

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Between-hospital and between-neighborhood variance in trauma outcomes: Cross-sectional observational evidence from the Detroit metropolitan area

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-022090
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	01-Feb-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Sall, Lauren; St. John Hospital & Medical Center, Surgery Hayward, R. David; St. John Hospital & Medical Center, Surgery Fessler, Mary; St. John Hospital & Medical Center, Surgery Edhayan, Elango; St. John Hospital & Medical Center, Surgery
Keywords:	ACCIDENT & EMERGENCY MEDICINE, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH, TRAUMA MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

View Only

1
2
3 Between-hospital and between-neighborhood variance in trauma outcomes: Cross-sectional
4
5 observational evidence from the Detroit metropolitan area
6
7
8
9
10
11

12 Lauren Sall, MD

13
14 R. David Hayward, PhD*

15
16 Mary M. Fessler, BA

17
18 Elango Edhayan, MD, FACS
19
20
21
22

23 St. John Hospital & Medical Center

24
25 Department of Surgery

26
27 Detroit, MI

28
29 USA
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 WORD COUNT: 1,883

39
40 KEY WORDS: traumatic injury; health inequalities; neighborhoods; trauma outcomes
41

42 Direct Correspondence to:

43 R. David Hayward, PhD

44 Senior Medical Researcher

45 Department of Surgery

46 St. John Hospital & Medical Center

47 22151 Moross Rd., PB 1, Suite. 212

48 Detroit, MI 48236

49 USA

50 Phone: (313) 343-3485

51 Email: Richard.Hayward@ascension.org
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

OBJECTIVES: Disparities in treatment outcomes for traumatic injury are an important concern for care providers and policy makers. Factors that may influence these disparities include differences in risk exposure based on neighborhood of residence, and differences in quality of care between hospitals in different areas. This study examines geographic disparities within a single region: the Detroit metropolitan area.

DESIGN: Data on all trauma admissions between 2006 and 2014 were obtained from the Michigan State Inpatient Database. Admissions were grouped by patient neighborhood of residence and admitting hospital. Generalized Linear Mixed Modeling procedures were used to determine the extent of shared variance based on these two levels of categorization on three outcomes. Patients with trauma due to common mechanisms (falls, firearms, and motor vehicle traffic) were examined as additional subgroups.

SETTING: 143 hospitals admitting patients for traumatic injury in the Detroit metropolitan area during the period from 2006 – 2014.

PARTICIPANTS: 404,675 adult patients admitted for treatment of traumatic injury.

OUTCOME MEASURES: In-hospital mortality, length of stay, and cost of care.

RESULTS: Intraclass correlation coefficients indicated that there was substantial shared variance in outcomes based on hospital, but not based on neighborhood of residence. Among all injury types, hospital-level differences accounted for 15.4% of variance in mortality risk, 36.2% of variance in length of stay, and 37.7% of variance in cost of care. Hospital variance in mortality was highest for firearm trauma (20.1%).

CONCLUSIONS: Based on these data, geographic disparities in trauma treatment outcomes were more strongly attributable to differences in access to quality hospital care than to risk

1
2
3 factors in the neighborhood environment. Transfer of high-risk cases, particularly firearm-related
4
5 trauma, to hospitals with greater institutional experience in the relevant area may help address
6
7 mortality disparities in particular.
8
9

10 11 12 STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY 13

- 14 • Data covers all hospital admissions in a major metropolitan area over a 9-year period
- 15
16 • Multi-level analysis allows decomposition of differences in patient outcomes shared
17
18 within neighborhood of residence and hospital of treatment
- 19
20 • Range of outcomes including mortality, length of stay, and cost of care
- 21
22 • Cannot assess mortality occurring before hospital admission
- 23
24 • Differences in intake patterns may increase between-hospital variance
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INTRODUCTION

The persistence of disparities in patient outcomes is a serious challenge for the US health care system¹. People with low incomes and members of racial and ethnic minority groups experience worse health outcomes across a broad spectrum, from lower birth weight² to greater risk of functional disability in older adulthood³. The causes of these disparities are complex and multifaceted, including differing levels of environmental exposure to health hazards⁴, cultural differences in health behaviors⁵, and unequal access to quality care⁶. Within the field of health disparities research, traumatic injury has received relatively little attention in comparison to areas such as chronic disease and infection⁷. Nevertheless, there is a significant body of evidence finding that factors including race^{7,8} and socioeconomic status^{9,10} may affect patients' risk of negative outcomes following trauma treatment.

The local geography of cities may play an important role in forming these disparities. Cities in the US remain heavily segregated by both race and socioeconomic status, with sharp differences in the demographic makeup of neighborhoods that may be in close proximity to one another¹¹. These neighborhoods may differ in terms of the risks they pose for traumatic injury. For example, socioeconomically-disadvantaged neighborhoods may have higher rates of trauma from causes like assault, which may entail greater risks of poorer outcomes. More broadly, residents of marginalized neighborhoods may face greater background health challenges, leaving them more likely to suffer from multiple comorbidities that are likely to complicate recovery from traumatic injury^{12,13}.

A related facet of metropolitan geography potentially impacting trauma outcomes relates to hospital quality and access. Quality of care issues are an increasing concern in the realm of public policy¹⁴. Large cities contain numerous hospitals providing emergency trauma care, and

1
2
3 most trauma patients are likely to be receive treatment at facilities in close proximity to the
4 places in which they live. Hospitals and other health care facilities serving primarily poor and
5 marginalized local populations may face challenges with funding levels and patient demands that
6 inhibit care quality^{6,15}. Insurance issues and patient familiarity may also serve to funnel high-risk
7 patients towards under-resourced hospitals, as patients may be more likely to opt to seek care at
8 institutions with which they are more familiar, and which they may perceive as less costly¹⁶.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 The extent to which these two aspects of local geography within metropolitan areas—
18 residential neighborhood and care facility – may be related to trauma outcomes has not been
19 thoroughly assessed. In this study, we use data from all trauma patients admitted for traumatic
20 injury to hospitals in the Detroit metropolitan area between 2006 and 2014 and apply statistical
21 techniques to determine the extent to which three outcomes (mortality, length of hospital stay,
22 and cost of care) differ as a function of (a) the neighborhoods in which patients reside, and (b)
23 the hospital providing care. The Detroit metropolitan area has some of the highest levels of
24 residential racial and ethnic segregation in the US, as well as some of the most extreme
25 economic inequalities¹⁷. As a region that has experienced a historical pattern of economic decline
26 and rejuvenation, as well as successive waves of movement between urban and suburban
27 neighborhoods, it serves to exemplify a number of the socioeconomic challenges facing policy
28 makers and health care providers in numerous US cities.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 METHOD

45
46 Individual-level admissions data for this project were obtained from the Healthcare Cost
47 and Utilization Project (HCUP), sponsored by the Agency for Health Research and Quality
48 (AHRQ). One element of the HCUP is the compilation of an annual database including medical
49 details of all hospital discharges in each state, known as the State Inpatient Database (SID).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Ethical approval for use of the data was granted by the Institutional Review Board of St. John
4 Hospital and Medical Center. Because the data were derived from clinical patient records and
5
6 were fully anonymous and de-identified, participant consent was not required.
7
8
9

10 Data for the present analyses come from the Michigan SID for the period of years from
11
12 2006 to 2014¹⁸. Patients residing in the Detroit Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) were
13
14 identified using the US Census Bureau definition as consisting of Wayne, Lapeer, Livingston,
15
16 Macomb, Oakland, and St. Clair counties. Trauma cases were identified using ICD-9 diagnostic
17
18 codes present at admission.
19
20

21 Hospitals. Each record in the SID includes a unique, anonymized, identification code
22
23 corresponding to the hospital to which the patient was admitted. This allows patients to be
24
25 clustered according to hospital. There were a total of 143 hospitals represented in the data, with a
26
27 median of 63 observations in each cluster.
28
29

30 Neighborhoods. Patient residence was identified by ZIP code in the SID, and in this study
31
32 each ZIP code is treated as a separate neighborhood. There were a total of 214 neighborhoods
33
34 represented in the data, with a median of 1,633 observations in each.
35
36

37 Patient outcomes. Patient outcomes include in-hospital mortality, length of stay, and total
38
39 cost of care. Mortality was derived from the case disposition code (0 = did not die, 1 = died).
40
41 Length of stay is given by the number of days between admission and discharge. Total cost is a
42
43 dollar amount corresponding to the total amount billed to any payer for each admission.
44
45

46 Trauma mechanism. Trauma mechanisms are derived from ICD-9 diagnosis codes
47
48 included for each admission case in the SID. The three most common specific mechanisms in
49
50 this sample were examined in these analyses: falls, firearms, and motor vehicle traffic.
51
52

53 Analytical approach
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In this study, we use a generalized linear mixed modeling (GLMM) framework to
4 estimate the proportion of variance in individual outcomes that is attributable to each of three
5 levels: hospitals, neighborhoods, and individuals (i.e., residual variance after hospital and
6 neighborhood variance has been accounted for). The GLMM method¹⁹ is a statistical modeling
7 technique which includes a mixture of fixed and random effects. Random effects represent
8 shared group-level linear relationships. Individual outcome values are allowed to vary at random
9 around a group mean, allowing for an estimate of the part of the outcome that varies between
10 groups and that varying between individuals. In these analyses, random intercept effects are
11 specified for both hospital and neighborhood, meaning that individual outcomes are allowed to
12 vary at random around both a hospital mean and a neighborhood mean. The group-level design
13 matrix is specified as cross-classified, meaning that both sets of higher-level clusters are included
14 in the same model, with each individual belonging to both a hospital and neighborhood cluster.
15 Because the distributions of the outcome variables are not the same, different linking functions
16 are used in GLMM models with different outcomes. Mortality is a binary variable, and uses a
17 binary linking function. Length of stay and total cost both have highly skewed continuous
18 distributions, making the use of a longnormal linking function appropriate.

19
20 The proportion of variance at the group level is given by the intra-class correlation
21 coefficient (ICC) corresponding to the level of clustering (in this case, hospital and
22 neighborhood). For outcomes with a non-binary function (i.e., length of stay and total cost), the
23 ICC is computed by dividing the group-level variance parameter by the sum of the group and
24 residual variance parameters. For binary GLMM (i.e., mortality), the ICC is given by dividing
25 the group-level variance parameter by the sum of the group-level parameter and 3.29, an estimate
26 of the theoretical variance in the binomial distribution²⁰. In the results, these figures are

1
2
3 expressed as a percentage of the total variance at each level. Cases with missing outcome data
4
5 were excluded on a pairwise basis.
6

7 8 RESULTS

9
10 Descriptive statistics for group and sample sizes for each analysis are included in Table 1,
11
12 along with relative variance estimates. There were a total of 404,675 admissions for traumatic
13
14 injury during the time period included in this study. The three largest subgroups based on
15
16 mechanism were falls (N = 117,931), motor vehicle traffic (N = 22,755), and firearms (N =
17
18 6,512). All patients were included in analyses of mortality. Sample sizes for analyses of length of
19
20 stay were somewhat smaller, likely reflecting patients who were transported to a hospital but
21
22 died before admission (1.8% of the full sample was lost at this stage). Total charge data were
23
24 available for only a subset of patients, due to under-reporting of this variable by hospitals (31.4%
25
26 of the total sample was lost at this stage).
27
28
29

30
31 There was significant variance at the hospital level across outcomes and trauma
32
33 mechanism, although the extent of this variance ranged from 2.9% for mortality due to falls to
34
35 37.7% for total cost across all injury mechanisms. Neighborhood variance was minimal across
36
37 outcomes and mechanism as well, with the highest estimate being 1.1% for motor vehicle traffic
38
39 mortality.
40
41

42 DISCUSSION

43
44 The persistence of disparities in health outcomes is an important concern for public
45
46 policy makers and for hospital administrators. This analysis addresses two important issues.
47
48 First, the extent of disparity in outcomes from trauma treatment has received relatively little
49
50 attention, with most research focusing primarily on treatment of acute and chronic disease.
51
52
53 Second, a longstanding question has been the relative importance of placement of care facilities
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 versus neighborhood risk factors and individual differences in creating patterns of geographic
4 health inequality – i.e., do marginalized neighborhoods suffer because they have access to
5 hospitals that have worse outcomes; because they exhibit environmental risk factors like
6 exposure to greater violence, more toxic substances, and generally unsanitary and stressful
7 conditions; or because their populations have other underlying risk factors, like higher rates of
8 chronic disease and lower levels of insurance coverage, unrelated to specific neighborhood
9 conditions.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 With respect to the first question, these results suggest that there are substantial
20 disparities in trauma outcomes related to factors outside of the facts of the trauma case and
21 individual differences in trauma patients. Ideally, these individual factors (represented here as
22 part of the residual variance) should account for all of the variance in outcomes – patient
23 outcomes should be equal across hospitals and across neighborhoods. Regarding the second
24 question, these data indicate that identifiable inequalities account for between 3% and 36% of
25 outcomes, depending on the outcome and trauma type examined. They also suggest that most of
26 these disparities in trauma outcomes appear to be due to hospital-level disparities, with the
27 independent influence of neighborhood being comparatively trivial. This lends support to the
28 view that geographic disparities in trauma outcomes (at least within the specific context of the
29 Detroit metropolitan area) seem to be mainly due to differences in care provided by facilities
30 available in these areas.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 This suggests that, at least in the case of trauma outcomes, policy should focus on
48 reducing disparities in treatment quality between hospitals in order to reduce community-level
49 disparities in outcomes. More broadly, it suggests that factors influencing geographic disparities
50 in trauma outcomes may arise at the point of treatment, rather than being the result of different
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 levels of risk derived from the neighborhood environment, at least when considered within a
4 single metropolitan area. Disparities in treatment quality may have a number of causes, including
5 differences in investment, differences in resource allocation, and differences in institutional
6 experience with treating trauma. In addition to addressing funding and investment disparities,
7 ways of addressing these differences might include transferring high risk cases to hospitals with
8 more extensive institutional experience in the relevant field.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Limitations of this study include the inherent inability to differentiate hospital-level variance that may be caused by differences in the patient population served at different institutions. For example, some institutions may admit a larger volume of more serious traumas, which may have less favorable outcomes. Additionally, because the database used includes only patients who were admitted, it is not possible to assess geographical differences in mortality among those who had a traumatic injury but died before they could be admitted for treatment. It is plausible that neighborhood disparities would be larger if these cases were included.

