Reimbursement Whirlwind: Evolving Wound Care Payment Models In Canada And The United States

By Therese Laub LPN CWS FACCWS and Douglas Queen BSc PhD MBA

How to cite: Laub T, Queen D. Reimbursement whirlwind: evolving wound care payment models in Canada and the United States. Wound Care Canada. 2026;24(1): 32-39. DOI: 10.56885/698853plftsa

Wound care reimbursement is undergoing rapid transformation across North America, particularly in the United States. Rising chronic disease prevalence, escalating health-care costs and the shift toward value-based care are reshaping how wound care services and technologies are funded.

Although Canada and the US operate within fundamentally different health-care financing structures, both systems face similar pressures to improve outcomes, reduce preventable utilization, and ensure sustainability. This manuscript examines the evolving reimbursement landscapes in both countries and outlines opportunities for cross-border learning to support more equitable, efficient and evidence-driven wound care.

Chronic wounds represent a growing clinical and economic burden across North America, affecting an estimated 2.5% of the population and generating billions in annual health-care expenditures.[1] Globally, wound care expenditure tops US$300 billion,[2] with the US accounting for nearly US$200 billion[2] and Canada some CAD$13 billion.[3] As treatment options expand and costs rise, reimbursement models are being re-evaluated while maintaining access to effective therapies.[4] Traditional fee-for-service structures are the foundation of wound care reimbursement. These structures are increasingly viewed as misaligned with the multidisciplinary nature of wound management.[5]

Both the United States and Canada are experiencing significant shifts in reimbursement policy, driven by the need to improve outcomes, reduce complications and contain costs.[6]

Despite their structural differences, both systems are moving toward models emphasizing value,

accountability and standardization (See Table 1).[7] As health-care systems adapt to these financial pressures and strive to improve patient outcomes, understanding reimbursement is vital for clinicians, administrators and policymakers.[8]

As wound treatments have advanced their usage has come under scrutiny considering misuse and overuse.[9] Managing the reimbursement of such advanced approaches has been challenging for most health-care systems around the world.[10]

Wound Care Reimbursement In The US

The US reimbursement environment is characterized by fragmentation and complexity.[11] Medicare, Medicaid and commercial insurers each maintain distinct coverage criteria, documentation requirements and utilization controls. This variability creates an administrative burden and inconsistent access to advanced wound therapies.[12]

Coverage for advanced wound therapies—such as negative pressure wound therapy (NPWT), bioengineered skin substitutes and advanced dressings—varies by payer and care setting.

Medicare coverage often depends on demonstrated medical necessity and adherence to evidence-based guidelines.[17]

Documentation as a reimbursement determinant: Documentation has become a central mechanism for controlling costs. Insufficient or imprecise documentation can result in immediate denials, prior authorization failures and post-payment audits.[15]

Wound Care Reimbursement In Canada

Canada's universal health-care system provides publicly funded wound care services, with reimbursement decisions made at the provincial or territorial level. This structure promotes equity and standardization but can slow the adoption of new technologies.[18] As a public system, Canada focuses on more social elements (See Table 2), such as integration and equity of care.[19] Similar to the US, cost containment is also a driver.[20]

Coverage decisions for advanced wound therapies are influenced by clinical evidence, cost-effectiveness analyses and provincial formulary inclusion.[21] In Canada, documentation influences program evaluation, future funding decisions and resource allocation.[22]

US vs Canada: Possible Integration Of Models

Prior authorizations, clinical documentation and coding accuracy are crucial for securing reimbursement.[24] However, gaps remain, particularly for newer technologies and out-of-pocket costs can be significant for patients when therapies fall outside established coverage policies.[25]

Canada, where the reimbursement landscape for advanced wound therapies is primarily governed by provincial and territorial health ministries, which determine coverage within their publicly funded health systems, has its own challenges.[26]

Table 1: Key Trends in the US Landscape

Key Trends in the US Landscape	
Shift Toward Value-Based Payment	The transition from fee-for-service to value-based models continues to accelerate. Bundled payments, accountable care organizations (ACOs), and pay-for-performance initiatives incentivize reductions in complications, readmissions and total cost of care.[13, 14]
Regulatory Tightening	Medicare and Medicaid have increased scrutiny on documentation accuracy, coding precision and appropriate utilization of advanced therapies, contributing to rising denial rates and audit activity.[15]
Private Payer Alignment	Commercial insurers increasingly mirror federal value-based strategies, often adding payer-specific formularies and coverage restrictions for wound care products and technologies.[16]
Shift to Outpatient and Home Based Care	To reduce costs and align with patient preferences, wound care is migrating from inpatient settings to outpatient clinics and home health environments.[12]

