



Prior Authorization Party Pros / Cons & Concerns

Prior authorization is a requirement that providers get insurer approval before certain treatments or medications are covered. Reducing prior authorization times can improve timely access to needed care, especially for complex or rare conditions.

Party	Pros (Arguments Supporting Prior Authorization in Rare Disease Contexts)	Cons / Concerns (Arguments for Reform or Limits in Rare Disease Contexts)
Democrats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can help ensure high-cost specialty therapies are used appropriately and supported by clinical guidelines. • Encourages insurers to review complex treatments carefully to avoid misuse or incorrect dosing. • Support tends to grow when paired with transparency, strong oversight, and patient protections. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA often delays access to lifesaving or time-sensitive rare disease treatments. • Many rare conditions lack established guidelines, leading to inappropriate denials and repeated requests. • Strong support for “gold-carding,” continuity-of-care protections, and strict timelines to prevent harmful delays.
Republicans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viewed as a tool to manage extremely high specialty drug costs and maintain private market stability. • Supports insurer flexibility and case-by-case review for expensive gene, cell, or biologic therapies. • Favors targeted PA for very high-cost treatments instead of broad mandates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA can block or delay physician-recommended treatments for rare diseases where expertise is limited. • Constituent concerns often focus on burdensome paperwork and insurers overruling specialists. • Supports reforms that reduce red tape, improve transparency, and protect continuity of care—while avoiding expansive regulation.