumenthal to ... - Elizabeth Warren, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.warren.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/warren_blumenthal_letter_to_mars_re_mars_petcare.pdf
22. Some parallels and differences - AVMA Journals, accessed April 26, 2026, https://avmajournals.avma.org/view/journals/javma/202/11/javma.1993.202.11.1819.pdf
23. FDA Animal Drug Regulation: How It Compares to Human Drugs - IntuitionLabs, accessed April 26, 2026, https://intuitionlabs.ai/pdfs/fda-animal-drug-regulation-how-it-compares-to-human-drugs.pdf
24. The Ins and Outs of Extra-Label Drug Use in Animals: A Resource for Veterinarians | FDA, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.fda.gov/animal-veterinary/resources-you/ins-and-outs-extra-label-drug-use-animals-resource-veterinarians
25. Off-Label Prescribing in Pediatric Population—Literature Review for 2012–2022 - MDPI, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.mdpi.com/1999-4923/15/12/2652
26. Off-Label Medication use in Children, More Common than We Think: A Systematic Review of the Literature - PMC, accessed April 26, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6677268/
27. A systematic review of the effects of euthanasia and occupational stress in personnel working with animals in animal shelters, veterinary clinics, and biomedical research facilities in - AVMA Journals, accessed April 26, 2026, https://avmajournals.avma.org/view/journals/javma/247/10/javma.247.10.1121.xml
28. Professional Burnout vs Compassion Fatigue vs Vicarious Trauma - Veterinary Integration Solutions, accessed April 26, 2026, https://vetintegrations.com/insights/professional-burnout-vs-compassion-fatigue-vs-vicarious-traumatization-in-the-veterinary-business/
29. The Psychology of Veterinarians — Compassion Fatigue, Euthanasia Stress & the Empathy Paradox | JobCannon, accessed April 26, 2026,

https://jobcannon.io/blog/psychology-of-veterinarians

30. Compassion Fatigue, Euthanasia Stress, and Their Management in Laboratory Animal Research - PMC, accessed April 26, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6526492/
31. Owner-reported financial limitations negatively impact emergency veterinary teams, accessed April 26, 2026, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/41052540/
32. A narrative review of the physiology and health effects of burnout associated with veterinarian-pertinent occupational stressors - PMC, accessed April 26, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10351608/
33. MSAR014 - MSAR Debt Information - AAMC, accessed April 26, 2026, https://students-residents.aamc.org/system/files/2026-04/MSAR014%20-%20MSAR%20Debt%20Information.pdf
34. 7 ways to reduce medical school debt | AAMC, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.aamc.org/news/7-ways-reduce-medical-school-debt
35. Physician Salary: Is It Worth the Student Debt?, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.studentloanplanner.com/physician-salary-how-much/
36. Debt Burden and ROI: DO vs. MD Cost, Salary, and Payback Time Models, accessed April 26, 2026, https://residencyadvisor.com/resources/do-vs-md/debt-burden-and-roi-do-vs-md-cost-salary-and-payback-time-models
37. Debt-to-Income Ratio Improves - Veterinary Medicine at Illinois, accessed April 26, 2026, https://vetmed.illinois.edu/2023/01/26/debt-to-income-ratio-new-veterinary-graduates/
38. Chart of the month: New insights on student debt | American Veterinary Medical Association, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.avma.org/blog/chart-month-new-insights-student-debt
39. Veterinary EduDebtology 101 - Student Debt Center - VIN, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.vin.com/studentdebtcenter/the/default.aspx?pid=14352&catId=73444&id=7516825
40. 2022 Veterinary Stats - Otto, accessed April 26, 2026, https://otto.vet/2022-vetirinary-stats/
41. Survey results highlight pet owner price sensitivity for veterinary services, accessed April 26, 2026,

https://www.avma.org/news/survey-results-highlight-pet-owner-price-sensitivity-veterinary-services

42. 52% of U.S. Pet Owners Skipped or Declined Veterinary Care - Gallup News, accessed April 26, 2026, https://news.gallup.com/poll/659057/pet-owners-skipped-declined-veterinary-care.aspx
43. Veterinarians report increasing price sensitivity, decreasing visits | American Veterinary Medical Association, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.avma.org/news/veterinarians-report-increasing-price-sensitivity-decreasing-visits
44. Why is it so much cheaper to treat pets than humans? - Advisory Board, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.advisory.com/daily-briefing/2020/03/04/vet-prices
45. Pet Insurance vs Human Health Insurance: Key Differences to Know | Pawlicy Advisor, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.pawlicy.com/blog/pet-insurance-vs-human-health-insurance/
46. Pet Health Insurance vs. Human Health Insurance | Pet Insurance Quotes, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.petinsurancequotes.com/blog/pet-advice/pet-insurance-vs-human-insurance
47. Pet Insurance vs Human Health Insurance. What's the Difference? - Trupanion, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.trupanion.com/pet-blog/article/pet-insurance-vs-human-health-insurance
48. How Pet Insurance Different Human Health Insurance: Guide for Pet Parents, accessed April 26, 2026, https://figopetinsurance.com/blog/how-pet-insurance-different-human-health-insurance
49. The Impact of Pet Health Insurance on Dog Owners' Spending for ..., accessed April 26, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7401533/
50. How Veterinary Oncology Differs from Human Cancer Care - DoveLewis, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.dovelewis.org/blog/how-veterinary-oncology-differs-human-cancer-care
51. “Positive” Cancer Trials With Surrogate Endpoints Rarely Improve Survival, Quality of Life, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.oncologynewscentral.com/oncology/positive-cancer-trials-with-surrogate-endpoints-rarely-improve-survival-quality-of-life

