

Nevada Strategies to **Address Consolidation and Promote Competition**

Consolidation Oversight

Consolidation oversight refers to the processes by which state regulators review mergers and acquisitions of health care entities to ensure they do not harm competition or increase consumer costs. This section examines whether state law or statutes require increased oversight of hospital consolidation transactions that exceed federal notification requirements, such as whether the state has the authority to approve, reject, or impose conditions on health care transactions to protect affordability and competition or if the state review standards require regulators to assess the impact of a consolidation on health care prices and affordability, not just market concentration. Specific strategies examined include:

- Transaction Notification Requirements

- Authority to Modify or Reject Consolidation Transactions

- Affordability Criteria Included in Transaction Review

Facility Fee Limits

Facility fees are charges for services provided in outpatient and physician office settings that hospitals own. These fees are becoming increasingly more common as the rate of health system consolidation has accelerated. As hospitals acquire more outpatient practices, these fees are increasingly applied, raising patient costs and disproportionately affecting communities already facing financial challenges, such as rural and minority populations. States may prohibit facility fees outright, or impose other regulatory mechanisms such as facility transparency laws, requiring hospitals to disclose facility fees separately from professional service charges, or establishing limits on patient cost-sharing for facility fees. The strategies examined in this section include:

- Prohibitions on Facility Fees

- Facility Fee Transparency Laws

- Limits on Facility Fee Cost-Sharing



Anti-Competitive Contract Provisions

Anti-competitive contracting is a pattern of contracting between health care providers and insurers where one party gains unfair advantages over potential competitors. States can enact regulations that limit dominant health systems from abusing their market power in ways that increase prices. This section evaluates whether states prohibit four types of anti-competitive contracting practices in the health system, including:

Restrictions on All-or-Nothing Contract Provisions: These clauses require plans to contract with all providers in a health system or none of them, even if those providers are low-value or high-cost.

Restrictions on Anti-Tiering and Anti-Steering Contract Provisions: These clauses require insurers to place favored providers in higher tiers regardless of cost or quality (anti-tiering) and restrict directing patients to higher value care from competitors (anti-steering).

Restrictions on Most Favored Nation Clauses: These clauses require health systems to agree to not to offer lower prices to competing insurers, preventing them from providing services at a lower price. These provisions may allow insurers and providers to collude to raise prices.

Restrictions on Physician Non-Competes: Physicians noncompete clauses restrict providers ability to work at other health systems in an area, minimizing providers ability to practice medicine.



Address Consolidation and Promote Competition

Consolidation Oversight

Policy	Status as of June 2025	Summary
Transaction Notification Required	 Requires health systems or providers to notify the state of consolidation transactions	The Nevada Attorney General must be notified of all health care or health carrier transactions that would result in a group practice or health carrier becoming the primary health care provider in a geographic area at least 30 days before the transaction is finalized. Similarly, all hospital merger, acquisition, and joint ventures must be reported to the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services at least 60 days after the transaction is finalized.
Authority to Modify or Reject Consolidation Transactions	 Does not have authority to approve, set conditions, or disapprove consolidation transactions	
Affordability Criteria included in Transaction Review	 Does not include consumer affordability or price growth in review criteria, approval conditions, or both	



State Has Active Policy or Program



Policy or Program Partially Implemented



State Does Not Have an Active Policy or Program



No Source, or Limited Information Found

Address Consolidation and Promote Competition

Facility Fees

Policy	Status as of June 2025	Summary
Prohibits Facility Fees	 State does not prohibit providers from charging any facility fees	
Facility Fee Transparency Laws	 State does not require providers to disclose facility fees to consumers, requires off-campus outpatient departments to identify the physical location where care was provided on claims forms, or both	
Limits Cost-Sharing for Facility Fees	 The state has no laws that limit the amount a patient may be billed out-of-pocket for facility fees	



State Has Active Policy or Program



Policy or Program Partially Implemented



State Does Not Have an Active Policy or Program



No Source, or Limited Information Found

Address Consolidation and Promote Competition

Anti-Competitive Contract Provisions

Policy	Status as of June 2025	Summary
Restricts All-or-Nothing Contract Provisions	 Law restricts All-or-Nothing contract provisions	Nevada prohibits All-or-Nothing clauses in contracts with a health care provider. Nevada was the first state to adopt widespread prohibitions on All-or-Nothing contract provisions.
Restricts Anti-Tiering and Anti-Steering Contract Provisions	 Law restricts Anti-Tiering or Anti-Steering contract provisions	Nevada restricts anti-tiering or anti-steering contract provisions, prohibiting those that restricts third parties from assigning providers of health care into tiers for the purpose of encouraging the use of certain providers of health care or requiring third parties to place all providers of health care affiliated with a business entity in the same tier.
Restricts Physician Noncompete Clauses	 Non-competes for physicians limited by statute	Nevada allows noncompete agreements if they are supported by valid consideration, reasonable in scope, and not unduly burdensome. They are prohibited for hourly workers and cannot prevent former employees from serving clients who voluntarily follow them. Courts can narrow overly broad covenants and must award attorney's fees if employers improperly enforce void agreements.
Restricts Most-Favored Nation Contract Provisions	 No law restricting Most Favored Nation contract provisions	



State Has Active Policy or Program



Policy or Program Partially Implemented



State Does Not Have an Active Policy or Program



No Source, or Limited Information Found

November 2025

healthcarevaluehub.org



With support from Arnold Ventures, the Healthcare Value Hub provides free, timely information about the policies and practices that address high health care costs and poor quality, bringing better value to consumers. The Hub is part of Altarum, a nonprofit organization with the mission of creating a better, more sustainable future for all by applying research-based and field-tested solutions that transform our systems of health and health care.