As policy-makers look for ways to reduce both disparities in trauma outcomes and the cost of providing care for traumatic injury, it is important to have a clear picture of the extent to which they differ as a function of local geography. This study represents a step towards addressing that question, indicating that differences between hospitals may play an important role in determining the extent of these differences.

1
2
3 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT:
4

5 The authors have no conflicting interests to declare.
6

7
8 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS
9

10 LS, RH, and MF drafted the manuscript. RH conducted the statistical analyses. LS and EE
11
12 developed the research questions. All authors reviewed and revised the manuscript.
13

14
15 DATA STATEMENT
16

17 Data from the State Inpatient Database (SID for the state of Michigan for the years 2006 – 2014
18
19 were obtained from the Agency for Health Research and Quality's (AHRQ) Healthcare Cost and
20
21 Utilization Project (HCUP). These data are available for purchase from AHRQ at
22
23 <http://www.hcup-us.ahrq.gov/>
24
25

26
27 FUNDING
28

29 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or
30
31 not-for-profit sectors.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. Adler, N. E. & Rehkopf, D. H. U.S. Disparities in Health: Descriptions, Causes, and Mechanisms. *Annu. Rev. Public Health* **29**, 235–252 (2008).
2. Howell, E. A., Hebert, P., Chatterjee, S., Kleinman, L. C. & Chassin, M. R. Black/white differences in very low birth weight neonatal mortality rates among New York City hospitals. *Pediatrics* **121**, e407–e415 (2008).
3. Freedman, V. A., Martin, L. G. & Schoeni, R. F. Recent trends in disability and functioning among older adults in the united states: A systematic review. *J. Am. Med. Assoc.* **288**, 3137–3146 (2002).
4. Juarez, P. D. *et al.* The public health exposome: a population-based, exposure science approach to health disparities research. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public. Health* **11**, 12866–12895 (2014).
5. Jackson, J. S., Knight, K. M. & Rafferty, J. A. Race and Unhealthy Behaviors: Chronic Stress, the HPA Axis, and Physical and Mental Health Disparities Over the Life Course. *Am. J. Public Health* **100**, 933–939 (2010).
6. Dimick, J., Ruhter, J., Sarrazin, M. V. & Birkmeyer, J. D. Black patients more likely than whites to undergo surgery at low-quality hospitals in segregated regions. *Health Aff. (Millwood)* **32**, 1046–1053 (2013).
7. Haider, A. H. *et al.* Disparities in trauma care and outcomes in the United States: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J. Trauma Acute Care Surg.* **74**, 1195–1205 (2013).
8. Maybury, R. S. *et al.* Pedestrians struck by motor vehicles further worsen race- and insurance-based disparities in trauma outcomes: The case for inner-city pedestrian injury prevention programs. *Surgery* **148**, 202–208 (2010).

- 1
2
3 9. Reimers, A. & Laflamme, L. Hip Fractures Among the Elderly: Personal and Contextual
4
5 Social Factors That Matter. *J. Trauma Acute Care Surg.* **62**, 365–369 (2007).
6
- 7
8 10. Corrigan, J. D. & Bogner, J. A. Neighborhood Characteristics and Outcomes After
9
10 Traumatic Brain Injury. *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil.* **89**, 912–921 (2008).
11
- 12
13 11. Iceland, J. & Sharp, G. White Residential Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas:
14
15 Conceptual Issues, Patterns, and Trends from the U.S. Census, 1980 to 2010. *Popul. Res.*
16
17 *Policy Rev.* **32**, 663–686 (2013).
18
- 19
20 12. Bergeron, E., Lavoie, A., Moore, L., Clas, D. & Rossignol, M. Comorbidity and age are
21
22 both independent predictors of length of hospitalization in trauma patients. *Can. J. Surg.* **48**,
23
24 361 (2005).
25
- 26
27 13. Moore, L. *et al.* Using information on preexisting conditions to predict mortality from
28
29 traumatic injury. *Ann. Emerg. Med.* **52**, 356–364.e2 (2008).
30
- 31
32 14. Tsai, T. C., Orav, E. J. & Jha, A. K. Patient Satisfaction and Quality of Surgical Care in
33
34 US Hospitals. *Ann. Surg.* **261**, 2–8 (2015).
35
- 36
37 15. Hasnain-Wynia R, Baker DW, Nerenz D & et al. Disparities in health care are driven by
38
39 where minority patients seek care: Examination of the hospital quality alliance measures.
40
41 *Arch. Intern. Med.* **167**, 1233–1239 (2007).
42
- 43
44 16. Vettukattil, A. S. *et al.* Do Trauma Safety-Net Hospitals Deliver Truly Safe Trauma
45
46 Care? A Multilevel Analysis of the National Trauma Data Bank. *J. Trauma Acute Care Surg.*
47
48 **70**, 978–984 (2011).
49
- 50
51 17. Darden, J., Rahbar, M., Jezierski, L., Li, M. & Velie, E. The Measurement of
52
53 Neighborhood Socioeconomic Characteristics and Black and White Residential Segregation in
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Metropolitan Detroit: Implications for the Study of Social Disparities in Health. *Ann. Assoc.*
4
5 *Am. Geogr.* **100**, 137–158 (2010).
6

7
8 18. Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP). *HCUP State Inpatient Databases (SID)*.
9
10 (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2006).
11

12 19. Brown, H. & Prescott, R. *Applied mixed models in medicine*. (John Wiley & Sons, 2014).
13

14 20. Nakagawa, S., Johnson, P. C. D. & Schielzeth, H. The coefficient of determination R²
15 and intra-class correlation coefficient from generalized linear mixed-effects models revisited
16 and expanded. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **14**, (2017).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Variance decomposition statistics

	Hospital Variance	Neighborhood Variance	Residual Variance	Patient N	Hospital N	ZIP code N	Mean (SD) or %
All Injuries							
Mortality	15.4%	0.8%	83.8%	404,675	143	214	2.5%
Length of Stay	36.2%	0.2%	63.6%	397,564	143	214	6.4 (8.3)
Total Cost	37.7%	0.2%	62.2%	277,668	143	214	36,264 (55,237)
Falls							
Mortality	2.9%	0.2%	96.9%	117,931	123	213	2.2%
Length of Stay	20.5%	0.5%	79.3%	115,798	123	213	5.2 (5.1)
Total Cost	25.0%	0.1%	74.9%	78,539	109	213	29,641 (31,826)
Firearms							
Mortality	20.1%	0.8%	79.1%	6,512	60	179	5.4%
Length of Stay	11.5%	0.3%	88.2%	6,101	60	179	7.0 (10.6)
Total Cost	18.4%	0.03%	81.5%	3,163	60	179	62,215 (91,234)
Motor Vehicle							
Mortality	4.7%	1.1%	94.2%	22,755	100	211	2.3%
Length of Stay	13.1%	0.3%	86.6%	21,598	100	211	5.2 (7.9)

1								
2								
3								
4	Total Cost	21.6%	0.6%	77.8%	12,833	100	211	49,358
5								
6								(75,765)
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								
13								
14								
15								
16								
17								
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								
26								
27								
28								
29								
30								
31								
32								
33								
34								
35								
36								
37								
38								
39								
40								
41								
42								
43								
44								
45								
46								
47								
48								
49								
50								
51								
52								
53								
54								
55								
56								
57								
58								
59								
60								

For peer review only

STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract Page 1 (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found Page 2
Introduction		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported Pages 1 – 5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses Page 5
Methods		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper Pages 5 – 7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection Pages 5 – 6
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants Pages 5 – 6
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable Page 6
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Pages 5 – 6
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias Page 7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at Page 8
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why Pages 6 – 7
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding Page 7 (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions Page 7 (c) Explain how missing data were addressed Page 7 (d) <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy N/A

(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses

N/A

Continued on next page

Results

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed Page 8 (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage N/A (c) Consider use of a flow diagram N/A
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders Page 8 (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest Table 1
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures Table 1
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included N/A (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized N/A (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period N/A
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses Page 8 & Table 1
Discussion		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives Page 9
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias Page 10
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence Pages 9 – 10
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results Page 9
Other information		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable,

1
2 for the original study on which the present article is based

3 N/A

4
5 *Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and
6 unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.
7

8
9 **Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and
10 published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely
11 available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at
12 <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is
13 available at www.strobe-statement.org.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

BMJ Open

Between-hospital and between-neighborhood variance in trauma outcomes: Cross-sectional observational evidence from the Detroit metropolitan area

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-022090.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	15-Jun-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Sall, Lauren; St. John Hospital & Medical Center, Surgery Hayward, R. David; St. John Hospital & Medical Center, Surgery Fessler, Mary; St. John Hospital & Medical Center, Surgery Edhayan, Elango; St. John Hospital & Medical Center, Surgery
Primary Subject Heading:	Emergency medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health, Surgery
Keywords:	ACCIDENT & EMERGENCY MEDICINE, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH, TRAUMA MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 Between-hospital and between-neighborhood variance in trauma outcomes: Cross-sectional
4
5 observational evidence from the Detroit metropolitan area
6
7
8
9
10
11

12 Lauren Sall, MD

13
14 R. David Hayward, PhD*

15
16 Mary M. Fessler, BA

17
18 Elango Edhayan, MD, FACS
19
20
21
22

23
24 St. John Hospital & Medical Center

25
26 Department of Surgery

27
28 Detroit, MI

29
30 USA
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 WORD COUNT: 2,912

39
40 KEY WORDS: traumatic injury; health inequalities; neighborhoods; trauma outcomes
41

42 Direct Correspondence to:

43 R. David Hayward, PhD

44 Senior Medical Researcher

45 Department of Surgery

46 St. John Hospital & Medical Center

47 22151 Moross Rd., PB 1, Suite. 212

48 Detroit, MI 48236

49 USA

50 Phone: (313) 343-3485

51 Email: Richard.Hayward@ascension.org
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

OBJECTIVES: Disparities in treatment outcomes for traumatic injury are an important concern for care providers and policy makers. Factors that may influence these disparities include differences in risk exposure based on neighborhood of residence, and differences in quality of care between hospitals in different areas. This study examines geographic disparities within a single region: the Detroit metropolitan area.

DESIGN: Data on all trauma admissions between 2006 and 2014 were obtained from the Michigan State Inpatient Database. Admissions were grouped by patient neighborhood of residence and admitting hospital. Generalized Linear Mixed Modeling procedures were used to determine the extent of shared variance based on these two levels of categorization on three outcomes. Patients with trauma due to common mechanisms (falls, firearms, and motor vehicle traffic) were examined as additional subgroups.

SETTING: 143 hospitals admitting patients for traumatic injury in the Detroit metropolitan area during the period from 2006 – 2014.

PARTICIPANTS: 404,675 adult patients admitted for treatment of traumatic injury.

OUTCOME MEASURES: In-hospital mortality, length of stay, and hospital charges.