52. Quality of Life Measurement in Prospective Studies of Cancer Treatments in Dogs and Cats, accessed April 26, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4895614/
53. Quality of life assessment in cancer patients receiving single-agent versus multidrug chemotherapy protocols - Open Veterinary Journal, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.openveterinaryjournal.com/index.php?mno=133246&html=1
54. Corporate consolidation and the rise of private equity - AAHA, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.aaha.org/trends-magazine/publications/corporate-consolidation-and-the-rise-of-private-equity/
55. Antitrust enforcement and consolidation in veterinary medicine, accessed April 26, 2026, https://pestakeholder.org/news/antitrust-enforcement-and-consolidation-in-veterinary-medicine/
56. Corporate Versus Private Practice: Which One Is Right For Me? - Family Vet Care of Oakdale, accessed April 26, 2026, https://oakdalevet.com/corporate-versus-private-practice-which-one-is-right-for-me/
57. Differences in perceptions and satisfaction exist among veterinarians employed at corporate versus privately owned veterinary clinics in - AVMA Journals, accessed April 26, 2026, https://avmajournals.avma.org/view/journals/javma/261/12/javma.23.06.0326.xml
58. NBER Working Paper Series DO HOSPITALS CROSS SUBSIDIZE? Guy David, Richard Lindrooth, Lorens A. Helmchen - University of Pennsylvania, accessed April 26, 2026, https://repository.upenn.edu/bitstreams/e2397f2e-da37-40c7-b496-c5ee5c625573/download
59. Cross-Subsidization in Hospital Care: Some Lessons from the Law and Economics of Regulation, accessed April 26, 2026, https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1489&context=healthmatrix
60. Do hospitals cross-subsidize? - PMC - NIH, accessed April 26, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5769684/
61. Profit Margin Calculator for Veterinary - Harvest, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.getharvest.com/calculators/profit-margin-calculator-for-veterinary
62. How to Know What Your Vet Practice is Worth, accessed April 26, 2026,

https://www.totalpracticesolutionsgroup.com/how-to-know-what-your-vet-practice-is-worth/

63. Veterinary Clinic Revenue Breakdown - Maven Imaging, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.mavenimaging.com/blog/veterinary-clinic-revenue-breakdown
64. How Profitable is a Vet Clinic in 2025? What To Know - Covetrus Technical Solutions, accessed April 26, 2026, https://software.covetrus.com/apac/veterinary-insights/article/practice-solutions/how-profitable-is-a-vet-clinic/
65. Fiscal Focus Points - Team-Based Veterinary Healthcare Delivery ..., accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.vin.com/apputil/content/defaultadv1.aspx?id=3862673&pid=11227&print=1
66. The Nonprofit Veterinarian Shortage: Who Will Care for the Pets Most in Need?, accessed April 26, 2026, https://jsmcah.org/index.php/jasv/article/view/75
67. Comparative Oncology: Advances in Cancer Care from Pets to Humans | Pharmacy Times, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.pharmacytimes.com/view/comparative-oncology-advances-in-cancer-care-from-pets-to-humans
68. Canine cancers as models: We have barely tapped the full potential ..., accessed April 26, 2026, https://cancerletter.com/trials-and-tribulations/20240503_4/
69. New Approach Methodologies (NAMs) - FDA, accessed April 26, 2026, https://www.fda.gov/science-research/science-and-research-special-topics/new-approach-methodologies-nams
70. Lost in translation: animal models and clinical trials in cancer treatment - PMC, accessed April 26, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3902221/
71. Terminology Matters: Understanding the Differences in Animal vs Human Drug Development - Kisaco Research |, accessed April 26, 2026, https://kisacoresearch.com/sites/default/files/documents/ahinnovationusa_linda_rhodes.pdf
72. Translating clinical trials from human to veterinary oncology and ..., accessed April 26, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4536666/
73. How Biomedical Innovation Is Healing Animals to Help People | University of Utah Health, accessed April 26, 2026,

Caveat lector

https://uofuhealth.utah.edu/newsroom/news/2025/12/how-biomedical-innovation-healing-animals-help-people