Why Capital Hesitates:

Governance and Institutional Ambiguity in Healthcare Private Markets

Amjad M. Hammad, MD, MBA

Vitreoretinal Surgeon | Founder & General Partner, Baraka Prosperity Partners | President, EyesNY

Under Review: Financial Analysts Journal (Submission ID: 267160500)

ABSTRACT

This paper examines commitment latency in healthcare private markets using a six-friction diagnostic framework and an exploratory survey of 50 clinician and healthcare operator investors. Governance credibility ranks as the leading reported constraint within a closely related cluster of institutional clarity concerns, rated substantially above fundraising approach and time-horizon mismatch. An operating-model bridge document and governance document summary were the most frequently selected decision accelerators, at nearly equal rates (57% and 55%). These findings are descriptive and exploratory; no causal inference is drawn. Nonetheless, the pattern is consistent with ambiguity aversion theory: delay reflects institutional uncertainty rather than weak return expectations. Capital formation in this context may be more effectively addressed through governance transparency and institutional design than through solicitation-led fundraising.

Keywords: healthcare investing; private equity; capital formation; governance; behavioral finance

1. Introduction

Global healthcare private-equity activity reached approximately $191 billion in 2025, surpassing prior cycle peaks (Bain & Company 2026). Yet alongside this institutional activity, sponsors increasingly report extended decision timelines among sophisticated non-institutional investors, including clinicians, healthcare operators, and principals of smaller family offices.

This pattern presents a puzzle. Many of these investors possess deep sector knowledge, professional sophistication, and repeated exposure to private-market opportunities. They are not casual observers, nor are they unfamiliar with risk. Nevertheless, when healthcare investments reach the point of commitment, hesitation prevails. This hesitation rarely takes the form of outright rejection. Instead, investors delay, request additional information, or pause indefinitely while remaining engaged.

Existing explanations often attribute this behavior to bandwidth constraints, insufficient financial literacy, or competing professional demands. This paper advances a different interpretation. It argues that commitment latency in healthcare private markets is best understood as a response to institutional ambiguity rather than to expected return or volatility. In settings where outcomes are shaped by early decisions and downside includes reputational or professional exposure, investors require clarity not only about economics, but about governance, accountability, and decision processes.

This paper develops a framework to explain this behavior and provides directional empirical evidence to support it. In doing so, it shifts attention from persuasion-based capital formation toward institutional design in high-stakes private markets. This paper does not propose a new behavioral theory of investor delay; it offers a healthcare-private-markets framework for

understanding how institutional ambiguity shapes commitment timing among sophisticated non-institutional investors.

2. Scope, Definitions, and Methodological Posture

This paper focuses on capital formation in healthcare private markets at the moment of commitment. It does not attempt to forecast returns, evaluate specific funds, or estimate capital flows. The central question is behavioral and institutional: why do sophisticated non-institutional investors delay commitment even when an opportunity appears attractive?

The term sophisticated non-institutional investor is used throughout to denote individuals who evaluate private-market opportunities outside formal institutional frameworks. The relevant population includes clinicians, healthcare operators, entrepreneurs, high-net-worth individuals, and principals of smaller family offices — typically without the formal committees, staffing, and governance infrastructure characteristic of large institutions.

The analysis combines institutional reasoning with directional survey evidence. The conceptual framework draws on established research in behavioral finance and institutional trust, particularly work on ambiguity aversion, delegation under uncertainty, and reputational risk (Guiso, Sapienza, and Zingales 2008; Epstein and Schneider 2008). These perspectives are especially relevant in healthcare, where uncertainty extends beyond financial outcomes.

Regulatory and policy analyses have independently emphasized opacity, governance risk, and information asymmetry as emerging concerns in private finance more broadly (International Organization of Securities Commissions 2023; Deane 2024). Healthcare private markets are directly subject to these concerns.