RESULTS: Intraclass correlation coefficients indicated that there was substantial shared variance in outcomes based on hospital, but not based on neighborhood of residence. Among all injury types, hospital-level differences accounted for 15.4% of variance in mortality risk, 36.2% of variance in length of stay, and 37.7% of variance in hospital charges. Hospital variance in mortality was highest for firearm trauma (20.1%).

CONCLUSIONS: Based on these data, geographic disparities in trauma treatment outcomes were more strongly attributable to differences in access to quality hospital care than to risk

1
2
3 factors in the neighborhood environment. Transfer of high-risk cases, particularly firearm-related
4
5 trauma, to hospitals with greater institutional experience in the relevant area may help address
6
7 mortality disparities in particular.
8
9

10 11 12 STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY 13

- 14 • Data covers all hospital admissions in a major metropolitan area over a 9-year period
 - 15 • Multi-level analysis allows decomposition of differences in patient outcomes shared
16 within neighborhood of residence and hospital of treatment
 - 17 • Range of outcomes including mortality, length of stay, and hospital charges
 - 18 • Cannot assess mortality occurring before hospital admission
 - 19 • Differences in intake patterns may increase between-hospital variance
- 20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INTRODUCTION

The persistence of disparities in patient outcomes is a serious challenge for the US health care system¹. People with low incomes and members of racial and ethnic minority groups experience worse health outcomes across a broad spectrum, from lower birth weight² to greater risk of functional disability in older adulthood³. The causes of these disparities are complex and multifaceted, including differing levels of environmental exposure to health hazards⁴, cultural differences in health behaviors⁵, and unequal access to quality care⁶. Within the field of health disparities research, traumatic injury has received relatively little attention in comparison to areas such as chronic disease and infection⁷. Nevertheless, there is a significant body of evidence finding that factors including race^{7,8} and socioeconomic status^{9,10} may affect patients' risk of negative outcomes following trauma treatment.

The local geography of cities may play an important role in forming these disparities. Cities in the US remain heavily segregated by both race and socioeconomic status, with sharp differences in the demographic makeup of neighborhoods that may be in close proximity to one another¹¹. These neighborhoods may differ in terms of the risks they pose for traumatic injury. For example, socioeconomically-disadvantaged neighborhoods may have higher rates of trauma from causes like assault, which may entail greater risks of poorer outcomes. More broadly, residents of marginalized neighborhoods may face greater background health challenges, leaving them more likely to suffer from multiple comorbidities that are likely to complicate recovery from traumatic injury^{12,13}.

A related facet of metropolitan geography potentially impacting trauma outcomes relates to hospital quality and access. Quality of care issues are an increasing concern in the realm of public policy¹⁴. Large cities contain numerous hospitals providing emergency trauma care, and

1
2
3 most trauma patients are likely to be receive treatment at facilities in close proximity to the
4 places in which they live. Hospitals and other health care facilities serving primarily poor and
5 marginalized local populations may face challenges with funding levels and patient demands that
6 inhibit care quality^{6,15}. Insurance issues and patient familiarity may also serve to funnel high-risk
7 patients towards under-resourced hospitals, as patients may be more likely to opt to seek care at
8 institutions with which they are more familiar, and which they may perceive as less costly¹⁶.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 The extent to which these two aspects of local geography within metropolitan areas—
18 residential neighborhood and care facility – may be related to trauma outcomes has not been
19 thoroughly assessed. In this study, we use data from all trauma patients admitted for traumatic
20 injury to hospitals in the Detroit metropolitan area between 2006 and 2014 and apply statistical
21 techniques to determine the extent to which three outcomes (mortality, length of hospital stay,
22 and hospital charges) differ as a function of (a) the neighborhoods in which patients reside, and
23 (b) the hospital providing care. The Detroit metropolitan area has some of the highest levels of
24 residential racial and ethnic segregation in the US, as well as some of the most extreme
25 economic inequalities¹⁷. As a region that has experienced a historical pattern of economic decline
26 and rejuvenation, as well as successive waves of movement between urban and suburban
27 neighborhoods, it serves to exemplify a number of the socioeconomic challenges facing policy
28 makers and health care providers in numerous US cities. It has a well-developed emergency and
29 trauma infrastructure, including three hospitals with ACS Level I trauma designation and 13 with
30 Level II designation during the period covered by this study.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 METHOD

50
51 Individual-level admissions data for this project were obtained from the Healthcare Cost
52 and Utilization Project (HCUP), sponsored by the Agency for Health Research and Quality
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

1
2
3 (AHRQ). One element of the HCUP is the compilation of an annual database including medical
4 details of all hospital discharges in each state, known as the State Inpatient Database (SID).

5
6
7 Ethical approval for use of the data was granted by the Institutional Review Board of St. John
8 Hospital and Medical Center. Because the data were derived from clinical patient records and
9
10 were fully anonymous and de-identified, participant consent was not required.
11
12
13

14
15 Data for the present analyses come from the Michigan SID for the period of years from
16 2006 to 2014¹⁸. Patients residing in the Detroit Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) were
17 identified using the US Census Bureau definition as consisting of Wayne, Lapeer, Livingston,
18 Macomb, Oakland, and St. Clair counties. Trauma cases were identified using ICD-9 diagnostic
19 codes present at admission (ICD-9 codes 800 – 959 were included).
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Hospitals. Each record in the SID includes a unique, anonymized, identification code
27 corresponding to the hospital to which the patient was admitted. This allows patients to be
28 clustered according to hospital. After excluding institutions with fewer than 100 trauma
29 admissions during the 9-year study period, there were a total of 66 hospitals represented in the
30 data, with a median of 2,845 observations in each cluster.
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Neighborhoods. Patient residence was identified by ZIP code in the SID, and in this study
38 each ZIP code is treated as a separate neighborhood. There were a total of 214 neighborhoods
39 represented in the data, with a median of 1,633 observations in each.
40
41
42
43

44 Patient outcomes. Patient outcomes include in-hospital mortality, length of stay, and total
45 hospital charges. Mortality was derived from the case disposition code (0 = did not die, 1 =
46 died). Length of stay is given by the number of days between admission and discharge. Total
47 hospital charges is a dollar amount corresponding to the total amount billed to any payer for each
48 admission.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Trauma mechanism. Trauma mechanisms are derived from ICD-9 diagnosis codes
4 included for each admission case in the SID. The three most common specific mechanisms in
5 this sample were examined in these analyses: falls, firearms, and motor vehicle traffic.
6
7

8
9
10 Injury severity. ICD-9 diagnosis codes included in the SID were used to calculate
11 estimated injury severity scores (ISS) for all patients. This procedure was carried out using
12 ICDPIC-R¹⁹, an open-source program executed in the R statistical environment which computes
13 abbreviated injury score (AIS) by body region based on ICD-9 codes, and then calculates an
14 estimated ISS based on regional AIS, and is based on a set of procedures that have been
15 extensively validated for this purpose^{20,21}.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Patient and neighborhood demographics. Individual demographics included age (in
24 years), gender, and race (white, black, or other). Neighborhood socioeconomic status (SES) was
25 measured using ZIP code-level poverty rate estimates published by the US Census Bureau²².
26 These estimates represent a three-year rolling average (e.g., the estimates for 2014 represent data
27 from 2012 – 2014). Because poverty rate data were not made available until 2012, whereas this
28 study covers the period from 2006 – 2014, neighborhood SES is represented in this study as a
29 single rate regardless of year (rather than varying across time), using data from 2014. It was not
30 possible to include information about hospital characteristics (e.g., trauma level designation)
31 because the Michigan SID excludes identifiers that would enable cross-referencing hospital IDs
32 with American Hospital Association data.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Analytical approach

47
48
49 In this study, we use a generalized linear mixed modeling (GLMM) framework to
50 estimate the proportion of variance in individual outcomes that is attributable to each of three
51 levels: hospitals, neighborhoods, and individuals (i.e., residual variance after hospital and
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

neighborhood variance has been accounted for). The GLMM method²³ is a statistical modeling technique which includes a mixture of fixed and random effects. Random effects represent shared group-level linear relationships. Individual outcome values are allowed to vary at random around a group mean, allowing for an estimate of the part of the outcome that varies between groups and that varying between individuals. In these analyses, random intercept effects are specified for both hospital and neighborhood, meaning that individual outcomes are allowed to vary at random around both a hospital mean and a neighborhood mean. The group-level design matrix is specified as cross-classified, meaning that both sets of higher-level clusters are included in the same model, with each individual belonging to both a hospital and neighborhood cluster. Because the distributions of the outcome variables are not the same, different linking functions are used in GLMM models with different outcomes. Mortality is a binary variable, and uses a binary linking function. Length of stay and total charges both have highly skewed continuous distributions, making the use of a longnormal linking function appropriate.

The proportion of variance at the group level is given by the intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) corresponding to the level of clustering (in this case, hospital and neighborhood). For outcomes with a non-binary function (i.e., length of stay and charges), the ICC is computed by dividing the group-level variance parameter by the sum of the group and residual variance parameters. For binary GLMM (i.e., mortality), the ICC is given by dividing the group-level variance parameter by the sum of the group-level parameter and 3.29, an estimate of the theoretical variance in the binomial distribution²⁴. In the results, these figures are expressed as a percentage of the total variance at each level. Cases with missing outcome data were excluded on a pairwise basis. LOS analyses exclude cases with mortality prior to admission (hence missing LOS data), but include other in-hospital mortality cases. Analyses were

conducted using SAS 9.4, except for the estimation of ISS, which was carried out using ICDPIC-R in R 3.5.

Patient and Public Involvement

This study addresses patient priorities by seeking to better understand how trauma care systems may be able to reduce patient mortality rates, the length of hospitalization, and charges incurred. Data are derived from administrative records, so patients were not directly involved in the design, recruitment, or conduct of the study. Results will be accessible to the public, including to individuals who may have patients during the study period.

RESULTS

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for the full patient sample at the individual, hospital, and neighborhood levels. There were a total of 404,675 admissions for traumatic injury during the time period included in this study, representing a total of 66 hospitals and 214 ZIP codes. The mean number of patients per hospital was 2,845 (IQR: 349 – 9,683), and the mean number per neighborhood was 1,630 (IQR: 765 – 2,879). The three largest subgroups based on mechanism were falls (N = 117,931), motor vehicle traffic (N = 22,755), and firearms (N = 6,512).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics at the individual, hospital, and neighborhood levels

	Individual (N = 404,675) Mean (SD) or %	Hospital (N = 66) Median [IQR]	Neighborhood (N = 214) Median [IQR]
N		2,845	1,630
individuals		[349; 9,683]	[765; 2,879]
Age	60.4 (23.7)	62.0	60.8
		[53.2, 66.6]	[57.3, 65.2]
Female	49.8%	50.6%	50.5%
		[40.1%, 56.7%]	[46.3%, 54.2%]
Race			
White	70.0%	74.6%	70.8%
		[40.6%, 91.0%]	[45.5%, 82.4%]

Black	26.0%	7.6%	2.3%
		[2.2%, 19.3%]	[0.9%, 10.0%]
Other	4.0%	8.2%	17.2%
		[3.6%, 23.2%]	[12.0%, 30.7%]
Mechanism			
Falls	44.3%	43.7%	46.7%
		[26.9%, 54.1%]	[40.4%, 52.2%]
Firearms	2.4%	0.4%	0.6%
		[0.04%, 1.1%]	[0.2%, 1.4%]
Motor Vehicle	8.6%	5.4%	8.4%
		[2.8%, 12.1%]	[7.0%, 10.4%]
Severity	4.9 (5.4)	4.5	5.0
		[3.5, 5.5]	[4.7, 5.2]
Mortality	2.5%	2.2%	2.4%
		[1.6%, 3.0%]	[2.0%, 2.7%]
LOS	6.4 (8.3)	5.9	6.3
		[5.2, 6.7]	[5.9, 6.7]
Charges (thousands of dollars)	36.3 (55.2)	32.5	36.9
		[25.5, 41.2]	[33.7, 39.5]
Poverty Rate	17.4 (14.4)	14.5	10.7
		[11.8, 19.9]	[6.5, 18.7]

Tables 2 and 3 allow for comparisons of case characteristics by neighborhood SES (defined by poverty rate quartiles) and injury severity (defined by cases with ISS up to 15 and those with ISS greater than 15). Patients from the poorest neighborhoods were substantially younger than the patient population as a whole, and were more likely to be male and black. Mortality rates, LOS, and charges were all significantly higher in poorer neighborhoods, but the magnitude of these differences in outcomes was small (e.g., 2.4% mortality in the lowest-quartile poverty neighborhoods, compared with 2.6% in the highest-poverty quartile). Both outcomes and demographics differed substantially by injury severity. Severely injured patients were much more likely to be male, and were somewhat younger and somewhat more likely to be Black. Firearm and MVT mechanisms were also much more common among the more severe injuries.

