

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

How Universal are Universal Pre-School Health Checks? Evidence from New Zealand's B4 School Check

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-025535
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	22-Jul-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Gibb, Sheree; University of Otago Wellington, Public Health; A Better Start National Science Challenge Milne, Barry; University of Auckland, Centre of Methods and Policy Application in the Social Sciences; University of Auckland Shackleton, Nichola; University of Auckland, Centre of Methods and Policy Application in the Social Sciences; A Better Start National Science Challenge Taylor, Barry; University of Otago, Department of the Dean; A Better Start National Science Challenge Audas, Richard; University of Otago Department of Women's and Children's Health; A Better Start National Science Challenge
Keywords:	healthcare disparities, data linkage, childhood intervention

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

How Universal are Universal Pre-School Health Checks? Evidence from New Zealand's B4 School Check

Sheree Gibb 1 2 4, Barry Milne^{1 2}, Nichola Shackleton^{1 2}, Barry Taylor 1 5, Richard Audas 1 3

Author affiliations

1 A Better Start, National Science Challenge

2 Centre of Methods and Policy Application in the Social Sciences, University of Auckland,
Auckland, New Zealand.

3 Women's and Children's Health, Dunedin School of Medicine, University of Otago, Dunedin, New
Zealand

4 Department of Public Health, University of Otago Wellington, New Zealand

5 Dean's Department, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

Corresponding author:

Sheree Gibb, Department of Public Health, University of Otago Wellington, 23 Mein Street,
Wellington, New Zealand

Sheree.gibb@otago.ac.nz

+64 4 918 5086

Key words: healthcare disparities; data linkage; childhood intervention

Word count: 3435

1
2
3
4
5 **Funding:** This study was funded by A Better Start – National Science Challenge, New Zealand
6
7 Ministry for Business, Innovation and Employment.
8

9 **Ethical approval:** This study was approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee
10
11 (ref D16/088.)
12
13

14 **Disclaimer:** Access to the data used in this study was provided by Statistics New Zealand under
15
16 conditions designed to give effect to the security and confidentiality provisions of the Statistics Act
17
18 1975. The results presented in this study are the work of the authors, not Statistics NZ.
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

Abstract

Objectives: We aimed to estimate how many children were not attending a universal pre-school health screen and to identify characteristics associated with non-participation

Design: Analysis of population level linked administrative data

Participants: Children were counted in the population of resident 4-year-olds for a given year if 1) they were ever resident in New Zealand, and 2) they lived in NZ for at least 6 months during the reference year, and 3) they were alive at the end of the reference year, and either 4) Appeared in any hospital (including emergency) admissions, community pharmaceutical dispensing, or GP enrolment datasets during the reference year, or 5) had a registered birth in New Zealand. We analysed 252,273 records from children over 4 years, from July 1st 2011 to June 30th 2015.

Results: We found that participation rates varied markedly for each component of the B4 School Check (in 2014/15 91.8% for Vision and Hearing tests (VHT), 87.2% for nurse checks (including height, weight, oral health, SDQ, PEDS) and 62.1% for Teacher SDQ (SDQT)), but participation rates for all components increased over time. Māori and Pacific children were more likely to miss out on VHT (Māori OR=1.67(1.63,1.72) Pacific OR=1.73(1.67,1.78)), nurse checks (Māori OR=1.60(1.56,1.63) Pacific OR=1.49(1.45,1.53)) and SDQT (Māori OR=1.32(1.29,1.34) Pacific OR=2.70(2.63,2.76)) than non-Māori and non-pacific children. Children from lower socioeconomic households, born to young mothers, with worse health status, from rented homes, residing in larger households, with higher rates of residential mobility were less likely to participate in the B4 School Check than other children.