Table 2: Key Trends in the Canadian Landscape

Key Trends in the Canadian Landscape	
Cost Containment and Standardization	Provincial health authorities rely on standardized formularies, clinical guidelines and cost-effectiveness assessments to manage expenditures.[21]
Regulatory Tightening	There is increasing emphasis on multidisciplinary wound care teams and standardized care pathways, consistent with broader Canadian health system reforms.[22]
Private Payer Alignment	Canada prioritizes equitable access to wound care services, though disparities persist in rural and remote communities.[23]

Table 3: Complementary Strengths in Wound Care Reimbursement

Complementary Strengths in Wound Care Reimbursement			
Domain	**United States[27]**	**Canada[28]**	**Implications for Future Models**
Access to Innovation	Faster adoption of advanced wound therapies when coverage exists; market-driven uptake	More cautious, formulary-based adoption	Create clearer, evidence-responsive pathways that balance innovation with stewardship
Equity of Access	Highly variable based on payer, geography and care setting	More uniform access across populations	Equity should be intentionally built into reimbursement design
Cost Control	Reactive mechanisms through audits, utilization controls and policy corrections	Proactive system-level cost containment	Shift from reactive correction to prevention-focused alignment
Incentive Structure	Increasing movement toward value-based and outcome-focused models	Limited linkage between reimbursement and wound-specific outcomes	Align funding with healing trajectories, complication reduction, and continuity of care
Administrative Burden	High documentation and compliance demands	Lower administrative complexity for clinicians	Preserve accountability while protecting clinical time

Possible Integration Of Models

The future of wound care reimbursement lies not in choosing between these models, but in integrating their strongest elements.

Coverage decisions are influenced by clinical evidence, cost-effectiveness assessments and local formulary listings. While some advanced wound therapies may be included in hospital or community care budgets, others—especially newer or higher-cost products—may require special approval or may not be funded at all.[27] Private insurance can sometimes supplement public coverage, but access varies widely across provinces/territories and between urban and rural settings. As a result, Canadian patients may experience variability in access to advanced wound therapies depending on their location and the policies of their local health authority.[28]

Across both systems, documentation has evolved from a clinical record to a primary tool of reimbursement governance.[29] Both countries face similar pressures—rising chronic disease burden, increasing wound complexity, escalating costs and demand for measurable outcomes—but employ different mechanisms to address them.[1,5] A comparative analysis reveals complementary strengths in each system, suggesting opportunities for hybrid reimbursement models that balance innovation, equity and sustainability (See Table 3).

Despite fundamentally different health-care financing structures, wound care reimbursement in both the US and Canada is being reshaped by the same underlying pressures: escalating chronic disease burden, rising costs associated with wound complications and increasing scrutiny over clinical variation.[30] These shared pressures are driving parallel trends while the mechanisms used to implement them differ markedly between the two countries.

Shared Direction: Value, Accountability And Cost Containment

Both countries are moving, deliberately but unevenly, away from pure fee-for-service models toward reimbursement approaches that emphasize value, outcomes and prevention of downstream costs.[31]

Policymakers on both sides of the border are increasingly focused on reducing avoidable hospitalizations, infections, amputations and prolonged lengths of stay related to chronic wounds.[39] However, how that value agenda is operationalized differs significantly.

In the US, value-based care is being layered onto an already complex multi-payer system.[32] This has resulted in intensified utilization management at the claim level, with reimbursement increasingly dependent on documentation precision, medical necessity thresholds and payer-specific coverage policies. Clinicians experience this shift directly through denials, audits and recoupments.[6]

In contrast, Canada's single-payer framework enables value-based principles to be applied at the system level. Provincial and regional authorities are embedding outcome accountability into funding models through global budgets, performance agreements and standardized pathways. Rather than claim-by-claim denials, the financial impact is felt through program scope, resource availability and service capacity.[26]

Advanced Therapy: Shared Scrutiny, Different Barriers

Access to advanced wound therapies is tightening in both countries, reflecting heightened concern over cost, evidence standards and system sustainability. Yet the barriers clinicians encounter differ in form and timing.