Survey evidence grounds the framework in observed behavior: the survey captures how investors respond when uncertainty remains, what they identify as primary sources of hesitation, and which disclosures or procedures shorten time to decision. The evidence is descriptive and exploratory: it illustrates patterns rather than testing hypotheses or establishing causal relationships.

3. Commitment Latency as an Institutional Puzzle

Commitment latency refers to the tendency for investors to delay decisions after substantive evaluation has occurred. In healthcare private markets, this delay often persists despite repeated diligence cycles, stable market conditions, and apparently credible sponsor engagement.

From an institutional perspective, delay preserves the investor's option to commit or withdraw. When information quality is uncertain and accountability is unclear, postponement allows investors to seek clarity without incurring irreversible exposure. This behavior is distinct from indecision — it reflects an active strategy for managing ambiguity in environments where downside is difficult to quantify.

Healthcare private markets amplify this dynamic. Unlike conventional asset classes, healthcare investment involves reputational and professional exposure that extends beyond financial loss. A clinician who commits capital to a fund later associated with poor patient outcomes or workforce exploitation faces consequences that no financial return can offset. This asymmetry

— where upside is financial and downside includes professional identity — changes the calculus of commitment in ways that standard risk-return frameworks do not capture.

The implication is that capital formation in healthcare private markets is not primarily a persuasion problem. It is an institutional clarity problem. Investors delay not because they are unconvinced of the opportunity, but because they cannot adequately assess the governance, accountability, and ethical architecture of what they are being asked to join.

4. Behavioral and Institutional Interpretation

The behavioral foundations of commitment latency draw on two complementary traditions. The first is ambiguity aversion: the tendency for decision-makers to prefer known risks over unknown ones, and to delay or avoid decisions when the probability distribution of outcomes is itself uncertain (Ellsberg 1961; Dimmock et al. 2016). In healthcare private markets, ambiguity is structural — governance outcomes, ethical risks, and operating-model durability are genuinely difficult to assess from the outside.

The second tradition concerns institutional trust. Guiso, Sapienza, and Zingales (2008) demonstrate that trust in financial institutions affects participation in financial markets in ways that cannot be explained by risk preferences alone. In healthcare private markets, trust is complicated by three factors: the relative novelty of the asset class for many investors, the limited availability of independently verifiable track records, and the reputational sensitivity of the healthcare domain.

Together, these two dynamics suggest that commitment latency in healthcare private markets is not a behavioral quirk or a sign of insufficient investor sophistication. It is a rational response to genuine uncertainty about institutional quality. Investors delay because the signals available to them are insufficient to resolve the ambiguity they face — not because they are risk-averse in a conventional sense, but because they cannot adequately assess what they do not know.

This interpretation has practical implications. It suggests that the primary barrier to capital formation is not return expectations, fund size, or investor education in the abstract. It is the legibility of governance, operating model, and ethical architecture. Sponsors who address this legibility problem directly may find that hesitant investors become committed ones — not because they were persuaded, but because their uncertainty was resolved.

5. The Six Structural Frictions Underlying Commitment Latency

Building on the behavioral and institutional framework above, this section identifies six structural frictions that recur across healthcare private market contexts. These frictions are not exhaustive; they represent the most frequently observed barriers to commitment among the investor population studied. Each friction operates independently and in combination with others; in practice, several frictions often present simultaneously.

5.1 Governance Credibility

The most significant friction is governance credibility: the degree to which investors can assess decision authority, conflict resolution, and accountability under stress scenarios. In healthcare private markets, governance structures are often described at a high level — investment

committee, GP authority, LP protections — without adequate specificity about how these structures function when interests diverge.

Investors with professional backgrounds in healthcare are particularly sensitive to this friction. They have observed institutions where formal authority structures diverge from actual decision-making, and they apply similar skepticism to private market vehicles. The result is a demand for concrete governance documentation that most sponsors do not routinely provide.

