Prior Authorization: Why 'Fighting Back' Is Now Standard Practice

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 7 August 2026 · Edited by Mara Voss

> The administrative burden of prior authorization continues to escalate, creating a significant barrier between patients and necessary medical care. What began as a mechanism to control costs and ensure appropriate utilization has evolved into a complex, often opaque system that frequently delays or denies treatments, even for established indications.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Prior authorization is no longer a simple approval process; it is an adversarial system requiring persistent appeals.
- The Data: A substantial percentage of initial prior authorization requests are denied, necessitating multiple rounds of appeals.
- The Action: Clinicians must adopt a proactive, 'fight back' mentality, documenting meticulously and understanding the appeals process to ensure patient access to care.

Prior authorization, a process requiring healthcare providers to obtain approval from a health insurer before a specific service or medication is rendered, has become a pervasive feature of modern medical practice. Its stated purpose is to ensure that treatments are medically necessary and cost-effective, thereby curbing unnecessary healthcare spending. But the reality on the ground for European GPs and specialists is often one of frustration, delays, and a significant diversion of clinical resources away from direct patient care.

The scope of prior authorization has expanded dramatically over the past two decades, now encompassing a vast array of services from imaging studies and specialist referrals to surgical procedures and high-cost medications. This expansion means that almost every clinician, regardless of specialty, will encounter prior authorization requirements on a daily basis. The administrative overhead associated with these requests is substantial, consuming valuable time that could otherwise be spent with patients or on other clinical duties.

The Administrative Labyrinth

The initial submission of a prior authorization request is rarely a straightforward affair. It typically involves completing detailed forms, often specific to each insurer, and providing extensive clinical documentation to justify the proposed treatment. This documentation must clearly articulate the patient's diagnosis, previous treatments attempted, rationale for the chosen therapy, and expected outcomes. Any perceived inadequacy or omission in this initial submission can lead to an immediate denial, regardless of the clinical merit.

Many clinicians report that the criteria used by insurers for approval are often inconsistent, lack transparency, or do

not align with established clinical guidelines. This disconnect forces providers into a position where they must not only justify their clinical decisions but also interpret and navigate an insurer's proprietary rules. The process can feel arbitrary, particularly when a treatment is widely accepted as standard of care but still faces hurdles.

The Inevitable Denial and Appeal

A significant proportion of initial prior authorization requests are denied. This is not an anomaly; it is an expected part of the process for many complex or expensive treatments. When a denial occurs, the clinician is then faced with the decision to appeal. This is where the 'fighting back' element truly begins. An appeal is not a simple resubmission; it is a formal challenge to the insurer's decision, requiring even more detailed documentation and often direct engagement with the insurer's medical review staff.

The first level of appeal typically involves submitting additional clinical notes, imaging reports, or laboratory results that further support the medical necessity of the treatment. This often means providing information that was already included in the initial submission but may have been overlooked or deemed insufficient by the initial reviewer. The expectation is that the clinician will meticulously review the denial letter, understand the specific reasons for the rejection, and then address each point with targeted evidence.

Escalation and Peer-to-Peer Reviews

If the first appeal is unsuccessful, the process often escalates to a second-level appeal, which may involve a 'peer-to-peer' review. This is a direct conversation between the prescribing clinician and a physician employed by the insurance company. While ostensibly a dialogue between medical professionals, these calls can be contentious. The insurer's physician may challenge the treatment plan, question the clinician's rationale, or suggest alternative, often less expensive, therapies. The prescribing clinician must be prepared to articulate a robust defense of their decision, citing relevant clinical evidence and patient-specific factors.

These peer-to-peer reviews are time-consuming and can be emotionally draining. Clinicians often feel they are being second-guessed by individuals who may not have the same depth of understanding of the patient's specific case or the nuances of their specialty. The goal for the clinician is to persuade the insurer's physician that the requested treatment is indeed the most appropriate and medically necessary course of action. Success in this stage often hinges on thorough preparation and an unwavering commitment to advocating for the patient.

The Impact on Patient Care

The most immediate and concerning consequence of prior authorization is the delay in patient care. Delays can have serious implications, particularly for conditions where timely intervention is critical, such as cancer, autoimmune diseases, or acute cardiovascular events. A patient awaiting approval for an urgent MRI or a specific chemotherapy regimen may experience disease progression, increased pain, or a worsening of their overall prognosis. This administrative hurdle directly compromises the principle of providing timely, effective care.

Beyond delays, outright denials can force clinicians to consider less optimal, often older or less effective, treatments that do not require prior authorization. This can lead to poorer patient outcomes, increased healthcare costs in the long run due to complications, and a diminished quality of life for the patient. The system, designed to control costs, can paradoxically lead to higher overall expenditures when patients are denied access to the most appropriate, preventative, or disease-modifying therapies.

The Burden on Clinical Staff

The administrative burden of prior authorization extends beyond the prescribing physician. Nurses, medical assistants, and administrative staff spend countless hours on the phone with insurance companies, filling out forms, tracking submissions, and managing appeals. This diversion of resources means less time for direct patient interaction, patient education, and other essential clinical support activities. Many practices have had to hire dedicated staff solely to manage prior authorization requests, adding to their operational costs.