As would be expected, mortality was substantially higher among those with more severe injuries, as were median LOS and charges.

Table 2. Individual descriptive statistics by poverty quartile

	1 st Quartile ($< 6.5\%$) N = 103,004	2 nd Quartile ($6.5\% - 10.8\%$) N = 79,738	3 rd Quartile ($10.8\% - 18.7\%$) N = 90,554	4 th Quartile ($> 18.7\%$) N = 134,257	<i>p</i> -value ^a
Age, mean [95% CI]	63.9 [63.7, 64.0]	65.1 [64.9, 65.2]	62.3 [62.1, 62.4]	53.8 [53.6, 53.9]	$< .001$
Female	53.0%	54.0%	52.0%	43.4%	$< .001$
Race					$< .001$
White	86.9%	93.5%	83.1%	38.5%	
Black	9.5%	3.3%	13.7%	56.3%	
Other	3.6%	3.2%	3.2%	5.2%	
Mechanism					$< .001$
Falls	49.8%	51.7%	47.3%	35.4%	
Firearms	1.0%	0.4%	1.0%	5.1%	
Motor Vehicle	8.0%	7.6%	8.1%	9.6%	
Severity (ISS), mean [95% CI]	5.0 [4.9, 5.0]	4.9 [4.9, 4.9]	4.7 [4.7, 4.7]	4.9 [4.9, 5.0]	$< .001$
Mortality	2.4%	2.5%	2.4%	2.6%	.002
LOS, median [IQR]	4.0 [2.0, 7.0]	4.0 [2.0, 7.0]	4.0 [2.0, 7.0]	4.0 [2.0, 8.0]	$< .001$
Charges (thousands of dollars), median [IQR]	22.2 [13.0, 37.8]	22.7 [13.2, 38.9]	22.3 [13.0, 38.0]	23.3 [13.3, 41.7]	$< .001$

NOTES: ISS Injury Severity Score, LOS Length of Stay
^a *p*-values for 1-way ANOVA (age, ISS), Kruskal-Wallis (LOS, cost), or chi-square (female, race, mechanism, mortality)

Table 3. Individual descriptive statistics by injury severity group

	Less Severe Injuries ISS ≤ 15 (N = 380,218)	More Severe Injuries ISS > 15 (N = 25,997)	<i>p</i> -value ^a
Age, mean [95% CI]	60.6 [60.6, 60.7]	57.0 [56.7, 57.3]	$< .001$
Female	50.8%	35.8%	
Race			$< .001$
White	70.4%	64.0%	
Black	25.7%	31.1%	
Other	3.9%	4.9%	
Mechanism			$< .001$

	Falls	44.4%	41.7%	
	Firearms	2.0%	8.1%	
	Motor Vehicle	7.4%	24.2%	
Mortality		2.1%	8.2%	< .001
LOS		4.0	6.0	< .001
		[2.0, 7.0]	[3.0, 11.0]	
Charges (thousands of dollars), median		22.0	37.2	< .001
[IQR]		[12.8, 37.5]	[19.6, 80.2]	
Neighborhood poverty rate, median		12.4	13.2	< .001
[IQR]		[6.5, 26.5]	[6.5, 32.3]	

NOTES: ISS Injury Severity Score, LOS Length of Stay

^a *p*-values for 1-way ANOVA (age), Kruskal-Wallis (LOS, cost), or chi-square (female, race, mechanism, mortality)

Table 4 presents the variance decomposition results for the full and stratified samples, along with the number of patients included in each model. All patients were included in analyses of mortality. Sample sizes for analyses of length of stay were somewhat smaller, likely reflecting patients who were transported to a hospital but died before admission (1.8% of the full sample was lost at this stage). Total charge data were available for only a subset of patients, due to under-reporting of this variable by hospitals (31.4% of the total sample was lost at this stage). Supplemental analyses (not shown) indicated that patients with missing charge data were substantially more likely to be black, male, and live in high-poverty neighborhoods. A substantial proportion of this missing data may be due to hospitals waiving or not reporting charges for uninsured patients with means to pay, and thus directly confounded with the aims of the study. Charge results should therefore be interpreted with some caution.

Table 4. Variance decomposition statistics

	Hospital	Neighborhood	Residual	Patient	Hospital	ZIP
	Variance	Variance	Variance	N	N	code N

	(ICC)	(ICC)	(ICC)			
All Injuries						
Mortality	15.4%	0.8%	83.8%	404,675	66	214
Length of Stay	36.2%	0.2%	63.6%	397,564	66	214
Total Charges	37.7%	0.2%	62.2%	276,478	66	214
Less Severe Injuries (ISS ≤ 15)						
Mortality	12.3%	0.4%	87.3%	378,788	66	214
Length of Stay	15.8%	0.2%	84.0%	370,933	66	214
Total Charges	33.0%	0.1%	66.9%	258,744	66	214
More Severe Injuries (ISS > 15)						
Mortality	4.8%	0.4%	94.8%	25,887	64	212
Length of Stay	21.3%	1.3%	77.3%	25,150	64	212
Total Charges	17.7%	0.8%	81.4%	17,734	64	212
All Falls						
Mortality	2.9%	0.2%	96.9%	117,454	65	213
Length of Stay	20.5%	0.5%	79.3%	115,334	65	213
Total Charges	25.0%	0.1%	74.9%	78,166	65	213
All Firearms						
Mortality	20.1%	0.8%	79.1%	6,498	52	178
Length of Stay	11.5%	0.3%	88.2%	6,089	52	178
Total Charges	18.4%	0.03%	81.5%	3,151	52	178
All Motor Vehicle						
Mortality	4.7%	1.1%	94.2%	22,604	65	211

Length of Stay	13.1%	0.3%	86.6%	21,457	65	211
Total Charges	21.6%	0.6%	77.8%	12,725	65	211

NOTES: ICC Intraclass Correlation Coefficient

There was significant variance at the hospital level across outcomes and trauma mechanism, although the extent of this variance ranged from 2.9% for mortality due to falls to 37.7% for total charges across all injury mechanisms. Neighborhood variance was minimal across outcomes and mechanism as well, with the highest estimate being 1.1% for motor vehicle traffic mortality. The extent of variance at the hospital levels was somewhat reduced but still substantial in the analyses stratified by both injury severity and by trauma mechanism. Hence, clustering of risk types did not appear to fully explain inter-hospital differences.

DISCUSSION

The persistence of disparities in health outcomes is an important concern for public policy makers and for hospital administrators. These results reflect a growing literature finding substantial between-hospital differences in outcomes for injured patients, related to hospital factors including patient volume²⁵, trauma level designation²⁶, and treatment efficiency²⁷. This analysis addresses two important issues. First, the extent of disparity in outcomes from trauma treatment has received relatively little attention, with most research focusing primarily on treatment of acute and chronic disease. Second, a longstanding question has been the relative importance of placement of care facilities versus neighborhood risk factors and individual differences in creating patterns of geographic health inequality – i.e., do marginalized neighborhoods suffer because they have access to hospitals that have worse outcomes; because they exhibit environmental risk factors like exposure to greater violence, more toxic substances,

1
2
3 and generally unsanitary and stressful conditions; or because their populations have other
4
5 underlying risk factors, like higher rates of chronic disease and lower levels of insurance
6
7 coverage, unrelated to specific neighborhood conditions.
8
9

10 With respect to the first question, these results suggest that there are substantial
11
12 disparities in trauma outcomes related to factors outside of the facts of the trauma case and
13
14 individual differences in trauma patients. Ideally, these individual factors (represented here as
15
16 part of the residual variance) should account for all of the variance in outcomes – patient
17
18 outcomes should be equal across hospitals and across neighborhoods. Regarding the second
19
20 question, these data indicate that identifiable inequalities account for between 3% and 36% of
21
22 outcomes, depending on the outcome and trauma type examined. They also suggest that most of
23
24 these disparities in trauma outcomes appear to be due to hospital-level disparities, with the
25
26 independent influence of neighborhood being comparatively trivial. This lends support to the
27
28 view that geographic disparities in trauma outcomes (at least within the specific context of the
29
30 Detroit metropolitan area) seem to be mainly due to differences in care provided by facilities
31
32 available in these areas.
33
34
35
36

37 Comparative analyses based on neighborhood poverty levels and injury severity
38
39 illustrates some potentially confounding factors. For example, patients living in high-poverty
40
41 neighborhoods tend to be at higher risk for negative outcomes in some regards – particularly in
42
43 terms of incidence of firearm injuries – but they are also substantially younger on average, and
44
45 thus may suffer from fewer risks related to comorbid conditions, which tend to increase with age.
46
47 Hospital-level disparities in outcomes remained after stratifying the analyses by injury severity
48
49 and by mechanism of injury. This suggests that these differences between hospitals are not solely
50
51 based on different background case characteristics. Although there are clearly disparities in terms
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of risk for different types of injury based on geographic location, these differences in caseload do
4
5 not appear to fully explain differences in hospital outcomes. Nevertheless, it remains likely that
6
7 different patient populations with different risk profiles play an important role in some fraction
8
9 of the inter-hospital variability seen here. Although it is beyond the scope of a single study to
10
11 identify all of these factors, it remains an important area for focus in future research.
12
13

14
15 These findings suggest that, at least in the case of trauma outcomes, policy should focus
16
17 on reducing disparities in treatment quality between hospitals in order to reduce community-level
18
19 disparities in outcomes. More broadly, it suggests that factors influencing geographic disparities
20
21 in trauma outcomes may arise at the point of treatment, rather than being the result of different
22
23 levels of risk derived from the neighborhood environment, at least when considered within a
24
25 single metropolitan area. Disparities in treatment quality may have a number of causes, including
26
27 differences in investment, differences in resource allocation, and differences in institutional
28
29 experience with treating trauma. In addition to addressing funding and investment disparities,
30
31 ways of addressing these differences might include transferring high risk cases to hospitals with
32
33 more extensive institutional experience in the relevant field.
34
35
36

37
38 Limitations of this study include the inherent inability to differentiate hospital-level
39
40 variance that may be caused by differences in the patient population served at different
41
42 institutions. For example, some institutions may admit a larger volume of more serious traumas,
43
44 which may have less favorable outcomes. It is plausible that neighborhood disparities would be
45
46 larger if these cases were included. Additionally, our data did not include information on pre-
47
48 hospital mortality, which has been identified in previous research as a critical phase for trauma
49
50 management²⁸. Since there is the potential for significant inequalities in pre-hospital care, for
51
52 example due to geographical differences in response times, this is an important element of the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 trauma care system to address in future research on disparities. Other shortcomings include a
4
5 lack of hospital-level data, including trauma level designation, due to limitations on the
6
7 Michigan SID data aimed at preserving institutional anonymity. Charge data must be interpreted
8
9 with some caution, because charges billed do not necessarily reflect hospital costs, and can vary
10
11 between regions based on a variety of factors unrelated to care²⁹. Finally, alternative ways of
12
13 identifying neighborhood clusters other than ZIP code (e.g., census tracts, or homogeneous ZIP
14
15 code groups) might yield more information regarding neighborhood variation. Future research
16
17 should seek to create and validate better methods of defining neighborhoods.
18
19
20

21 As policy-makers look for ways to reduce both disparities in trauma outcomes and the
22
23 cost of providing care for traumatic injury, it is important to have a clear picture of the extent to
24
25 which they differ as a function of local geography. This study represents a step towards
26
27 addressing that question, indicating that differences between hospitals may play an important
28
29 role in determining the extent of these differences.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT:
4

5 The authors have no conflicting interests to declare.
6

7
8 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS
9

10 LS, RH, and MF drafted the manuscript. RH conducted the statistical analyses. LS and EE
11 developed the research questions. All authors reviewed and revised the manuscript.
12
13

14
15 DATA STATEMENT
16

17 Data from the State Inpatient Database (SID for the state of Michigan for the years 2006 – 2014
18 were obtained from the Agency for Health Research and Quality's (AHRQ) Healthcare Cost and
19 Utilization Project (HCUP). These data are available for purchase from AHRQ at
20
21
22
23
24 <http://www.hcup-us.ahrq.gov/>
25

26
27 FUNDING
28

29 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or
30 not-for-profit sectors.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. Adler, N. E. & Rehkopf, D. H. U.S. Disparities in Health: Descriptions, Causes, and Mechanisms. *Annu. Rev. Public Health* **29**, 235–252 (2008).
2. Howell, E. A., Hebert, P., Chatterjee, S., Kleinman, L. C. & Chassin, M. R. Black/white differences in very low birth weight neonatal mortality rates among New York City hospitals. *Pediatrics* **121**, e407–e415 (2008).
3. Freedman, V. A., Martin, L. G. & Schoeni, R. F. Recent trends in disability and functioning among older adults in the united states: A systematic review. *J. Am. Med. Assoc.* **288**, 3137–3146 (2002).
4. Juarez, P. D. *et al.* The public health exposome: a population-based, exposure science approach to health disparities research. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public. Health* **11**, 12866–12895 (2014).
5. Jackson, J. S., Knight, K. M. & Rafferty, J. A. Race and Unhealthy Behaviors: Chronic Stress, the HPA Axis, and Physical and Mental Health Disparities Over the Life Course. *Am. J. Public Health* **100**, 933–939 (2010).
6. Dimick, J., Ruhter, J., Sarrazin, M. V. & Birkmeyer, J. D. Black patients more likely than whites to undergo surgery at low-quality hospitals in segregated regions. *Health Aff. (Millwood)* **32**, 1046–1053 (2013).
7. Haider, A. H. *et al.* Disparities in trauma care and outcomes in the United States: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J. Trauma Acute Care Surg.* **74**, 1195–1205 (2013).
8. Maybury, R. S. *et al.* Pedestrians struck by motor vehicles further worsen race- and insurance-based disparities in trauma outcomes: The case for inner-city pedestrian injury prevention programs. *Surgery* **148**, 202–208 (2010).