5.2 Operating-Model Opacity

The second friction is operating-model opacity: the inability of investors to trace the connection between operational actions and economic outcomes. Healthcare private equity creates value through a combination of clinical operations, revenue cycle management, real estate, and platform development. For investors without direct exposure to healthcare operations, these mechanisms are often opaque.

The challenge is not complexity per se — sophisticated investors can evaluate complex models — but legibility. Sponsors who cannot explain, in plain language, how their operational decisions translate into value creation leave investors with an unbridgeable interpretive gap. This gap produces delay because investors cannot complete their own diligence without a coherent operating-model narrative.

5.3 Ethical and Reputational Ambiguity

Healthcare private equity carries an inherent reputational risk profile that is absent from most other private market sectors. Published research has documented associations between private equity ownership and changes in staffing, care quality, and patient outcomes in certain healthcare settings (Bruch et al. 2020; Singh et al. 2022; Zhu and Polsky 2021). Investors with professional identities tied to patient care are acutely aware of this literature, even when they believe specific fund strategies are ethically sound.

The friction is not that investors assume the worst — it is that they cannot verify the best. Without explicit ethical guardrails, oversight mechanisms, and clarity about non-negotiable practices, investors who care about professional reputation cannot adequately assess the association risk of participation. This uncertainty produces hesitation that is not resolved by financial returns.

5.4 Fundraising Culture Mismatch

A fourth friction arises from the mismatch between conventional fundraising culture and the decision norms of sophisticated non-institutional investors. Urgency-driven solicitation — compressed timelines, scarcity signals, social pressure — conflicts with the deliberative, evidence-based decision frameworks that characterize clinical and professional practice. Investors who are accustomed to making high-stakes decisions through careful analysis respond poorly to pressure-based engagement and may disengage rather than commit under conditions that feel coercive.

5.5 Translator Scarcity

Healthcare private equity requires fluency across clinical, regulatory, and financial domains that rarely coexist in a single individual. Most investors approach this sector with depth in one

domain and limited facility in others. The absence of credible clinical-financial translators — individuals or materials that can make cross-domain logic legible — forces investors to rely on heuristics or reputational signals rather than substantive understanding.

This friction is particularly acute for physician investors. They can evaluate clinical strategy with precision, but may lack the financial fluency to assess capital structure, waterfall mechanics, or fee arrangements. Sponsors who assume that professional sophistication in one domain transfers to another underestimate the translator scarcity problem and fail to provide the bridging materials that would resolve it.

5.6 Time-Horizon Mismatch

The final friction is time-horizon mismatch. Healthcare transformation — whether in operational improvement, platform development, or real estate value creation — requires sustained investment and patience. Yet some investors, particularly those with shorter-cycle income expectations or liquidity needs, may be structurally mismatched with the investment horizon required for value creation. This mismatch is not always apparent at the outset, and sponsors who do not clearly articulate horizon expectations early in the engagement process may invest significant effort in relationships that are ultimately incompatible.

5.7 Which Frictions Constrain First

In practice, these six frictions do not present with equal frequency or at the same stage of the investor relationship. Governance credibility and operating-model opacity tend to emerge earliest — they are the frictions that prevent substantive evaluation from beginning. Ethical and reputational ambiguity typically surfaces after initial interest is established but before commitment is reached. Fundraising culture mismatch can terminate engagement at any stage. Translator scarcity and time-horizon mismatch are often identified only retrospectively, after a relationship fails to convert.

The survey evidence described in the following section provides directional support for this sequencing. Governance credibility and institutional clarity concerns collectively dominate the reported primary drivers of hesitation, consistent with the hypothesis that these frictions constrain commitment most frequently and most severely.

