Disclosing Physician Ratings: Performance Effects and the Difficulty of Altering Ratings Consensus

Henry Eyring
London School of Economics and Political Science

Compliance with Data and Code Sharing Policy for the Journal of Accounting Research

June 2020

1. *A description of which author(s) handled the data and conducted analyses*

   Henry Eyring received data for the paper's analyses from the field site, University of Utah Health Care (UUHC), and performed the analyses.

2. *A detailed description of how the raw data were obtained or generated, including data sources, the date(s) on which data were downloaded or obtained, and the instrument used to generate the data (e.g., for surveys or experiments). We recommend that more than one author is able to vouch for the stated source of the data.*

   Henry Eyring met with and discussed the field study with executives and data managers at UUHC. UUHC had gathered patient satisfaction ratings using a third-party survey vendor, Press Ganey Inc., which automatically emails a survey following each patient visit at UUHC. The UUHC Exceptional Patient Experience department transferred patient satisfaction survey results on November 4, 2014 for 2011-2013, and on February 26, 2015 for 2013-2014. The survey responses came with some patient characteristics and physician characteristics. The UUHC Decision Support department transferred procedure, additional physician characteristics, additional patient characteristics, and wait time data spanning 2011 through 2014. These transfers came at the following dates: physician covariates on March 23, 2015, all visits with patient covariates on September 8, 2015, procedure data on September 18, 2015, and time data on August 24, 2016. The UUHC Information Technology department transferred web traffic data regarding the number of page views to each physician's official UUHC web page spanning 2011 through 2014 on May 21, 2016. Data managers provided assistance through 2019 in linking components of the datasets and incorporating data fields in the analysis.

3. *If the data are obtained from an organization on a proprietary basis, the authors should privately provide the editors with contact information for a representative of the organization who can confirm data were obtained by the authors. The editors would not make this information publicly available. The authors should also provide information to the editors about the data sharing agreement with the organization (e.g., non-disclosure agreement, any restrictions imposed by the organization on the authors with respect to publishing certain results).*

   The data are obtained from UUHC on a proprietary basis. I have privately provided the editors with contact information for a representative of UUHC who can confirm the data were obtained by the author. I have also explained to the editors the terms of the agreed-upon use of the data. UUHC did not impose restrictions with respect to publishing certain results, and we do not have permission to share the data publicly.

4. *A complete description of the steps necessary to collect and process the data used in the final analyses reported in the paper. For experimental papers, we require information about subject eligibility and/or selection, as well as any exclusion criteria.*

   I describe the steps necessary to collect and process the data in sections 3 and 4 of the paper. I provide further details in the Stata do-file "DPR_Code".

5. *Prior to final acceptance of the paper, the computer program used to convert the raw data into the dataset used in the analysis plus a brief description that enables other researchers to use this program. Instead of the program, researchers can provide a detailed step-by-step description that enables other researchers to arrive at the same dataset used in the analysis. The purpose of this requirement is to facilitate replication and to help other researchers understand in detail how the sample was formed, including the treatment of outliers, Winsorization, truncation, etc. This programming is in most circumstances not proprietary. However, we recognize that some parts of the data generation process may indeed be proprietary or otherwise cannot be made publicly available. In such cases, the authors should inform the editors upon submission, so that the editors can consider an exemption from this requirement.*

   The file "DPR_Code" contains the computer program used to produce the results of the main analyses reported in tables 3–5 and 7–9. The data are from a health care system and so do not come with identifiers as there would be for data that are publicly available or could be purchased.

6. *Data and programs should be maintained by at least one author (usually the corresponding author) for at least six years, consistent with National Science Foundation guidelines.*

   I will maintain all data and programs for at least six years.