- 1
2
3 9. Reimers, A. & Laflamme, L. Hip Fractures Among the Elderly: Personal and Contextual
4
5 Social Factors That Matter. *J. Trauma Acute Care Surg.* **62**, 365–369 (2007).
6
- 7
8 10. Corrigan, J. D. & Bogner, J. A. Neighborhood Characteristics and Outcomes After
9
10 Traumatic Brain Injury. *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil.* **89**, 912–921 (2008).
11
- 12
13 11. Iceland, J. & Sharp, G. White Residential Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas:
14
15 Conceptual Issues, Patterns, and Trends from the U.S. Census, 1980 to 2010. *Popul. Res.*
16
17 *Policy Rev.* **32**, 663–686 (2013).
18
- 19
20 12. Bergeron, E., Lavoie, A., Moore, L., Clas, D. & Rossignol, M. Comorbidity and age are
21
22 both independent predictors of length of hospitalization in trauma patients. *Can. J. Surg.* **48**,
23
24 361 (2005).
25
- 26
27 13. Moore, L. *et al.* Using information on preexisting conditions to predict mortality from
28
29 traumatic injury. *Ann. Emerg. Med.* **52**, 356–364.e2 (2008).
30
- 31
32 14. Tsai, T. C., Orav, E. J. & Jha, A. K. Patient Satisfaction and Quality of Surgical Care in
33
34 US Hospitals. *Ann. Surg.* **261**, 2–8 (2015).
35
- 36
37 15. Hasnain-Wynia, R., Baker, Nerenz, D. & *et al.* Disparities in health care are driven by
38
39 where minority patients seek care: Examination of the hospital quality alliance measures.
40
41 *Arch. Intern. Med.* **167**, 1233–1239 (2007).
42
- 43
44 16. Vettukattil, A. S. *et al.* Do Trauma Safety-Net Hospitals Deliver Truly Safe Trauma
45
46 Care? A Multilevel Analysis of the National Trauma Data Bank. *J. Trauma Acute Care Surg.*
47
48 **70**, 978–984 (2011).
49
- 50
51 17. Darden, J., Rahbar, M., Jezierski, L., Li, M. & Velie, E. The Measurement of
52
53 Neighborhood Socioeconomic Characteristics and Black and White Residential Segregation in
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Metropolitan Detroit: Implications for the Study of Social Disparities in Health. *Ann. Assoc.*
4
5 *Am. Geogr.* **100**, 137–158 (2010).
6
7
8 18. Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP). *HCUP State Inpatient Databases (SID)*.
9
10 (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2006).
11
12 19. Clark, D. E., Black, A. W., Skavdahl, D. H. & Hallagan, L. D. Open-access programs for
13
14 injury categorization using ICD-9 or ICD-10. *Inj. Epidemiol.* **5**, 11 (2018).
15
16 20. Sears, J. M., Blonar, L. & Bowman, S. M. Predicting work-related disability and medical
17
18 cost outcomes: A comparison of injury severity scoring methods. *Injury* **45**, 16–22 (2014).
19
20 21. Greene, N. H., Kernic, M. A., Vavilala, M. S. & Rivara, F. P. Validation of ICDPIC
21
22 software injury severity scores using a large regional trauma registry. *Inj. Prev.* **21**, 325
23
24 (2015).
25
26 22. U. S. Census Bureau. *American FactFinder*. (2014).
27
28 23. Brown, H. & Prescott, R. *Applied mixed models in medicine*. (John Wiley & Sons, 2014).
29
30 24. Nakagawa, S., Johnson, P. C. D. & Schielzeth, H. The coefficient of determination R²
31
32 and intra-class correlation coefficient from generalized linear mixed-effects models revisited
33
34 and expanded. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **14**, (2017).
35
36 25. Nathens AB, Jurkovich GJ, Maier RV & et al. Relationship between trauma center
37
38 volume and outcomes. *JAMA* **285**, 1164–1171 (2001).
39
40 26. Demetriades, D. *et al.* The effect of trauma center designation and trauma volume on
41
42 outcome in specific severe injuries. *Ann. Surg.* **242**, 512–519 (2005).
43
44 27. Novack, V., Jotkowitz, A., Etzion, O. & Porath, A. Does delay in surgery after hip
45
46 fracture lead to worse outcomes? A multicenter survey. *Int. J. Qual. Health Care* **19**, 170–176
47
48 (2007).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 28. Kleber, C. *et al.* Overall Distribution of Trauma-related Deaths in Berlin 2010:
4
5 Advancement or Stagnation of German Trauma Management? *World J. Surg.* **36**, 2125–2130
6
7 (2012).
8
9
- 10 29. Wakeam, E. *et al.* Variation in the cost of 5 common operations in the United States.
11
12 *Surgery* **162**, 592–604 (2017).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract Page 1 (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found Page 2
Introduction		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported Pages 1 – 5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses Page 5
Methods		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper Pages 5 – 7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection Pages 5 – 6
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants Pages 5 – 6
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable Page 6
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Pages 5 – 6
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias Page 7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at Page 8
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why Pages 6 – 7
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding Page 7 (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions Page 7 (c) Explain how missing data were addressed Page 7 (d) <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy N/A

(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses

N/A

Continued on next page

Results

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed Page 8 (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage N/A (c) Consider use of a flow diagram N/A
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders Page 8 (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest Table 1
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures Table 1
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included N/A (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized N/A (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period N/A
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses Page 8 & Table 1
Discussion		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives Page 9
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias Page 10
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence Pages 9 – 10
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results Page 9
Other information		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable,

1
2 for the original study on which the present article is based

3 N/A

4
5 *Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and
6 unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.
7

8
9 **Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and
10 published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely
11 available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at
12 <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is
13 available at www.strobe-statement.org.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

BMJ Open

Between-hospital and between-neighborhood variance in trauma outcomes: Cross-sectional observational evidence from the Detroit metropolitan area

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-022090.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	09-Oct-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Sall, Lauren; St. John Hospital & Medical Center, Surgery Hayward, R. David; St. John Hospital & Medical Center, Surgery Fessler, Mary; St. John Hospital & Medical Center, Surgery Edhayan, Elango; St. John Hospital & Medical Center, Surgery
Primary Subject Heading:	Emergency medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health, Surgery
Keywords:	ACCIDENT & EMERGENCY MEDICINE, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH, TRAUMA MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 Between-hospital and between-neighborhood variance in trauma outcomes: Cross-sectional
4
5 observational evidence from the Detroit metropolitan area
6
7
8
9
10
11

12 Lauren Sall, MD

13
14 R. David Hayward, PhD*

15
16 Mary M. Fessler, BA

17
18 Elango Edhayan, MD, FACS
19
20
21
22

23 St. John Hospital & Medical Center

24
25 Department of Surgery
26
27

28 Detroit, MI

29
30 USA
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 WORD COUNT: 2,912

39
40 KEY WORDS: traumatic injury; health inequalities; neighborhoods; trauma outcomes
41

42 Direct Correspondence to:

43 R. David Hayward, PhD

44 Senior Medical Researcher

45 Department of Surgery

46 St. John Hospital & Medical Center

47 22151 Moross Rd., PB 1, Suite. 212

48 Detroit, MI 48236

49 USA

50 Phone: (313) 343-3485

51 Email: Richard.Hayward@ascension.org
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

OBJECTIVES: Disparities in treatment outcomes for traumatic injury are an important concern for care providers and policy makers. Factors that may influence these disparities include differences in risk exposure based on neighborhood of residence, and differences in quality of care between hospitals in different areas. This study examines geographic disparities within a single region: the Detroit metropolitan area.

DESIGN: Data on all trauma admissions between 2006 and 2014 were obtained from the Michigan State Inpatient Database. Admissions were grouped by patient neighborhood of residence and admitting hospital. Generalized Linear Mixed Modeling procedures were used to determine the extent of shared variance based on these two levels of categorization on three outcomes. Patients with trauma due to common mechanisms (falls, firearms, and motor vehicle traffic) were examined as additional subgroups.

SETTING: 66 hospitals admitting patients for traumatic injury in the Detroit metropolitan area during the period from 2006 – 2014.

PARTICIPANTS: 404,675 adult patients admitted for treatment of traumatic injury.

OUTCOME MEASURES: In-hospital mortality, length of stay, and hospital charges.

RESULTS: Intraclass correlation coefficients indicated that there was substantial shared variance in outcomes based on hospital, but not based on neighborhood of residence. Among all injury types, hospital-level differences accounted for 12.5% of variance in mortality risk, 28.5% of variance in length of stay, and 32.2% of variance in hospital charges. Adjusting results for patient age, injury severity, mechanism, and comorbidities did not result in significant reduction in the estimated variance at the hospital level.

1
2
3 CONCLUSIONS: Based on these data, geographic disparities in trauma treatment outcomes
4
5 were more strongly attributable to differences in access to quality hospital care than to risk
6
7 factors in the neighborhood environment. Transfer of high-risk cases to hospitals with greater
8
9 institutional experience in the relevant area may help address mortality disparities in particular.
10
11
12
13

14 STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- 16 • Data covers all hospital admissions in a major metropolitan area over a 9-year period
- 17
- 18 • Multi-level analysis allows decomposition of differences in patient outcomes shared
- 19
- 20 within neighborhood of residence and hospital of treatment
- 21
- 22
- 23 • Range of outcomes including mortality, length of stay, and hospital charges
- 24
- 25
- 26 • Cannot assess mortality occurring before hospital admission
- 27
- 28
- 29 • Differences in intake patterns may increase between-hospital variance
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

INTRODUCTION

The persistence of disparities in patient outcomes is a serious challenge for the US health care system¹. People with low incomes and members of racial and ethnic minority groups experience worse health outcomes across a broad spectrum, from lower birth weight² to greater risk of functional disability in older adulthood³. The causes of these disparities are complex and multifaceted, including differing levels of environmental exposure to health hazards⁴, cultural differences in health behaviors⁵, and unequal access to quality care⁶. Within the field of health disparities research, traumatic injury has received relatively little attention in comparison to areas such as chronic disease and infection⁷. Nevertheless, there is a significant body of evidence finding that factors including race^{7,8} and socioeconomic status^{9,10} may affect patients' risk of negative outcomes following trauma treatment.

The local geography of cities may play an important role in forming these disparities. Cities in the US remain heavily segregated by both race and socioeconomic status, with sharp differences in the demographic makeup of neighborhoods that may be in close proximity to one another¹¹. These neighborhoods may differ in terms of the risks they pose for traumatic injury. For example, socioeconomically-disadvantaged neighborhoods may have higher rates of trauma from causes like assault, which may entail greater risks of poorer outcomes. More broadly, residents of marginalized neighborhoods may face greater background health challenges, leaving them more likely to suffer from multiple comorbidities that are likely to complicate recovery from traumatic injury^{12,13}.

