
Prepared by the Policy Surveillance Program Staff

May 2013
I. **Scope:** Compile statutes/regulations that authorize or prohibit any kind of billing for the provision of free services for testing and/or treatment of sexually transmitted diseases.

II. **Primary Data Collection**

a. **Dates of data collection:** March 7, 2013 – May 31, 2013

b. **Dates covered in the dataset:** January 1, 1986 – May 31, 2013

c. **Data Collection Methods:** Two legally trained researchers, working independently on randomly selected states, used legal databases such as Westlaw and Lexis to identify relevant statutes and/or regulations. Consultation of non-subscription-based compilations of state law was used to ensure accessibility to the statutes for future researchers or users. All search terms and strategies were captured and recorded by the researchers, and the time spent on each task was tracked. Comprehensive “master search terms,” to capture relevant law within legal databases for most states, were developed, tested, and recorded.

d. **Search terms and databases used:** All searches were performed using either Westlaw Classic or Westlaw Next. Please see part E for searches run and exclusion criteria.

   i. without compensation & "healthcare" "health care" "medical care" /p compensation bill! pay! % secured % damages % worker! % toll % advisory

e. **Information about initial returns and additional inclusion or exclusion criteria:** Search results regarding 3rd party billing were considered relevant if they contained explicit permissions or prohibitions concerning voluntary contribution by patients or any kind of billing by practitioners who provide uncompensated care.

III. **Coding**
a. **Development of Coding Scheme**: Questions were developed by the researchers and one supervisor and then entered into the LawAtlas Workbench.

b. Jurisdictions were randomly assigned for coding to two legally trained researchers. Twenty percent of the jurisdictions assigned were redundantly coded by both researchers. This means two records were created containing the same law, questions and date. Both researchers coded these records, resulting in two records for the same jurisdiction and date.

c. The Supervisor reviewed the redundant coding by downloading the data from the Workbench into Microsoft Excel and comparing the records, variable by variable, looking for divergences. When a divergence was identified it was discussed with the researchers. The reason for the divergence was identified and resolved. A measure of divergence was calculated by the Supervisor and the duplicate record was deleted.

d. The Supervisor oversaw the overall quality of the data by downloading the data from the Workbench in Microsoft Excel and reviewing it in order to find caution flags, divergences in redundant records and errors in the coding. Daily Coding Review sheets were sent to the researchers for their review. Issues in the coding were discussed by the Supervisor and the researchers in coding meetings.

e. Coding was completed based on the plain language of the law. If an answer was not explicit in the law, the researcher coded that question as “not explicitly stated.” For the question, “Do any of the state laws concerning free health care services explicitly prohibit charging the patient?” the researchers coded “yes” if there is any law that prohibits charging the patient, even if it is specific to one disease. If the prohibition was applicable to a specific disease/treatment/etc. that disease is included in a caution note.