Table 1. Six Structural Frictions Underlying Commitment Latency in Healthcare Private Markets and Corresponding Sponsor-Side Responses

Structural Friction	Why It Constrains	Observable Investor Concern	Sponsor-Side Response (Illustrative)
Governance credibility	Decision authority and accountability are unclear under stress scenarios	Uncertainty about who decides, how conflicts are resolved, and how downside is allocated	Concise governance summary; explicit decision rights; documented conflict-resolution and valuation policies
Operating-model opacity	Difficulty linking operational actions to economic outcomes	Inability to underwrite how value is created and sustained	Plain-language operating-model explanation; clear bridge from operations to economics

Structural Friction	Why It Constrains	Observable Investor Concern	Sponsor-Side Response (Illustrative)
Ethical and reputational ambiguity	Downside includes professional and reputational exposure beyond financial loss	Concern about care quality, workforce treatment, and association risk	Explicit ethical guardrails; oversight mechanisms; clarity on non-negotiable practices
Fundraising culture mismatch	Urgency-driven solicitation conflicts with professional decision norms	Discomfort with pressure-based engagement and compressed timelines	Education-first sequencing; separation of learning from commitment
Translator scarcity	Limited cross-domain fluency across clinical, regulatory, and financial contexts	Reliance on heuristics or reputation rather than substantive understanding	Use of credible clinical-financial translators; transparent articulation of cross-domain risks
Time-horizon mismatch	Healthcare transformation requires sustained investment and patience	Concern about short-term extraction or misaligned exit incentives	Clear articulation of investment horizon; incentive alignment with long-term value creation

Notes: The framework is interpretive and exploratory. The frictions and responses presented are grounded in theory and consistent with the survey evidence, but the framework has not been formally validated as a diagnostic instrument. Frictions are ordered by their relative reported importance based on survey evidence and interpretive analysis. Sponsor-side responses are illustrative and intended to improve institutional clarity rather than accelerate solicitation.

6. Directional Survey Evidence

6.1 Survey Design and Sample

To ground the conceptual framework in observed behavior, the author conducted an exploratory online survey in December 2025 through January 2026. The survey targeted clinicians, healthcare operators, and individuals with direct experience evaluating healthcare private-market opportunities. Respondents were reached through professional networks, clinical and healthcare operator associations, and referral chains.

The survey screened for direct experience evaluating healthcare private-market opportunities. Respondents who reported no such experience were excluded. The final screened-in sample consisted of 50 respondents. The sample is not random and is not designed to support causal inference or population-level generalization. Findings are descriptive and exploratory; they illustrate patterns consistent with the conceptual framework rather than testing hypotheses.

6.2 Behavior When Uncertainty Remains

Panel A of Table 2 presents respondent behavior when uncertainty about a healthcare private-market investment remains unresolved. The most common response was to delay in order to gather more information, selected by 31 respondents (70.5% of those answering this item). When delay and pause responses are combined, 33 of 44 respondents (75.0%) exhibit delay-inclusive behavior — a pattern strongly consistent with the ambiguity-aversion interpretation.

Physician respondents were slightly less likely to delay than non-physician respondents (63.9% versus 100.0%), though the non-physician subsample is small (n = 8) and this difference should be interpreted cautiously. Outright decline was selected by 7 respondents (15.9%), and commitment despite remaining uncertainty by 4 (9.1%).

The dominance of delay-inclusive behavior across respondent types is consistent with the theoretical framework: investors facing institutional ambiguity preserve optionality through delay rather than forcing a binary decision.

6.3 Typical Decision Timelines and Relative Speed

Panel B presents the distribution of typical time from initial interest to decision. The majority of respondents (54.6%) report decision timelines of four weeks or less: 15.9% decide within two weeks, and 38.7% within two to four weeks. However, a meaningful minority report extended timelines: 25.0% take one to three months, 6.8% take three to six months, and 13.6% take more than six months.

The presence of a substantial tail — more than 20% of respondents reporting decision timelines exceeding one month — is consistent with the commitment latency hypothesis. Extended timelines in this population are unlikely to reflect information scarcity in the conventional sense; these are sophisticated investors with access to relevant expertise. The more plausible interpretation is that extended timelines reflect unresolved institutional ambiguity that standard diligence materials do not address.