A related facet of metropolitan geography potentially impacting trauma outcomes relates to hospital quality and access. Quality of care issues are an increasing concern in the realm of public policy¹⁴. Large cities contain numerous hospitals providing emergency trauma care, and

1
2
3 most trauma patients are likely to be receive treatment at facilities in close proximity to the
4 places in which they live. Hospitals and other health care facilities serving primarily poor and
5 marginalized local populations may face challenges with funding levels and patient demands that
6 inhibit care quality^{6,15}. Insurance issues and patient familiarity may also serve to funnel high-risk
7 patients towards under-resourced hospitals, as patients may be more likely to opt to seek care at
8 institutions with which they are more familiar, and which they may perceive as less costly¹⁶.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 The extent to which these two aspects of local geography within metropolitan areas—
18 residential neighborhood and care facility – may be related to trauma outcomes has not been
19 thoroughly assessed. In this study, we use data from all trauma patients admitted for traumatic
20 injury to hospitals in the Detroit metropolitan area between 2006 and 2014 and apply statistical
21 techniques to determine the extent to which three outcomes (mortality, length of hospital stay,
22 and hospital charges) differ as a function of (a) the neighborhoods in which patients reside, and
23 (b) the hospital providing care. The Detroit metropolitan area has some of the highest levels of
24 residential racial and ethnic segregation in the US, as well as some of the most extreme
25 economic inequalities¹⁷. As a region that has experienced a historical pattern of economic decline
26 and rejuvenation, as well as successive waves of movement between urban and suburban
27 neighborhoods, it serves to exemplify a number of the socioeconomic challenges facing policy
28 makers and health care providers in numerous US cities. It has a well-developed emergency and
29 trauma infrastructure, including three hospitals with ACS Level I trauma designation and 13 with
30 Level II designation during the period covered by this study.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 METHOD

50
51 Individual-level admissions data for this project were obtained from the Healthcare Cost
52 and Utilization Project (HCUP), sponsored by the Agency for Health Research and Quality
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (AHRQ). One element of the HCUP is the compilation of an annual database including medical
4 details of all hospital discharges in each state, known as the State Inpatient Database (SID).

5
6
7 Ethical approval for use of the data was granted by the Institutional Review Board of St. John
8 Hospital and Medical Center. Because the data were derived from clinical patient records and
9
10 were fully anonymous and de-identified, participant consent was not required.
11
12
13

14
15 Data for the present analyses come from the Michigan SID for the period of years from
16 2006 to 2014¹⁸. Patients residing in the Detroit Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) were
17 identified using the US Census Bureau definition as consisting of Wayne, Lapeer, Livingston,
18 Macomb, Oakland, and St. Clair counties. Trauma cases were identified using ICD-9 diagnostic
19 codes present at admission (ICD-9 codes 800 – 959 were included; no exclusions were made for
20 codes indicating late effects of trauma or superficial injuries).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 Hospitals. Each record in the SID includes a unique, anonymized, identification code
30 corresponding to the hospital to which the patient was admitted. This allows patients to be
31 clustered according to hospital. After excluding institutions with fewer than 100 trauma
32 admissions during the 9-year study period, there were a total of 66 hospitals represented in the
33 data, with a median of 2,845 observations in each cluster.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 Neighborhoods. Patient residence was identified by ZIP code in the SID, and in this study
42 each ZIP code is treated as a separate neighborhood. There were a total of 214 neighborhoods
43 represented in the data, with a median of 1,633 observations in each.
44
45
46

47
48 Patient outcomes. Patient outcomes include in-hospital mortality, length of stay, and total
49 hospital charges. Mortality was derived from the case disposition code (0 = did not die, 1 =
50 died). Length of stay is given by the number of days between admission and discharge. Total
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 hospital charges is a dollar amount corresponding to the total amount billed to any payer for each
4 admission.
5

6
7 Patient comorbidities. The SID database includes data on a range of comorbid conditions
8 (i.e., medical conditions existing prior to the present hospitalization episode). Examples include
9 asthma, substance abuse, and obesity. The total number of comorbidities noted in each patient's
10 record was computed to serve as an index of underlying patient health for the purposes of these
11 analyses.
12
13
14
15
16
17

18
19 Trauma mechanism. Trauma mechanisms are derived from ICD-9 diagnosis codes
20 included for each admission case in the SID. The three most common specific mechanisms in
21 this sample were examined in these analyses: falls, firearms, and motor vehicle traffic.
22
23
24
25

26 Injury severity. ICD-9 diagnosis codes included in the SID were used to calculate
27 estimated injury severity scores (ISS) for all patients. This procedure was carried out using
28 ICDPIC-R¹⁹, an open-source program executed in the R statistical environment which computes
29 abbreviated injury score (AIS) by body region based on ICD-9 codes, and then calculates an
30 estimated ISS based on regional AIS, and is based on a set of procedures that have been
31 extensively validated for this purpose^{20,21}.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Patient and neighborhood demographics. Individual demographics included age (in
41 years), gender, and race (white, black, or other). Neighborhood socioeconomic status (SES) was
42 measured using ZIP code-level poverty rate estimates published by the US Census Bureau²².
43 These estimates represent a three-year rolling average (e.g., the estimates for 2014 represent data
44 from 2012 – 2014). Because poverty rate data were not made available until 2012, whereas this
45 study covers the period from 2006 – 2014, neighborhood SES is represented in this study as a
46 single rate regardless of year (rather than varying across time), using data from 2014. It was not
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

possible to include information about hospital characteristics (e.g., trauma level designation) because the Michigan SID excludes identifiers that would enable cross-referencing hospital IDs with American Hospital Association data.

Analytical approach

In this study, we use a generalized linear mixed modeling (GLMM) framework to estimate the proportion of variance in individual outcomes that is attributable to each of three levels: hospitals, neighborhoods, and individuals (i.e., residual variance after hospital and neighborhood variance has been accounted for). The GLMM method²³ is a statistical modeling technique which includes a mixture of fixed and random effects. Random effects represent shared group-level linear relationships. Individual outcome values are allowed to vary at random around a group mean, allowing for an estimate of the part of the outcome that varies between groups and that varying between individuals. In these analyses, random intercept effects are specified for both hospital and neighborhood, meaning that individual outcomes are allowed to vary at random around both a hospital mean and a neighborhood mean. The group-level design matrix is specified as cross-classified, meaning that both sets of higher-level clusters are included in the same model, with each individual belonging to both a hospital and neighborhood cluster. Because the distributions of the outcome variables are not the same, different linking functions are used in GLMM models with different outcomes. Mortality is a binary variable, and uses a binary linking function. Length of stay and total charges both have highly skewed continuous distributions, making the use of a longnormal linking function appropriate.

The proportion of variance at the group level is given by the intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) corresponding to the level of clustering (in this case, hospital and neighborhood). For outcomes with a non-binary function (i.e., length of stay and charges), the

1
2
3 ICC is computed by dividing the group-level variance parameter by the sum of the group and
4 residual variance parameters. For binary GLMM (i.e., mortality), the ICC is given by dividing
5 the group-level variance parameter by the sum of the group-level parameter and 3.29, an estimate
6 of the theoretical variance in the binomial distribution²⁴. In the results, these figures are
7 expressed as a percentage of the total variance at each level. Cases with missing outcome data
8 were excluded on a pairwise basis. LOS and charge analyses exclude cases with in-hospital
9 mortality.

10
11 For each analysis, two GLMM models are computed. The first model includes random
12 effects only, and provides an estimate of the total variance at each level, ignoring differences in
13 outcomes arising due to systematic between-group differences in patient demographics and
14 injury characteristics. The second model includes add fixed effects to control for some of these
15 differences in casemix, including patient age, number of comorbidities, ISS, and mechanism of
16 injury. By comparing the confidence intervals of the ICC estimates, it is possible to evaluate
17 whether or not a significant proportion of the shared variance at each random effects level can be
18 attributed to the factors controlled for as fixed effects. Analyses were conducted using SAS 9.4,
19 except for the estimation of ISS, which was carried out using ICDPIC-R in R 3.5.

20 Patient and Public Involvement

21
22 This study addresses patient priorities by seeking to better understand how trauma care
23 systems may be able to reduce patient mortality rates, the length of hospitalization, and charges
24 incurred. Data are derived from administrative records, so patients were not directly involved in
25 the design, recruitment, or conduct of the study. Results will be accessible to the public,
26 including to individuals who may have patients during the study period.

27 RESULTS

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for the full patient sample at the individual, hospital, and neighborhood levels. There were a total of 404,675 admissions for traumatic injury during the time period included in this study, representing a total of 66 hospitals and 214 ZIP codes. The mean number of patients per hospital was 2,845 (IQR: 349 – 9,683), and the mean number per neighborhood was 1,630 (IQR: 765 – 2,879). The three largest subgroups based on mechanism were falls (N = 117,931), motor vehicle traffic (N = 22,755), and firearms (N = 6,512).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics at the individual, hospital, and neighborhood levels

	Individual (N = 404,675) Mean (SD) or %	Hospital (N = 66) Median [IQR]	Neighborhood (N = 214) Median [IQR]
N individuals		2,845 [349; 9,683]	1,630 [765; 2,879]
Age	60.4 (23.7)	62.0 [53.2, 66.6]	60.8 [57.3, 65.2]
Female	49.8%	50.6% [40.1%, 56.7%]	50.5% [46.3%, 54.2%]
Race			
White	70.0%	74.6% [40.6%, 91.0%]	70.8% [45.5%, 82.4%]
Black	26.0%	7.6% [2.2%, 19.3%]	2.3% [0.9%, 10.0%]
Other	4.0%	8.2% [3.6%, 23.2%]	17.2% [12.0%, 30.7%]
Mechanism			
Falls	44.3%	43.7% [26.9%, 54.1%]	46.7% [40.4%, 52.2%]
Firearms	2.4%	0.4% [0.04%, 1.1%]	0.6% [0.2%, 1.4%]
Motor Vehicle	8.6%	5.4% [2.8%, 12.1%]	8.4% [7.0%, 10.4%]
Severity	4.9 (5.4)	4.5 [3.5, 5.5]	5.0 [4.7, 5.2]
Comorbidities	2.7 (2.0)	2.8 [2.0, 3.1]	2.7 [2.5, 2.8]
Mortality	2.5%	2.2% [1.6%, 3.0%]	2.4% [2.0, 2.7%]
LOS	6.4 (8.3)	5.9	6.3

		[5.2, 6.7]	[5.9, 6.7]
Charges	36.3 (55.2)	32.5	36.9
(thousands of dollars)		[25.5, 41.2]	[33.7, 39.5]
Poverty Rate	17.4 (14.4)	14.5	10.7
		[11.8, 19.9]	[6.5, 18.7]

Tables 2 and 3 allow for comparisons of case characteristics by neighborhood SES (defined by poverty rate quartiles) and injury severity (defined by cases with ISS up to 15 and those with ISS greater than 15). Patients from the poorest neighborhoods were substantially younger than the patient population as a whole, and were more likely to be male and black. Mortality rates, LOS, and charges were all significantly higher in poorer neighborhoods, but the magnitude of these differences in outcomes was small (e.g., 2.4% mortality in the lowest-quartile poverty neighborhoods, compared with 2.6% in the highest-poverty quartile). Both outcomes and demographics differed substantially by injury severity. Severely injured patients were much more likely to be male, and were somewhat younger and somewhat more likely to be Black. Firearm and MVT mechanisms were also much more common among the more severe injuries. As would be expected, mortality was substantially higher among those with more severe injuries, as were median LOS and charges.