US clinicians may experience relatively rapid access once approval is granted, but face increasing hurdles upfront through prior authorization, narrowing indications and escalating documentation requirements.[33] Canadian clinicians, by contrast, face slower adoption cycles driven by formulary inclusion processes, regional approvals and budget impact analyses that evaluate affordability at scale.[34]

The result is a shared reality: access to advanced therapies is no longer based solely on clinical appropriateness, but on whether the therapy fits within broader economic and policy constraints.

Documentation As A Reimbursement Lever

One of the clearest points of convergence is the expanding role of documentation as a reimbursement gatekeeper. In the US, documentation has become a punitive mechanism: failure to meet evolving standards can result in immediate nonpayment or post-payment recoupment.[31] In Canada, documentation functions more as a justificatory mechanism, influencing future funding decisions, program evaluation and system confidence, rather than individual clinician payment.[35]

In both systems, documentation is no longer simply a clinical record; it is a primary tool of cost control.

Equity Considerations Shaping Policy

Equity concerns are increasingly influencing reimbursement discussions in both countries, though they arise from different systemic challenges.[36] The US grapples with disparities driven by insurance status and income, while Canada faces inequities related to geography, workforce availability and regional resource distribution.[37]

As a result, reimbursement reforms in both systems are being evaluated not only for cost savings, but for their impact on access to wound care for vulnerable populations, particularly those in rural, long-term care and home-based settings.[4,38]

Standardization And Its Impact On Clinical Practice

Finally, both countries are moving toward greater standardization of wound care delivery through defined pathways, algorithms and escalation criteria.[39] Variation in care is increasingly viewed as a financial risk.[40]

For US clinicians, this standardization is largely payer-driven and tied to reimbursement compliance.[41] For Canadian clinicians, it is system-driven and tied to resource allocation and service planning. In both cases, clinical autonomy remains, but must now operate within defensible, standardized frameworks.[42]

Key Takeaway for Wound Care Clinicians

- The US model excels at accelerating innovation but struggles with equity.
- The Canadian model protects access but can limit therapeutic flexibility.
- A hybrid reimbursement approach, equitable, outcome-driven and evidence-responsive - offers the clearest path forward.

In both the US and Canada, wound care clinicians should expect tighter reimbursement controls, higher documentation expectations and reduced tolerance for variation without clear justification. While both countries are responding to the same economic and clinical pressures, they are pursuing fundamentally different reimbursement strategies: the US is tightening control at the point of payment, placing increasing administrative and documentation burdens directly on clinicians, whereas Canada is tightening control at the system level, prioritizing sustainability, equity and standardization over speed of access.

Toward A Joint US–Canada Framework

Both countries recognize that chronic wound care requires multidisciplinary expertise, longitudinal management and timely access to appropriate therapies. Reimbursement models must evolve to support early intervention, coordination across care settings and integration of digital tools.

Despite structural differences in health system design, the US and Canada are confronting the same underlying challenge: chronic wound care is being reimbursed through regulatory and payment frameworks that fail to reflect its clinical complexity, longitudinal nature and impact on system-wide outcomes.

Both countries recognize that wound care cannot be sustainably managed as a narrow procedural service. Effective wound management requires advanced clinical judgment, coordination across care settings and timely access to appropriate interventions.

Reimbursement models that emphasize episodic transactions over longitudinal management risk driving delayed healing, avoidable complications and higher downstream costs.

A shared path forward requires balancing access with accountability. The US can benefit from greater national standardization, system-level oversight and support for coordinated care models, while Canada can strengthen responsiveness by enabling faster, criteria-based access to advanced therapies and reinforcing clinician discretion within standardized frameworks. Neither innovation nor equity should be treated as mutually exclusive goals.

Both systems must move toward reimbursement strategies that:

- Recognize wound care as a distinct, multidisciplinary specialty
- Support early intervention, reassessment and escalation when clinically indicated
- Incentivize coordination across post-acute and community care settings
- Leverage digital and AI tools to enhance—not replace—clinical judgment.