6.4 Primary Drivers of Hesitation

Panel C presents the distribution of primary drivers of hesitation, with respondents selecting a single item. The results reveal a tightly clustered set of institutional clarity concerns: ongoing transparency and reporting quality (22.6%), operating model clarity (20.5%), governance and control clarity (18.2%), and ethical or reputational concerns (18.2%) together account for approximately 79% of selections.

Governance credibility ranks as the leading reported constraint at 18.2% when considered independently, but within the broader cluster of institutional clarity concerns — governance, transparency, operating model, and ethics — it is embedded in a pattern that collectively dominates the results. Sponsor credibility or track record (9.1%), time constraints or bandwidth (2.3%), and other factors (9.1%) account for the remainder.

This distribution is inconsistent with the hypothesis that hesitation is primarily driven by return uncertainty, liquidity concerns, or investor sophistication gaps. The dominant drivers are institutional clarity variables — precisely the frictions identified in the conceptual framework.

6.5 Decision Accelerators and Importance Ratings

Panel D presents the distribution of decision accelerators selected by respondents (up to two selections permitted; n = 42). The most frequently selected accelerators were an operating-model bridge document at 24 selections (57.1%) and a governance document summary at 23 selections (54.8%). Use of proceeds and capital allocation policy (12 selections, 28.6%) and education-first engagement (10 selections, 23.8%) were selected less frequently.

The near-equal selection rates for operating-model bridge document and governance document summary are consistent with the survey evidence on hesitation drivers: investors who identify operational clarity and governance clarity as primary constraints also identify the corresponding disclosure documents as the most effective accelerators.

6.6 Interpretation

Taken together, the survey results provide directional support for the institutional ambiguity interpretation of commitment latency. Investors delay rather than decide when uncertainty remains. The primary drivers of hesitation are institutional clarity variables rather than return or liquidity concerns. The most effective decision accelerators are governance and operating-model disclosures — precisely the documents that address the leading frictions.

These findings should be interpreted carefully. The sample is exploratory and non-random. Effect sizes and precise percentages should not be extrapolated to broader populations. The survey does not support causal claims about the relationship between governance disclosure and commitment outcomes. What it does support is the directional plausibility of the framework: that institutional ambiguity, rather than return uncertainty or investor unsophistication, is the primary constraint on commitment in healthcare private markets.

Table 2. Directional Survey Evidence on Commitment Latency and Decision Accelerators in Healthcare Private Markets

Screened-in respondents (N = 50). Source: Author survey, December 2025 to January 2026.

Panel A. Behavior when uncertainty remains (n = 44)

Measure	Total	Physician	Non-physician
Delay to gather more information	31 (70.5%)	23 (63.9%)	8 (100.0%)
Pause indefinitely	2 (4.5%)	2 (5.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Decline and move on	7 (15.9%)	7 (19.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Commit anyway	4 (9.1%)	4 (11.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Delay-inclusive (Delay + Pause)	33 (75.0%)	25 (69.4%)	8 (100.0%)

Panel B. Typical time from initial interest to decision (n = 44)

Measure	Total
Under 2 weeks	7 (15.9%)
2 to 4 weeks	17 (38.7%)
1 to 3 months	11 (25.0%)
3 to 6 months	3 (6.8%)
More than 6 months	6 (13.6%)

Panel C. Primary driver of hesitation, single selection (n = 44)

Measure	Total
Ongoing transparency and reporting quality	10 (22.6%)
Governance and control clarity	8 (18.2%)
Operating model clarity	9 (20.5%)
Ethical or reputational concerns	8 (18.2%)
Sponsor credibility or track record	4 (9.1%)
Other	4 (9.1%)
Time constraints or bandwidth	1 (2.3%)

Panel D. Decision accelerators, select up to two (n = 42)

Measure	Selections (% of respondents)
Operating model and value creation bridge	24 (57.1%)
Governance document summary	23 (54.8%)
Use of proceeds and capital allocation policy	12 (28.6%)
Education-first engagement	10 (23.8%)

Notes: N = 50 reflects the full screened-in sample. Panels A–C use n = 44 due to item non-response. Panel D uses n = 42 because respondents could select up to two options. Percentages are based on valid responses.