Table 2. Individual descriptive statistics by poverty quartile

	1 st Quartile ($< 6.5\%$) N = 103,004	2 nd Quartile ($6.5\% - 10.8\%$) N = 79,738	3 rd Quartile ($10.8\% - 18.7\%$) N = 90,554	4 th Quartile ($> 18.7\%$) N = 134,257	<i>p</i> -value ^a
Age, mean [95% CI]	63.9 [63.7, 64.0]	65.1 [64.9, 65.2]	62.3 [62.1, 62.4]	53.8 [53.6, 53.9]	$< .001$
Female	53.0%	54.0%	52.0%	43.4%	$< .001$
Race					$< .001$
White	86.9%	93.5%	83.1%	38.5%	
Black	9.5%	3.3%	13.7%	56.3%	
Other	3.6%	3.2%	3.2%	5.2%	
Mechanism					$< .001$
Falls	49.8%	51.7%	47.3%	35.4%	

Firearms	1.0%	0.4%	1.0%	5.1%	
Motor Vehicle	8.0%	7.6%	8.1%	9.6%	
Severity (ISS), mean [95% CI]	5.0 [4.9, 5.0]	4.9 [4.9, 4.9]	4.7 [4.7, 4.7]	4.9 [4.9, 5.0]	< .001
Comorbidities, mean [95% CI]	2.7 [2.7, 2.7]	2.8 [2.8, 2.8]	2.9 [2.8, 2.9]	2.7 [2.7, 2.7]	< .001
Mortality	2.4%	2.5%	2.4%	2.6%	.002
LOS, median [IQR]	4.0 [2.0, 7.0]	4.0 [2.0, 7.0]	4.0 [2.0, 7.0]	4.0 [2.0, 8.0]	< .001
Charges (thousands of dollars), median [IQR]	22.2 [13.0, 37.8]	22.7 [13.2, 38.9]	22.3 [13.0, 38.0]	23.3 [13.3, 41.7]	< .001

NOTES: ISS Injury Severity Score, LOS Length of Stay

^a *p*-values for 1-way ANOVA (age, ISS), Kruskal-Wallis (LOS, cost), or chi-square (female, race, mechanism, mortality)

Table 3. Individual descriptive statistics by injury severity group

	Less Severe Injuries ISS ≤ 15 (N = 380,218)	More Severe Injuries ISS > 15 (N = 25,997)	<i>p</i> -value ^a
Age, mean [95% CI]	60.6 [60.6, 60.7]	57.0 [56.7, 57.3]	< .001
Female	50.8%	35.8%	
Race			< .001
White	70.4%	64.0%	
Black	25.7%	31.1%	
Other	3.9%	4.9%	
Mechanism			< .001
Falls	44.4%	41.7%	
Firearms	2.0%	8.1%	
Motor Vehicle	7.4%	24.2%	
Comorbidities, mean [95% CI]	2.8 [2.7, 2.8]	2.5 [2.5, 2.5]	< .001
Mortality	2.1%	8.2%	< .001
LOS	4.0 [2.0, 7.0]	6.0 [3.0, 11.0]	< .001
Charges (thousands of dollars), median [IQR]	22.0 [12.8, 37.5]	37.2 [19.6, 80.2]	< .001
Neighborhood poverty rate, median [IQR]	12.4 [6.5, 26.5]	13.2 [6.5, 32.3]	< .001

NOTES: ISS Injury Severity Score, LOS Length of Stay

^a *p*-values for 1-way ANOVA (age), Kruskal-Wallis (LOS, cost), or chi-square (female, race, mechanism, mortality)

Table 4 presents the ICC results for the full and stratified samples, along with the number of patients included in each model. All patients were included in analyses of mortality. Sample sizes for analyses of length of stay were somewhat smaller, likely reflecting patients who were transported to a hospital but died before admission (1.8% of the full sample was lost at this stage). Total charge data were available for only a subset of patients, due to under-reporting of this variable by hospitals (31.4% of the total sample was lost at this stage). Supplemental analyses (not shown) indicated that patients with missing charge data were substantially more likely to be black, male, and live in high-poverty neighborhoods. A substantial proportion of this missing data may be due to hospitals waiving or not reporting charges for uninsured patients with means to pay, and thus directly confounded with the aims of the study. Charge results should therefore be interpreted with some caution.

Table 4. Variance decomposition statistics, all cases

	Hospital ICC [95% CI]	Neighborhood ICC [95% CI]	Residual ICC [95% CI]	Patient N
Mortality, unadjusted	12.5% [7.4, 17.0]	0.4% [0.2, 0.6]	87.1% [82.4, 92.3]	404,675
Mortality, adjusted for case mix	9.3% [5.5, 12.8]	0.2% [0.05, 0.4]	90.5% [86.9, 94.4]	397,170
Length of Stay, unadjusted	28.5% [20.6, 35.0]	0.3% [0.2, 0.4]	71.2% [64.7, 79.1]	386,886
Length of Stay, adjusted for case mix	23.9% [16.9, 29.8]	0.2% [0.1, 0.2]	76.0% [70.0, 82.9]	379,881
Total Charges, unadjusted	32.2% [21.7, 40.5]	0.2% [0.1, 0.3]	67.5% [59.3, 78.1]	269,816
Total Charges, adjusted for case mix	22.7% [16.5, 28.2]	0.3% [0.2, 0.4]	77.0% [71.5, 83.3]	266,861

NOTES: ICC Intraclass Correlation Coefficient; unadjusted models include random effects only, adjusted models include fixed effects for patient age, Injury Severity Scale (ISS), mechanism of injury, and number of patient comorbidities; Hospital N = 66; ZIP code N =

There was significant variance at the hospital level for all outcomes. The extent of the hospital-level variance was significantly higher for LOS and total charges than for mortality. In each case, the magnitude of the ICC estimate was lower in the case mix adjusted model than in the unadjusted model, but none of these differences were statistically significant (i.e., between-hospital differences in the factors controlled in the adjusted model did not account for a significant proportion of the between-hospital disparities in outcomes). Although neighborhood ICC was statistically significant in all of the models presented in Table 4, the magnitude of the variance explained at this level was not clinically meaningful (less than 0.5% in all models).

Table 5. Variance decomposition statistics by injury severity

	Hospital ICC [95% CI]	Neighborhood ICC [95% CI]	Residual ICC [95% CI]	Patient N
Less Severe Injuries (ISS ≤ 15)^a				
Mortality, unadjusted	12.3% [7.2, 16.8]	0.4% [0.1, 0.6]	87.3% [82.7, 92.6]	378,788
Mortality, adjusted for casemix	9.5% [5.6, 13.1]	0.1% [-0.1, 0.3]	90.4% [86.7, 94.4]	371,287
Length of Stay, unadjusted	16.6% [11.3, 21.3]	0.2% [0.1, 0.2]	83.2% [78.4, 88.5]	363,469
Length of Stay, adjusted for casemix	13.4% [9.0, 17.4]	0.1% [0.06, 0.1]	86.5% [82.5, 90.9]	356,467
Total Charges, unadjusted	33.4% [22.6, 41.6]	0.1% [0.08, 0.2]	66.5% [58.2, 77.3]	253,507
Total Charges, adjusted for casemix	30.3% [20.3, 38.2]	0.3% [0.2, 0.4]	69.4% [61.5, 79.5]	250,555
More Severe Injuries (ISS > 15)^b				
Mortality, unadjusted	4.8% [1.2, 8.0]	0.4% [-0.2, 1.1]	94.8% [90.9, 99.0]	25,887
Mortality, adjusted for casemix	4.3% [0.9, 7.4]	0.6% [-0.1, 1.3]	95.1% [91.3, 99.3]	25,883
Length of Stay, unadjusted	19.7% [12.0, 26.4]	1.5% [0.9, 2.2]	78.9% [72.0, 86.8]	23,417
Length of Stay, adjusted for casemix	17.0% [9.9, 23.3]	0.1% [0.06, 1.6]	81.9% [75.5, 89.3]	23,414

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Total Charges, unadjusted	17.2%	0.1%	81.8%	16,309
	[9.5, 24.1]	[0.04, 1.6]	[74.8, 89.8]	
Total Charges, adjusted for casemix	13.5%	0.5%	86.0%	16,306
	[7.2, 19.2]	[0.1, 0.8]	[80.2, 92.5]	

NOTES: ICC Intraclass Correlation Coefficient; unadjusted models include random effects only, adjusted models include fixed effects for patient age, Injury Severity Scale (ISS), mechanism of injury, and number of patient comorbidities

^a Hospital N = 66; ZIP Code N = 214

^b Hospital N = 64; ZIP Code N = 212

Tables 5 and 6 present the stratified analyses by injury severity (Table 5) and mechanism of trauma (Table 6). There was significant variance at the hospital level across outcomes and trauma mechanism, although the extent of this variance ranged from 2.9% for mortality due to falls to 33.4% for total charges among less severe injuries. Again, there were no cases in which the unadjusted and case mix adjusted models differed significantly in the estimation of hospital ICC. Neighborhood variance was minimal across outcomes and mechanism as well, with the highest estimate being 1.6% for motor vehicle traffic mortality (after case mix adjustment).

Table 6. Variance decomposition statistics by selected injury mechanisms

	Hospital ICC [95% CI]	Neighborhood ICC [95% CI]	Residual ICC [95% CI]	Patient N
Falls^a				
Mortality, unadjusted	2.9%	0.2%	96.9%	117,454
	[1.0, 4.7]	[-0.2, 0.7]	[94.6, 99.3]	
Mortality, adjusted for casemix	2.4%	0.0%	97.6%	117,454
	[2.4, 2.4]	[0.0, 0.0]	[97.6, 97.6]	
Length of Stay, unadjusted	19.3%	0.2%	80.5%	112,954
	[11.2, 26.2]	[0.1, 0.3]	[73.6, 88.7]	
Length of Stay, adjusted for casemix	13.5%	0.1%	86.4%	112,915
	[7.3, 18.9]	[0.06, 0.2]	[80.9, 92.6]	
Total Charges, unadjusted	22.5%	0.09%	77.4	76,409
	[10.9, 31.7]	[0.02, 0.2]	[67.2, 89.1]	
Total Charges, adjusted for casemix	24.0%	0.04%	75.9	76,385
	[11.1, 33.8]	[-0.006, 0.1]	[66.1, 88.8]	
Firearms^b				
Mortality, unadjusted	20.2%	0.8%	79.1%	6,498
	[15.9, 32.9]	[-2.9, 4.2]	[64.5, 101.9]	
Mortality, adjusted for casemix	16.4%	1.5 %	82.1%	6,498
	[-0.6, 28.5]	[-2.2, 4.9]	[68.1, 103.3]	

Length of Stay, unadjusted	20.3%	0.0%	79.7%	2,970
	[6.7, 30.4]	[0.0, 0.0]	[69.6, 93.3]	
Length of Stay, adjusted for casemix	12.6%	0.2%	87.1%	5,857
	[4.9, 19.7]	[-0.2, 0.8]	[79.8, 95.2]	
Total Charges, unadjusted	12.2%	0.2%	87.6%	5,858
	[5.0, 18.8]	[-0.2, 0.6]	[80.8, 95.1]	
Total Charges, adjusted for casemix	21.3%	0.07%	78.6%	2,970
	[5.8, 33.6]	[-0.4, 0.8]	[66.2, 94.7]	
Motor Vehicle ^c				
Mortality, unadjusted	4.7%	1.1%	94.2%	22,604
	[-0.8, 9.7]	[-1.1, 3.4]	[87.3, 101.9]	
Mortality, adjusted for casemix	2.7%	1.6%	95.6%	22,604
	[-0.4, 5.7]	[-1.0, 4.2]	[90.4, 101.5]	
Length of Stay, unadjusted	13.0%	0.3%	86.7%	21,082
	[6.0, 19.2]	[0.1, 0.6]	[80.3, 93.8]	
Length of Stay, adjusted for casemix	14.5%	0.2%	85.3%	21,057
	[7.0, 21.2]	[-0.002, 0.4]	[78.6, 93.0]	
Total Charges, unadjusted	19.6%	0.6%	79.8%	12,430
	[10.0, 27.7]	[0.2, 1.2]	[71.5, 89.7]	
Total Charges, adjusted for casemix	18.3%	0.5%	81.1%	12,418
	[8.9, 26.4]	[0.2, 1.0]	[73.0, 90.8]	

NOTES: ICC Intraclass Correlation Coefficient; unadjusted models include random effects only, adjusted models include fixed effects for patient age, Injury Severity Scale (ISS), mechanism of injury, and number of patient comorbidities

^a Hospital N = 65; ZIP Code N = 213

^b Hospital N = 52; ZIP Code N = 178

^c Hospital N = 65; ZIP Code N = 211

Sensitivity analyses were conducted to evaluate whether the decision to exclude cases with in-hospital mortality from the LOS and total charges. No significant differences were detected in any ICC statistics between analyses conducted with and without these cases.