Conclusion: The patterns of non-participation suggest a reinforcing of existing disparities, whereby the children most in need are not getting the services they require. There needs to be an increased effort by public health organizations, community and whānau to ensure that all children are tested and screened.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Whole population sample of all children completing B4 School check over 4 years (N=252,273)
- Using linked data from different sectors provided information about a wide range of characteristics
- Only bivariate analyses were possible; sample loss due to missing data meant that multivariate analysis was not feasible

Introduction

Globally, a common practice in childhood development is to screen children to determine if there are any key developmental problems that need to be assessed. These screens typically check for problems relating to general health, including hearing, vision, height, weight and oral health. They also often screen for emotional, behavioural, or intellectual issues that might be evident (1). Hall and Stewart-Brown categorize four types of screening programmes: i) biochemical; ii) screening involving objective measures (such as height and weight, vision and hearing; iii) screening involving physical examination; and iv) screening involving understanding of child development (2). Although there is some disagreement on what children should be screened for, how and when, there is a general consensus that screening in early childhood accompanied with targeted interventions is worthwhile (3).

In New Zealand, the screen is called the Before School Check (B4SC) and it is administered to four year olds. The B4SC was implemented in New Zealand starting in September 2008, although it was not universal until 2010. There are eight key developmental areas that are assessed: vision, hearing, oral health, general health, growth measurement, strengths and difficulties (SDQ) as reported by parents and teachers and a parental evaluation of development status (PEDS). If concerns are identified in any area, children are referred for further testing or intervention. The B4SC is administered by the Ministry of Health, which has set a target 90% participation rate across the country, with parents and guardians being notified of the B4SC via enrolment with a primary health care provider (PHO). The Ministry's data suggests they have been meeting their target since 2013, but compliance falls short of 100% (4). Furthermore, not all four year olds (96%) are registered with a PHO (5), and including these unregistered children in the denominator may further reduce compliance rates.

1 This raises three concerns: First, that a non-trivial number of children are missing their checks.
2
3
4 Second, that some children may not be registered with a PHO and as such, their parents are not
5
6 notified that their child should attend a B4SC. And third, that these children may be more likely to
7
8 be in higher risk categories and could benefit from the referrals to interventions that accompany
9
10 this screen. It is this final concern that is the focus of this study.
11
12
13
14

15 **Evidence Preschool / School Entry Screening Participation**

16
17
18
19

20 Across different universal health checks available to the adult populations of different countries
21
22 certain patterns persist: those in poorer socioeconomic circumstances, with lower qualifications, at
23
24 greater risk of health problems are less likely to attend such checks (6).
25
26
27
28

29 The available evidence for universal health checks in childhood suggests a similar pattern. Wood
30
31 et al considered the coverage of universal child health reviews in Scotland (7). They considered two
32
33 cohorts of children, the first, born in 1998/99 were eligible for 5 health checks (10 days/6-8
34
35 weeks/8-9 months/22-24 months and 39-42 months) and a second cohort, born in 2007/08, were
36
37 only eligible for the first two checks. They found that coverage rates of the 10-day check were very
38
39 high in both cohorts (99%), but this declined as the children aged. For the 6-8 week review,
40
41 coverage was between 94-95%, and for the 39-42 month review the coverage rates fell to 86%.
42
43
44

45 There were clear deprivation gradients, with children living in the least deprived areas much more
46
47 likely to have a health check than those in the most deprived areas, and these gradients increased
48
49 substantially with increasing age and decreasing coverage. They conducted an audit on a subset of
50
51 the areas included in the review (Glasgow and Fife). Consistent with the inverse care law (8) they
52
53 found that children who missed the 6-8 week review were more likely to require additional health
54
55 services and support in the future than those who attended the review.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Similarly, findings from the National Child Measurement Programme (9), a population level screen
5
6 of BMI among children at ages 4-5 and 10-11 in the UK, shows that despite very high coverage
7
8 rates ($\geq 93\%$ from 2009 onwards), children not captured by the screen are more likely to live in
9
10 deprived areas and are more likely to have a higher BMI.
11
12
13
14

15 These universal checks are often the only instrument to identify children in need of additional
16
17 services, who may otherwise be missed by the health system. The early identification of health and
18
19 developmental issues increases the efficacy and cost effectiveness of treatment and lessens the
20
21 risk of any potential comorbidities. Therefore, these systematic differences in attendance highlight
22
23 a crucial issue: Those children most in need are missing out on vital services.
24
25
26
27
28