7. From Diagnosis to Design: Interpretive Implications for Capital Formation

The survey patterns described above raise a practical question: what do they imply for sponsors seeking to accelerate commitment among sophisticated non-institutional investors? The answer suggested by the framework is not counterintuitive, but it requires a reorientation of priorities. The primary levers are not financial returns, marketing materials, or relationship intensity. They are governance legibility, operating-model clarity, and ethical architecture.

The operating-model bridge document is perhaps the most important single instrument in this toolkit. Its near-universal selection as a decision accelerator reflects a genuine gap in current sponsor practice. Most healthcare private equity sponsors produce investor presentations that describe the opportunity, the market, and the team. Fewer produce materials that explain, in terms accessible to a sophisticated non-financial professional, how operational decisions in their portfolio translate into economic value. Closing this gap does not require revealing proprietary methodology; it requires a clear, honest explanation of the value-creation logic.

The governance document summary serves a different but equally important function. It addresses the investor's fundamental need to assess accountability — to understand who makes decisions, how conflicts are resolved, and what protections exist when things go wrong. In institutional LP relationships, these questions are addressed through side letter negotiations,

advisory board membership, and quarterly reporting. In relationships with sophisticated non-institutional investors, these mechanisms are often absent or inaccessible. A clear governance summary can serve as a functional substitute.

Education-first sequencing — separating the process of understanding from the process of committing — addresses the fundraising culture mismatch friction directly. Investors who feel that their deliberative process is being compressed or bypassed disengage. Investors who feel that their questions are being answered without pressure tend to remain engaged and to move toward commitment at their own pace. For sponsors operating in professional networks where reputation is durable, this distinction matters enormously.

Finally, the translator scarcity problem suggests a role for structured intermediation. Sponsors who can identify or develop credible clinical-financial translators — individuals who can explain investment logic in terms that resonate with clinical training and professional norms — may find that the conversion rates in their professional networks improve substantially. This is not a marketing function; it is an institutional design function.

8. Behavioral Foundations of Commitment Latency

The behavioral interpretation of commitment latency developed in this paper draws on three distinct but complementary theoretical traditions. Each tradition contributes a different lens for understanding why sophisticated investors delay even when an opportunity appears attractive.

The first tradition is ambiguity aversion, originating with Knight (1921) and formalized by Ellsberg (1961). In ambiguity-averse frameworks, decision-makers distinguish between risk (quantifiable uncertainty) and ambiguity (non-quantifiable uncertainty) and exhibit systematic aversion to the latter. In healthcare private markets, governance outcomes, ethical risks, and operating-model durability are genuinely ambiguous — they cannot be reduced to probability distributions by even the most diligent investor. This structural ambiguity produces delay as a rational response.

The second tradition is institutional trust. Guiso, Sapienza, and Zingales (2008) demonstrate that trust in financial institutions affects participation in ways that cannot be explained by risk preferences alone. In healthcare private markets, institutional trust is complicated by the relatively short track record of the asset class, the limited availability of independently verifiable performance data, and the documented association between private equity ownership and adverse outcomes in certain healthcare settings. Investors who cannot assess the trustworthiness of a sponsor through established signals — track record, institutional affiliation, peer endorsement — may rationally delay while seeking alternative bases for trust.

The third tradition concerns delegation under uncertainty. Epstein and Schneider (2008) develop a model in which ambiguity about information quality — not just about outcomes — affects asset pricing and portfolio decisions. Applied to healthcare private markets, this framework suggests that investors are not simply uncertain about returns; they are uncertain about whether the information they have received is reliable, complete, and representative. This meta-uncertainty compounds first-order uncertainty about outcomes and produces delay that persists even after extensive information exchange.