Aligning reimbursement with the realities of wound pathophysiology and care delivery is not simply a financial imperative, it is a patient safety issue. By learning from each other's strengths, the US and Canada have the opportunity to advance reimbursement models that promote healing, reduce preventable utilization and support sustainable, high-quality wound care across the continuum.

Conclusion

Both the United States and Canada are experiencing substantial shifts in wound care reimbursement, with a common trend towards value-based models and cost containment. However, the US system is more fragmented and market-driven, leading to greater variability in coverage and access, while Canada's publicly funded approach aims for standardization and equity, albeit with regional differences. Providers in both countries must stay informed about policy changes to ensure continued access to effective wound care for their patients.

A Case Study In Innovation[43, 44]

The WiSeR (Wound care, Innovation, Science and Research) program is an initiative focused on advancing wound care practices through research, education, and the implementation of innovative solutions. In the United States, the WiSeR program aims to improve patient outcomes by standardizing wound care protocols, integrating cutting-edge technology and fostering collaboration among health-care professionals.

Within the US, the WiSeR program has been implemented in various health-care settings, including hospitals, clinics and academic institutions. The program emphasizes evidence-based practices, continuous professional development and the use of data analytics to track and enhance wound healing outcomes. It also provides training and resources for health-care providers to ensure best practices in wound assessment, management and prevention.

As of January 2026, the WiSeR program has not been officially launched in Canada. However, there is growing interest among Canadian health-care professionals and organizations in adopting similar evidence-based wound care frameworks. The success of WiSeR in the US and the increasing need for advanced wound care solutions in Canada suggest that the program, or a comparable model, may eventually be introduced to the Canadian health-care system. Adoption would likely involve collaboration with Canadian health authorities to tailor the program to local policies, resources and patient needs.

In summary, the WiSeR program is making significant strides in improving wound care in the US through innovation, research and education. While it has yet to be established in Canada, its proven benefits and the demand for improved wound care practices indicate a strong possibility for future adoption north of the border.

The reimbursement landscapes in the United States and Canada are undergoing profound transformation. While the US system is tightening controls at the point of payment, Canada is tightening controls at the system level. A hybrid model—equitable, outcome-driven, evidence-responsive and innovation-enabled—offers the clearest path forward for wound care reimbursement across North America.

Assessment, documentation and establishing medical necessity are foundational pillars in the provision of quality health care. Thorough patient and wound assessment enable health-care professionals to collect critical information about a patient's condition, symptoms and history, which informs accurate diagnoses and effective care planning. The assessment process also supports continuity of care, ensuring that relevant details are communicated during transitions between providers or settings.

Documentation plays a vital role in both clinical practice and the broader health-care system. Accurate, timely and comprehensive records serve as a legal record of care provided, facilitate communication among multidisciplinary teams and support quality assurance and risk management efforts. Proper documentation is essential for demonstrating medical necessity, the justification for specific treatments, procedures or services based on clinical evidence and patient need. Medical necessity is not only crucial for ethical care delivery but also for securing insurance coverage and compliance with regulatory standards. When assessment findings and interventions are clearly documented, it ensures transparency, accountability and continuity, ultimately safeguarding both patient welfare and provider integrity.

Therese Laub LPN CWS FACCWS is a Certified Wound Specialist (CWS) and Fellow in the American College of Clinical Wound Specialists (FACCWS) with over a decade of experience in wound care consulting, program development and clinical operations. Through her company, Cicerone Consultants, she specializes in wound management solutions, compliance-driven models and staff training for home health, facilities and private practices. www.cicerone-consultants.com.

Douglas Queen BSc PhD MBA is CEO Medicalhelplines.com Inc, Toronto ON.