29 In New Zealand we are in a unique position to examine the characteristics of those not completing
30
31 the B4SC. Many routinely collected government databases (including B4SC) are held in the
32
33 Statistics New Zealand Integrated Data Infrastructure (IDI) and each individual is assigned a unique
34
35 identifier which allows their records to be linked across data files. In this analysis we build a
36
37 population cohort using birth records and immigration/emigration files to determine which four
38
39 year-olds were in the country and eligible for the B4SC between July 1st 2011 to June 30th 2015,
40
41 and then we examine the characteristics of those who do not get the B4SC.
42
43
44
45
46

47 The aim of this paper is to identify characteristics associated with non-participation in the B4SC by
48
49 linking to deprivation, birth, census, health, disability and immunisation records, all of which are
50
51 housed in the IDI and are linkable through a person specific unique identifier created by Statistics
52
53 New Zealand.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Methods

Data

All data were sourced from the Integrated Data Structure (8), a secure database containing anonymised microdata about individuals.

B4 School Check

The B4 School Check (B4SC) is a universal programme offered to all families in New Zealand with four-year-old children (9). The percentage attending the B4SC was estimated as 79% in 2011/2012, 80% in 2012/2013, 91% in 2013/2014, 92% in 2014/15, and 92% in 2015-2016 (4). High coverage of vulnerable groups (Māori children and children from areas of high socioeconomic deprivation) is encouraged by linking a portion of DHB funding for B4SC to coverage targets these groups. In the 2015/16 year the coverage for Māori children was 88% and for Pacific children it was 89% (10). For children from high deprivation areas the coverage was 93% (4). This paper uses data from B4 school checks completed between the fiscal years 2011/12 and 2014/15.

Population

To identify the population of children eligible for a B4SC, annual populations of four-year-old children were constructed using methods developed previously for constructing populations from the Integrated Data Infrastructure (IDI) (10,11). Children were included in the population for a given year if they lived in NZ for at least 6 months during the reference year, were alive at the end of the reference year, were included in the IDI spine (which aims to cover an “ever-resident” population including all those who either were born in New Zealand, migrated to New Zealand, or paid tax in New Zealand (11)), and:

- 1 - Appeared in any hospital (including emergency) admissions, community pharmaceutical
2 dispensing, or GP enrolment datasets during the reference year; OR
3
4
5
6 - Had a NZ birth record.
7

8 The effects of changing the criteria for inclusion in the population are shown in the sensitivity
9 analysis in Appendix 2
10
11
12
13

14 Patient and public involvement

15 Patients and public were not involved in the design or conduct of this study.
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Measures**

23 B4SC completion

24 For the purposes of this study, B4SC components that are usually administered together were
25 grouped together, creating three components: Vision and Hearing Test (VHT) checks (vision and
26 hearing); nurse checks (growth, dental, immunisation, Parents Evaluation of Developmental Status
27 (PEDS), and Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) Parent); and SDQ Teacher. If a child had
28 completed all checks within a component they were considered to have completed that
29 component. B4SC coverage was calculated as the number of children completing a B4SC
30 component divided by the total number of children in the population. Completion rates for the
31 individual component checks can be found in Appendix 1.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Ethnicity

48 Ethnicity measures were taken from the source ranked ethnicity table in IDI. The table collates
49 ethnicities that are reported to different administrative collections in IDI and ranks these sources
50 to provide a single ethnic profile for each individual. Ranking is based on how closely the
51 ethnicities reported for an individual in the administrative source match those reported in the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 census (census records have highest priority and 84.3% of the study population had ethnicity
2 sourced from census, followed by birth records (13.9%), followed by health (1.7%))(12). From this
3 we constructed four dichotomous ethnicity variables representing membership of each of the
4 following major ethnic groups: Māori; Pacific; Asian; European. The MELAA (Middle Eastern, Latin
5 American and African) and Other ethnic groups were not used in this study as the number of
6 children in these groups was too small. Individuals could belong to more than one ethnic group.
7 Identifying as more than one ethnicity is common in New Zealand (13) and 23.9% of the current
8 sample belonged to multiple ethnic groups. Ethnicity information was available for all of children in
9 the sample.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Socioeconomic deprivation