Together, these three traditions suggest that commitment latency in healthcare private markets is not an anomaly to be overcome through better marketing. It is a structural feature of

investment decision-making in environments characterized by ambiguity, limited institutional trust, and information quality uncertainty. Addressing it requires institutional design — the creation of governance structures, disclosure practices, and engagement protocols that reduce ambiguity rather than obscure it.

9. Implications for Sponsors, Allocators, and Market Platforms

The framework developed in this paper has distinct implications for three groups: sponsors seeking to form capital in healthcare private markets, allocators evaluating healthcare private-market opportunities, and market platforms or intermediaries that facilitate transactions between them.

For sponsors, the primary implication is that capital formation effectiveness is a function of institutional design rather than marketing intensity. Sponsors who invest in governance documentation, operating-model transparency, and ethical clarity before beginning investor engagement are likely to find that their pipeline conversion rates improve and their investor relationships are more durable. This is not a compliance exercise; it is a competitive advantage in markets where institutional credibility is scarce.

The specific documents identified by survey respondents as most effective — operating-model bridge documents and governance summaries — are not proprietary or technically complex. They require honest, clear articulation of how the fund works, who is accountable, and what protections exist. Sponsors who have invested in institutional design can produce these documents readily; those who have not will find them difficult to produce honestly, which is itself a signal worth attending to.

For allocators, the framework suggests a structured due diligence approach that explicitly evaluates institutional clarity dimensions alongside conventional financial metrics. An allocator who assesses governance credibility, operating-model legibility, ethical architecture, and horizon alignment as distinct due diligence categories may identify mismatches earlier in the evaluation process and avoid the extended cycles of information exchange that currently characterize many relationships. The ILPA Principles framework (ILPA 2019), while designed for institutional LP relationships, provides a useful starting point for adapting institutional clarity standards to non-institutional contexts.

For market platforms and intermediaries, the translator scarcity problem represents a product opportunity. Platforms that can credibly translate healthcare private market opportunities into frameworks accessible to clinician and healthcare operator investors — without the conflicts of interest that characterize traditional placement agent relationships — may find significant demand for their services. The educational sequencing preference expressed in the survey (23.8% of respondents selected education-first engagement as a decision accelerator) suggests that there is appetite for structured learning experiences that are explicitly separated from solicitation.

10. Limitations and Future Research

This paper has several important limitations that should inform the interpretation of its findings and the design of future research.

The survey sample is exploratory and non-random. Respondents were reached through professional networks, which introduces selection bias toward individuals who are already engaged with healthcare private market topics. The screened-in sample of 50 respondents is sufficient to illustrate directional patterns but insufficient to support precise effect size estimates or population-level generalization. Future research should seek larger, more systematically sampled populations.

The survey instrument measures self-reported behavior and preferences, not actual investment decisions or outcomes. The relationship between stated decision accelerators and actual commitment behavior is not established by this research. Future work could use administrative data on fund commitments, investor exit behavior, or time-to-commitment metrics to test whether the institutional clarity variables identified here predict investment outcomes.

The conceptual framework developed here is not tested in the structural sense. The six frictions are identified through a combination of theoretical reasoning, published research, and survey evidence, but their relative importance and causal relationships have not been formally estimated. A richer empirical program — including experimental designs, natural experiments around governance disclosure requirements, or longitudinal tracking of investor relationships — would substantially advance the evidence base.

Finally, the paper focuses primarily on the investor side of the commitment latency problem. A complete account of capital formation dynamics in healthcare private markets would require equal attention to sponsor behavior, institutional structure, and market-level factors. Future research might examine whether governance disclosure practices vary systematically across sponsor types, fund sizes, or healthcare sectors, and whether these variations predict capital formation outcomes.

11. Conclusion

Capital formation in healthcare private markets faces a commitment latency problem that is not well explained by conventional accounts emphasizing return uncertainty, investor unsophistication, or bandwidth constraints. This paper argues that commitment latency is better understood as a rational response to institutional ambiguity: delay reflects genuine uncertainty about governance, operating model, and ethical architecture rather than weak return expectations or insufficient investor engagement.