The sheer volume of paperwork and phone calls can lead to burnout among clinical staff. The repetitive nature of fighting for approvals, often for treatments that are clearly indicated, fosters a sense of futility and frustration. This administrative overload contributes to the broader problem of healthcare professional burnout, impacting morale and potentially leading to staff shortages.

Strategies for 'Fighting Back'

Given the current landscape, clinicians must adopt proactive strategies to navigate the prior authorization process effectively. Meticulous documentation is paramount. Every clinical decision, every patient encounter, and every rationale for a chosen therapy must be clearly and comprehensively recorded. This includes documenting failed prior therapies, specific patient characteristics that justify a particular treatment, and the potential adverse outcomes of delaying or denying care.

Understanding the specific requirements of different insurers is also critical. While a daunting task, having access to a handbook on healthcare management can provide insights into the policy and organizational developments that shape these processes. Many practices maintain internal databases or cheat sheets detailing common prior authorization requirements for frequently prescribed medications or procedures. This institutional knowledge can streamline the initial submission process and reduce the likelihood of immediate denials. Furthermore, leveraging electronic health record (EHR) systems to generate pre-populated forms or automatically flag prior authorization requirements can help to automate some of the more tedious aspects of the process.

Building a strong case for appeal requires not only detailed clinical notes but also a clear understanding of the insurer's denial rationale. Clinicians should request and carefully review the specific reasons for denial, as these often highlight the precise information the insurer believes is missing or insufficient. Tailoring the appeal to directly address these points, rather than simply resubmitting the original request, significantly increases the chances of success. Engaging in peer-to-peer reviews with a well-prepared argument, backed by robust evidence and a firm understanding of the patient's clinical needs, is essential.

The Broader Advocacy

Beyond individual patient advocacy, there is a growing movement among medical societies and professional organizations to advocate for systemic reforms to the prior authorization process. These efforts focus on increasing transparency, standardizing criteria based on evidence-based guidelines, and streamlining the appeals process. The goal is to shift the balance from an adversarial system to one that genuinely supports appropriate patient care while still managing costs responsibly. The current system often feels like a barrier to care, rather than a safeguard.

The ongoing challenge for clinicians is to balance the demands of patient care with the administrative burden imposed by prior authorization. It requires a resilient approach, a commitment to detailed documentation, and a willingness to

engage in what can often feel like a protracted battle. For now, 'fighting back' is not merely an option; it is an integral part of ensuring patients receive the care they need.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The current state of prior authorization demands a fundamental shift in how clinicians approach administrative tasks. It is no longer sufficient to simply submit a request and expect approval; the process has become inherently adversarial, requiring a proactive and persistent stance. This means dedicating more resources to documentation and understanding the intricate, often arbitrary, rules of various insurers.

For patients, this system translates directly into delays and potential denials of necessary care. Clinicians must be transparent with patients about these administrative hurdles, managing expectations and empowering them to understand why their treatment might be delayed. The emotional toll of waiting for approval, particularly for serious conditions, cannot be overstated.

The industry, particularly health insurers, must recognize the significant burden this process places on the healthcare system. While cost control is a legitimate concern, the current implementation often leads to increased administrative costs, clinician burnout, and ultimately, poorer patient outcomes. A more collaborative, evidence-based approach to prior authorization is desperately needed to align with clinical best practices.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. Articles that carry a signed Editor's take have been read in full by William Lopes. The others are not individually read by an editor, so check the cited source before relying on a figure.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Friman S, Maijala R, Eloranta S, Suominen S, Ikonen T. The characteristics of leadership and their effectiveness in quality management in healthcare - A systematic literature review and a content analysis. Health Serv Manage Res. 2025;38(1):37-49. doi:10.1177/09514848241254921
2. 2. Endalamaw A, Khatri RB, Mengistu TS, et al. A scoping review of continuous quality improvement in healthcare system: conceptualization, models and tools, barriers and facilitators, and impact. BMC Health Serv Res. 2024;24(1):487. doi:10.1186/s12913-024-10828-0
3. 3. Jayousi S, Barchielli C, Alaimo M, et al. ICT in Nursing and Patient Healthcare Management: Scoping Review and Case Studies. Sensors (Basel). 2024;24(10). doi:10.3390/s24103129
4. 4. Pinnock H, Parke HL, Panagioti M, et al. Systematic meta-review of supported self-management for asthma: a healthcare perspective. BMC Med. 2017;15(1):64. doi:10.1186/s12916-017-0823-7
5. 5. Silvola S, Restelli U, Croce D, Basu D. Change management for services redesign in healthcare: a conceptual framework. J Prev Med Hyg. 2024;65(3):E410-E433. doi:10.15167/2421-4248/jpmh2024.65.3.3023
6. 6. Macklin J, Samson B, Zsager A, Ross H, Pinto A, Gibson JL. Cardiovascular disease management and healthcare delivery for people experiencing homelessness: a scoping review. BMC Health Serv Res. 2024;24(1):1080. doi:10.1186/s12913-024-11503-0

LICENCE & RIGHTS

© 2026 The Life Science Feed. All rights reserved. This content is produced for medical education purposes. It may not be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted without prior written permission from The Life Science Feed.

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com