References

1. Sen CK. Human wounds and its burden: an updated compendium of estimates. Adv Wound Care (New Rochelle). 2019 Feb 1;8(2):39-48. DOI: 10.1089/wound.2019.0946.
2. Queen D, Botros M, Harding K. International opinion-the true cost of wounds for Canadians. Int Wound J. 2024 Jan;21(1):e14522. DOI: 10.1111/iwj.14522.
3. Queen D, Botros M. The true cost of wounds for Canadians. Wound Care Canada. 2024;22(1):16-20.
4. Tettelbach W, Armstrong D, Niezgoda J, Wahab N, Cole W, Tucker T, et al. The hidden costs of limiting access: clinical and economic risks of Medicare's future effective cellular, acellular and matrix-like products (CAMPs) Local Coverage Determination. J Wound Care. 2025 May 1;34(Sup5):S5-S14. DOI: 10.12968/jowc.2025.0120.
5. Nussbaum SR, Carter MJ, Fife CE, DaVanzo J, Haught R, Nusgart M, et al. An economic evaluation of the impact, cost, and medicare policy implications of chronic nonhealing wounds. Value Health. 2018 Jan;21(1):27-32. DOI: 10.1016/j.jval.2017.07.007.
6. Wagenschieber E, Blunck D. Impact of reimbursement systems on patient care - a systematic review of systematic reviews. Health Econ Rev. 2024 Mar 16;14(1):22. DOI: 10.1186/s13561-024-00487-6.
7. Sen CK. Standardized Wound care: patchwork practices? Adv Wound Care (New Rochelle). 2024 Oct;13(10):485-493. DOI: 10.1089/wound.2024.0130.
8. Sen CK. Human wound and its burden: updated 2025 compendium of estimates. Advances in Wound Care. 2025;14(9):429-438. DOI: 10.1177/21621918251359554.
9. Costa IG, Strachan R, Schoales C. Steer clear: inadvertent use of antimicrobials can cause unintentional harm to wound healing. Wound Care Canada. 2024;22(1):68-77. DOI: 10.56885/OPYU8295.
10. Tatarusanu SM, Lupascu FG, Profire BS, Szilagyi A, Gardikiotis I, Iacob AT, et al. Modern approaches in wounds management. Polymers (Basel). 2023 Sep 4;15(17):3648. DOI: 10.3390/polym15173648.
11. Ghannam D, Angelé-Halgand N, Kosremelli-Asmar M. Fragmentation of healthcare systems: challenges through patients' eyes. Int J Qual Stud Health Well-being. 2025 Dec 31;20(1):2598719. DOI: 10.1080/17482631.2025.2598719.
12. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). Medicare program updates and payment policy changes. 2023.