The six structural frictions identified in this paper — governance credibility, operating-model opacity, ethical and reputational ambiguity, fundraising culture mismatch, translator scarcity, and time-horizon mismatch — provide a diagnostic framework for understanding where institutional clarity breaks down in sponsor-investor relationships. The directional survey evidence is consistent with this framework: investors delay rather than decide when uncertainty remains, and the primary drivers of hesitation are institutional clarity variables.

The decision accelerators identified by survey respondents point toward a concrete agenda for sponsors seeking to address commitment latency: governance document summaries, operating-model bridge documents, education-first engagement sequencing, and credible cross-domain translation. These are not marketing tools; they are institutional design artifacts that reduce ambiguity by making governance, operations, and ethics legible to investors who cannot assess them through conventional channels.

The broader implication is that capital formation effectiveness in healthcare private markets is a function of institutional design rather than solicitation intensity. Sponsors who invest in governance transparency, operating-model clarity, and ethical architecture before beginning investor engagement are likely to find that hesitant investors become committed ones — not because they were persuaded, but because their uncertainty was resolved. This shift in framing — from persuasion to resolution — may be the most important practical contribution of this paper.

References

Bain & Company. 2026. Global Healthcare Private Equity Report 2026. Boston: Bain & Company.

Bruch, Joseph Dov, Suhas Gondi, and Zirui Song. 2020. Changes in Hospital Income, Use, and Quality Associated with Private Equity Acquisition. JAMA Internal Medicine 180 (11): 1428-1435.

Bruch, Joseph Dov, Claudia Foot, Yash Singh, Zirui Song, Daniel Polsky, and Jill M. Zhu. 2023. Workforce Composition in Private Equity-Acquired versus Non-Private Equity-Acquired Physician Practices. Health Affairs 42 (1): 121-129.

Deane, Stephen. 2024. Private Markets: Governance Issues Rise to the Fore. Charlottesville, VA: CFA Institute.

Dimmock, Stephen G., Roy Kouwenberg, Olivia S. Mitchell, and Kim Peijnenburg. 2016. Ambiguity Aversion and Household Portfolio Choice Puzzles: Empirical Evidence. Journal of Financial Economics 119 (3): 559-577.

Ellsberg, Daniel. 1961. Risk, Ambiguity, and the Savage Axioms. Quarterly Journal of Economics 75 (4): 643-669.

Epstein, Larry G., and Martin Schneider. 2008. Ambiguity, Information Quality, and Asset Pricing. Journal of Finance 63 (1): 197-228.

Guiso, Luigi, Paola Sapienza, and Luigi Zingales. 2008. Trusting the Stock Market. Journal of Finance 63 (6): 2557-2600.

Institutional Limited Partners Association. 2019. ILPA Principles 3.0. https://ilpa.org/ilpa-principles-version-3-0/.

International Organization of Securities Commissions. 2023. Emerging Risks in Private Finance. Madrid: IOSCO.

Knight, Frank H. 1921. Risk, Uncertainty and Profit. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Singh, Yash, Zirui Song, Daniel Polsky, Joseph Dov Bruch, and Jill M. Zhu. 2022. Association of Private Equity Acquisition of Physician Practices with Changes in Health Care Spending and Utilization. JAMA Health Forum 3 (9): e222886.

Tushman, Michael L., and Thomas J. Scanlan. 1981. Boundary Spanning Individuals: Their Role in Information Transfer and Their Antecedents. Academy of Management Journal 24 (2): 289-305.

U.S. Government Accountability Office. 2025. Health Care Consolidation: Published Estimates of the Extent and Effects of Physician Consolidation. GAO-25-107450. Washington, D.C.: GAO.

Zhu, Jill M., and Daniel Polsky. 2021. Private Equity and Physician Medical Practices: Navigating a Changing Ecosystem. New England Journal of Medicine 384 (11): 981-983.