DISCUSSION

The persistence of disparities in health outcomes is an important concern for public policy makers and for hospital administrators. These results reflect a growing literature finding substantial between-hospital differences in outcomes for injured patients, related to hospital factors including patient volume²⁵, trauma level designation²⁶, and treatment efficiency²⁷. This analysis addresses two important issues. First, the extent of disparity in outcomes from trauma

1
2
3 treatment has received relatively little attention, with most research focusing primarily on
4
5 treatment of acute and chronic disease. Second, a longstanding question has been the relative
6
7 importance of placement of care facilities versus neighborhood risk factors and individual
8
9 differences in creating patterns of geographic health inequality – i.e., do marginalized
10
11 neighborhoods suffer because they have access to hospitals that have worse outcomes; because
12
13 they exhibit environmental risk factors like exposure to greater violence, more toxic substances,
14
15 and generally unsanitary and stressful conditions; or because their populations have other
16
17 underlying risk factors, like higher rates of chronic disease and lower levels of insurance
18
19 coverage, unrelated to specific neighborhood conditions.
20
21
22

23
24 With respect to the first question, these results suggest that there are substantial
25
26 disparities in trauma outcomes related to factors outside of the facts of the trauma case and
27
28 individual differences in trauma patients. Ideally, these individual factors (represented here as
29
30 part of the residual variance) should account for all of the variance in outcomes – patient
31
32 outcomes should be equal across hospitals and across neighborhoods. Regarding the second
33
34 question, these data indicate that identifiable inequalities account for between 2% and 33% of
35
36 outcomes, depending on the outcome and trauma type examined. They also suggest that most of
37
38 these disparities in trauma outcomes appear to be due to hospital-level disparities, with the
39
40 independent influence of neighborhood being comparatively trivial. This lends support to the
41
42 view that geographic disparities in trauma outcomes (at least within the specific context of the
43
44 Detroit metropolitan area) seem to be mainly due to differences in care provided by facilities
45
46 available in these areas.
47
48
49

50
51 Comparative analyses based on neighborhood poverty levels and injury severity
52
53 illustrates some potentially confounding factors. For example, patients living in high-poverty
54
55
56
57
58
59

1
2
3 neighborhoods are at higher risk for negative outcomes in some regards – particularly in terms of
4 incidence of firearm injuries – but they are also substantially younger on average, and thus may
5 suffer from fewer risks related to comorbid conditions, which tend to increase with age.
6
7

8
9
10 Hospital-level disparities in outcomes remained after stratifying the analyses by injury severity
11 and by mechanism of injury, as well as after controlling for some individual and case-level risk
12 factors (including age, injury severity, and comorbidity). This suggests that the differences
13 between hospitals are not solely based on different background case characteristics. Although
14 there are clearly disparities in terms of risk for different types of injury based on geographic
15 location, these differences in case mix do not appear to fully explain differences in hospital
16 outcomes. Nevertheless, it remains likely that different patient populations with different risk
17 profiles play an important role in some fraction of the inter-hospital variability seen here.
18
19

20
21 Although it is beyond the scope of a single study to identify all of these factors, it remains an
22 important area for focus in future research.
23
24

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

These findings suggest that, at least in the case of trauma outcomes, policy should focus on reducing disparities in treatment quality between hospitals in order to reduce community-level disparities in outcomes. More broadly, it suggests that factors influencing geographic disparities in trauma outcomes may arise at the point of treatment, rather than being the result of different levels of risk derived from the neighborhood environment, at least when considered within a single metropolitan area. Disparities in treatment quality may have a number of causes, including differences in investment, differences in resource allocation, and differences in institutional experience with treating trauma. In addition to addressing funding and investment disparities, ways of addressing these differences might include transferring high risk cases to hospitals with more extensive institutional experience in the relevant field.

1
2
3 Limitations of this study include the inherent inability to fully differentiate hospital-level
4 variance that may be caused by differences in the patient population served at different
5 institutions. Although the adjusted models partially account for some the most plausible of these
6 factors, including injury severity and mechanism, as well as patient age and comorbidities, it is
7 not possible to control for all factors that may contribute to disparities in case mix between
8 hospitals. Additionally, our data did not include information on pre-hospital mortality, which has
9 been identified in previous research as a critical phase for trauma management²⁸. Since there is
10 the potential for significant inequalities in pre-hospital care, for example due to geographical
11 differences in response times, this is an important element of the trauma care system to address
12 in future research on disparities. Although sensitivity analyses indicated that loss of cases with
13 mortality did not significantly affect the results of the LOS and charge analyses, the problem of
14 dealing with right-censored data remains a limitation. Other shortcomings include a lack of
15 hospital-level data, including trauma level designation, due to limitations on the Michigan SID
16 data aimed at preserving institutional anonymity. Charge data must be interpreted with some
17 caution, because charges billed do not necessarily reflect hospital costs, and can vary between
18 regions based on a variety of factors unrelated to care²⁹. Finally, the use of ZIP code as a proxy
19 for neighborhood (although necessary in this case because of a lack of alternate geographic
20 identifiers in the data) presents limitations, because ZIP codes reflect administrative divisions
21 that do not necessarily reflect the realities of the social geography in which they are situated;
22 they may divide or combine genuine neighborhoods, limiting their usefulness as indicators of
23 residential conditions. Alternative ways of identifying neighborhood clusters other than ZIP code
24 (e.g., census tracts, or homogeneous ZIP code groups) might yield more accurate information
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 regarding neighborhood variation. Future research should seek to create and validate better
4
5 methods of defining neighborhoods.
6

7
8 As policy-makers look for ways to reduce both disparities in trauma outcomes and the
9
10 cost of providing care for traumatic injury, it is important to have a clear picture of the extent to
11
12 which they differ as a function of local geography. This study represents a step towards
13
14 addressing that question, indicating that differences between hospitals may play an important
15
16 role in determining the extent of these differences.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT:
4

5 The authors have no conflicting interests to declare.
6

7
8 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS
9

10 LS, RH, and MF drafted the manuscript. RH conducted the statistical analyses. LS and EE
11 developed the research questions. All authors reviewed and revised the manuscript.
12
13

14
15 DATA STATEMENT
16

17 Data from the State Inpatient Database (SID for the state of Michigan for the years 2006 – 2014
18 were obtained from the Agency for Health Research and Quality's (AHRQ) Healthcare Cost and
19 Utilization Project (HCUP). These data are available for purchase from AHRQ at
20
21
22
23
24 <http://www.hcup-us.ahrq.gov/>
25

26
27 FUNDING
28

29 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or
30 not-for-profit sectors.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. Adler, N. E. & Rehkopf, D. H. U.S. Disparities in Health: Descriptions, Causes, and Mechanisms. *Annu. Rev. Public Health* **29**, 235–252 (2008).
2. Howell, E. A., Hebert, P., Chatterjee, S., Kleinman, L. C. & Chassin, M. R. Black/white differences in very low birth weight neonatal mortality rates among New York City hospitals. *Pediatrics* **121**, e407–e415 (2008).
3. Freedman, V. A., Martin, L. G. & Schoeni, R. F. Recent trends in disability and functioning among older adults in the united states: A systematic review. *J. Am. Med. Assoc.* **288**, 3137–3146 (2002).
4. Juarez, P. D. *et al.* The public health exposome: a population-based, exposure science approach to health disparities research. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public. Health* **11**, 12866–12895 (2014).
5. Jackson, J. S., Knight, K. M. & Rafferty, J. A. Race and Unhealthy Behaviors: Chronic Stress, the HPA Axis, and Physical and Mental Health Disparities Over the Life Course. *Am. J. Public Health* **100**, 933–939 (2010).
6. Dimick, J., Ruhter, J., Sarrazin, M. V. & Birkmeyer, J. D. Black patients more likely than whites to undergo surgery at low-quality hospitals in segregated regions. *Health Aff. (Millwood)* **32**, 1046–1053 (2013).
7. Haider, A. H. *et al.* Disparities in trauma care and outcomes in the United States: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J. Trauma Acute Care Surg.* **74**, 1195–1205 (2013).
8. Maybury, R. S. *et al.* Pedestrians struck by motor vehicles further worsen race- and insurance-based disparities in trauma outcomes: The case for inner-city pedestrian injury prevention programs. *Surgery* **148**, 202–208 (2010).

- 1
2
3 9. Reimers, A. & Laflamme, L. Hip Fractures Among the Elderly: Personal and Contextual
4
5 Social Factors That Matter. *J. Trauma Acute Care Surg.* **62**, 365–369 (2007).
6
- 7
8 10. Corrigan, J. D. & Bogner, J. A. Neighborhood Characteristics and Outcomes After
9
10 Traumatic Brain Injury. *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil.* **89**, 912–921 (2008).
11
- 12
13 11. Iceland, J. & Sharp, G. White Residential Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas:
14
15 Conceptual Issues, Patterns, and Trends from the U.S. Census, 1980 to 2010. *Popul. Res.*
16
17 *Policy Rev.* **32**, 663–686 (2013).
18
- 19
20 12. Bergeron, E., Lavoie, A., Moore, L., Clas, D. & Rossignol, M. Comorbidity and age are
21
22 both independent predictors of length of hospitalization in trauma patients. *Can. J. Surg.* **48**,
23
24 361 (2005).
25
- 26
27 13. Moore, L. *et al.* Using information on preexisting conditions to predict mortality from
28
29 traumatic injury. *Ann. Emerg. Med.* **52**, 356–364.e2 (2008).
30
- 31
32 14. Tsai, T. C., Orav, E. J. & Jha, A. K. Patient Satisfaction and Quality of Surgical Care in
33
34 US Hospitals. *Ann. Surg.* **261**, 2–8 (2015).
35
- 36
37 15. Hasnain-Wynia, R., Baker, Nerenz, D. & *et al.* Disparities in health care are driven by
38
39 where minority patients seek care: Examination of the hospital quality alliance measures.
40
41 *Arch. Intern. Med.* **167**, 1233–1239 (2007).
42
- 43
44 16. Vettukattil, A. S. *et al.* Do Trauma Safety-Net Hospitals Deliver Truly Safe Trauma
45
46 Care? A Multilevel Analysis of the National Trauma Data Bank. *J. Trauma Acute Care Surg.*
47
48 **70**, 978–984 (2011).
49
- 50
51 17. Darden, J., Rahbar, M., Jezierski, L., Li, M. & Velie, E. The Measurement of
52
53 Neighborhood Socioeconomic Characteristics and Black and White Residential Segregation in
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Metropolitan Detroit: Implications for the Study of Social Disparities in Health. *Ann. Assoc.*
4
5 *Am. Geogr.* **100**, 137–158 (2010).
6
7
- 8 18. Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP). *HCUP State Inpatient Databases (SID)*.
9
10 (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2006).
11
- 12 19. Clark, D. E., Black, A. W., Skavdahl, D. H. & Hallagan, L. D. Open-access programs for
13
14 injury categorization using ICD-9 or ICD-10. *Inj. Epidemiol.* **5**, 11 (2018).
15
- 16 20. Sears, J. M., Blonar, L. & Bowman, S. M. Predicting work-related disability and medical
17
18 cost outcomes: A comparison of injury severity scoring methods. *Injury* **45**, 16–22 (2014).
19
- 20 21. Greene, N. H., Kernic, M. A., Vavilala, M. S. & Rivara, F. P. Validation of ICDPIC
21
22 software injury severity scores using a large regional trauma registry. *Inj. Prev.* **21**, 325
23
24 (2015).
25
- 26 22. U. S. Census Bureau. *American FactFinder*. (2014).
27
- 28 23. Brown, H. & Prescott, R. *Applied mixed models in medicine*. (John Wiley & Sons, 2014).
29
- 30 24. Nakagawa, S., Johnson, P. C. D. & Schielzeth, H. The coefficient of determination R²
31
32 and intra-class correlation coefficient from generalized linear mixed-effects models revisited
33
34 and expanded. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **14**, (2017).
35
- 36 25. Nathens AB, Jurkovich GJ, Maier RV & et al. Relationship between trauma center
37
38 volume and outcomes. *JAMA* **285**, 1164–1171 (2001).
39
- 40 26. Demetriades, D. *et al.* The effect of trauma center designation and trauma volume on
41
42 outcome in specific severe injuries. *Ann. Surg.* **242**, 512–519 (2005).
43
- 44 27. Novack, V., Jotkowitz, A., Etzion, O. & Porath, A. Does delay in surgery after hip
45
46 fracture lead to worse outcomes? A multicenter survey. *Int. J. Qual. Health Care* **19**, 170–176
47
48 (2007).
49
- 50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 28. Kleber, C. *et al.* Overall Distribution of Trauma-related Deaths in Berlin 2010:
4
5 Advancement or Stagnation of German Trauma Management? *World J. Surg.* **36**, 2125–2130
6
7 (2012).
8
9
10 29. Wakeam, E. *et al.* Variation in the cost of 5 common operations in the United States.
11
12 *Surgery* **162**, 592–604 (2017).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract Page 1 (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found Page 2
Introduction		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported Pages 1 – 5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses Page 5
Methods		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper Pages 5 – 7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection Pages 5 – 6
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants Pages 5 – 6
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable Page 6
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Pages 5 – 6
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias Page 7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at Page 8
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why Pages 6 – 7
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding Page 7 (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions Page 7 (c) Explain how missing data were addressed Page 7 (d) <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy N/A

(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses

N/A

Continued on next page

Results

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed Page 8
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage N/A
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram N/A
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders Page 8
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest Table 1
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures Table 1
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included N/A
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized N/A
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period N/A
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses Page 8 & Table 1

Discussion

Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives Page 9
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias Page 10
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence Pages 9 – 10
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results Page 9

Other information

Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable,
---------	----	--

1
2 for the original study on which the present article is based

3 N/A

4
5 *Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and
6 unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.
7

8
9 **Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and
10 published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely
11 available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at
12 <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is
13 available at www.strobe-statement.org.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60