13. Burwell SM. Setting value-based payment goals--HHS efforts to improve U.S. health care. N Engl J Med. 2015 Mar 5;372(10):897-9. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp1500445.
14. Porter ME, Lee TH. The strategy that will fix health care. Harv Bus Rev. 2013 Oct 1;91(10):50-70.
15. Office of Inspector General. Medicare audits and improper payment trends. Washington (DC): U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; 2022.
16. Avalere Health. Commercial payer trends in specialty care management. Washington (DC): Avalere; 2022.
17. Armstrong DG, Boulton AJM, Bus SA. Diabetic foot ulcers and their recurrence. N Engl J Med. 2020 Jun 11;376(24):2367–2375.
18. Marchildon G. Health systems in transition: Canada. Toronto (ON): University of Toronto Press; 2013.
19. Atkinson G, Rai A, Wankah P, Lavergne R, Marshall EG, Embrett M,, et al. The intersection of policy and health equity in primary health care: a policy scan of 3 Canadian provinces. J Primary Care Community Health. 2025;16. DOI: 10.1177/21501319251383598.
20. Achor EC, Okon II, Jader A, Ewelike SC, Ibrahim M, Lucero-Prisno III DE.. Achieving sustainable healthcare cost containment in the United States: the role of collaborative efforts among stakeholders. Discov Health Systems. 2025;4:6. DOI: 10.1007/s44250-025-00188-9.
21. CADTH. Health technology assessment methods and guidelines. Ottawa (ON): Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health; 2022.
22. Health Quality Ontario. Quality standards for wound care in Ontario. Toronto (ON): HQO; 2019.
23. Allan B, Smylie J. First Peoples, second class treatment: the role of racism in the health and well-being of Indigenous peoples in Canada. Toronto (ON): Wellesley Institute; 2015.
24. Nusgart M. HCPCS coding: an integral part of your reimbursement strategy. Adv Wound Care (New Rochelle). 2013 Dec;2(10):576–582. DOI: 10.1089/wound.2013.0484.
25. Hess CT. Know your coverage policies. Adv Skin Wound Care. 2015 Sep;28(9):432. DOI: 10.1097/01.ASW.0000470733.98813.e9.
26. Martin D, Miller AP, Quesnel-Vallée A, Caron NR, Vissandjée B, Marchildon GP. Canada's universal healthcare system: achieving its potential. Lancet. 2018 Apr 28;391(10131):1718–1735. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30181-8.
27. Schaum KD. Increased provider payments = increased patient copayments. Adv Skin Wound Care. 2023 Mar;36(3):126-127. DOI: 10.1097/01.ASW.0000918892.23553.a3.
28. Laub T. Compliance that heals: aligning outcomes and costs in Canadian chronic wound care. Wound Care Canada. 2025;23(2):60-64. DOI: 10.56885/480044ttnhoj.
29. Ebbers T, Kool RB, Smeele LE, Dirven R, den Besten CA, Karssemakers LHE, et al. The impact of structured and standardized documentation on documentation quality; a multicenter, retrospective study. J Med Syst. 2022 May 21;46(7):46. DOI: 10.1007/s10916-022-01837-9.
30. Khalil H, Ameen M, Davies C, Liu C. Implementing value-based healthcare: a scoping review of key elements, outcomes, and challenges for sustainable healthcare systems. Front Public Health. 2025;13:1514098. DOI: 10.3389/fpubh.2025.1514098.
31. Crowley R, Daniel H, Cooney TG, et al. Envisioning a better U.S. health care system for all: coverage and cost of care. Ann Intern Med. 2020 Jan 21;172(2_supplement):S7-S32. DOI: 10.7326/M19-2415.
32. Frese W, Winkler L. A guide to understanding common denial issues. Physician Leadersh J. 2025;12(1):11/17. DOI: 10.55834/plj.6054827417.
33. Chen WC, Carpenter C, Sidiqi B, Pattison AJ, Hwang J, Pappas D, et al. Integrating prior authorization into clinical workflows for care access and practitioner experience. JAMA Netw Open. 2025 Dec 1;8(12):e2549093. DOI: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2025.49093.
34. Gorfinkel I, Lexchin JR. Cost-of-living challenges highlight urgency for clinicians to prescribe affordable medications. Can Fam Physician. 2023 Sep;69(9):599–600. DOI: 10.46747/cfp.6909599.
35. Dhalla IA, Tepper J. Improving the quality of health care in Canada. CMAJ. 2018 Oct 1;190(39):E1162–E1167. DOI: 10.1503/cmaj.171045.
36. Deber R, Hollander MJ, Jacobs P. Models of funding and reimbursement in health care: A conceptual framework. Can Public Adm. 2008 Sep;51(3):381-405. DOI: 10.1111/j.1754-7121.2008.00030.x.
37. Rawson NS, Adams J. Do reimbursement recommendation processes used by government drug plan in Canada adhere to good governance principles? Clinicoecon Outcomes Res. 2017 Oct 23;9:721-730. DOI: 10.2147/CEOR.S144695.
38. Lasser KE, Himmelstein DU, Woolhandler S. Access to care, health status, and health disparities in the United States and Canada: results of a cross-national population-based survey. Am J Public Health. 2006 Jul;96(7):1300–1307. DOI: 10.2105/AJPH.2004.059402.
39. Hensen P, Ma HL, Luger TA, Roeder N, Steinhoff M. Pathway management in ambulatory wound care: defining local standards for quality improvement and interprofessional care. Int Wound J. 2005 Jun;2(2):104–111. DOI: 10.1111/j.1742-4801.2005.00098.x.
40. Ali SA, Myers SB. Clinical resource management reimbursement models and accountable care. In: StatPearls (Internet). Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2025 Jan-. Available from: nih.gov.
41. Erickson SM, Outland B, Joy S, et al. Envisioning a better U.S. health care system for all: health care delivery and payment system reforms. Ann Intern Med. 2020 Jan 21;172(2_supplement):S33-S49. DOI: 10.7326/M19-2407.
42. Valiani S, Terrett L, Gebhardt C, Prokopchuk-Gauk O, Isinger M. Beyond clinical metrics: standardizing documentation. CMAJ. 2020 Sep;192(37):E1067-E1073. DOI: 10.1503/cmaj.200756.
43. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. WISeR (Wasteful and Inappropriate Service Reduction) Model (Internet). Baltimore (MD): CMS Innovation Center; 2026 (cited 2026 May). Available from: cms.gov.
44. Chapman Law Group. Impact of the CMS WISeR Model (Internet). Chapman Law Group; 2025 (cited 2026 May). Available from: chapmanlawgroup.com.