26 NZ Deprivation Score (NZDep) was calculated using the standard 2013 NZDep concordance(14) and
27 the child's meshblock of usual residence at the time of the 4th birthday, or the first meshblock
28 recorded within 12 months after the date of the 4th birthday if no meshblock was recorded prior to
29 that. Each meshblock was assigned a score from 1 (least deprived) to 10 (most deprived).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Deprivation information was available for 99.7% of children in the sample.
38
39
40
41

42 Urbanicity

43 The child's meshblock of usual residence was also used to define urbanicity. The standard
44 classification of urban/rural areas in New Zealand (15) is a five-point scale: 1) Main urban (centred
45 on a city or major urban area, population of at least 30 000), 2) secondary urban (centred on larger
46 regional centres, population 10 000-29 999), 3) minor urban (centred around smaller towns,
47 population 1 000–9 999), 4) rural centre (population 300-999) and 5) other rural. These were
48 collapsed into two groups: urban (main urban, secondary urban, and minor urban area) and rural
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

1 (rural centre and other rural). Urbanicity information was available for 99.7% of children in the
2
3
4 sample.

5 6 7 8 9 Residence changes

10 The total number of different addresses lived at from birth to fourth birthday (minus one to give
11
12 the number of changes) was calculated from the address notification table in IDI which collates
13
14 address updates reported to data providers. Number of residence changes was available for all
15
16 children in the sample.
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Hospitalisations

24 The following variables were obtained from hospital records: total number of hospital admissions
25
26 (excluding the child's birth and any emergency department visits that did not result in hospital
27
28 admission) from birth to fourth birthday; the total number of days spent in hospital for those visits;
29
30 total number of emergency department visits from birth to fourth birthday. Hospitalisation
31
32 information was available for all children in the sample.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 GP enrolment

40 The extent to which a child had continuous enrolment with a general practitioner was estimated
41
42 by counting the number of quarters in which a child was enrolled with a Primary Health
43
44 Organisation (umbrella organisations for general practitioners) from birth to fourth birthday. GP
45
46 enrolment information was available for all children in the sample.
47
48
49
50
51

52 Disability

1 Children who received a referral to Disability Support Services before their fourth birthday were
2 classified as having a disability. This information was available for all children in the sample.
3
4
5
6
7

8 Information from birth record

9
10 Birth records were available for 94.1% of the total sample. The following variables were obtained
11 from the child's birth record: the child's birth weight, in grams; gestational age, categorised into
12 <37 weeks, 37-42 weeks, and >42 weeks; whether or not a father was recorded on the child's birth
13 certificate; age of the child's mother at the time of the child's birth, grouped into under 20; 20-24;
14 25-29; 30-34; 35 and over.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Variables from census records

25
26 Additional variables were obtained by linking to census records. Household variables were
27 obtained by linking to the household form connected to the child's census record, 82.9% of
28 children had census household information available. Mother and father variables were obtained
29 by first linking to the child's birth record to identify mother and father, and then linking to census
30 records for the mother and father. 79.8% of children had mother census information available;
31 68.5% had father census information available. All census variables are recorded as at 5 March
32 2013. The variables from Census were: size of household (including child), grouped into: 2 to 4
33 people; 5 to 7 people; 8 or more people; whether the dwelling was rented or owned (including
34 those held in family trusts); whether or not any member of the child's household received benefit
35 income in the year to 5 March 2013; whether or not the child's mother spoke enough English to
36 have a conversation about everyday things; the highest qualification of the child's mother and
37 father at the time of the 2013 census, classified into: no formal qualifications; high school
38 qualifications; tertiary qualification below Bachelor degree; Bachelor degree or higher; the current
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 smoking status of the child's mother at the time of the census, classified into: current regular
2
3 smoker; ex-smoker; never smoked.
4
5
6
7

8 **Analysis**

9
10 All analyses were conducted using SAS Enterprise Guide version 9 within the secure data lab
11
12 environment. First, we constructed the population, and calculated rates of those who completed
13
14 components (VHT, nurse checks, SDQT) of the B4SC. Second, we compared the characteristics of
15
16 those who did not complete a component compared to those who did, and calculated unadjusted
17
18 odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals.
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

Results

Table 1 shows the percentage of children who completed the VHT, nurse and SDQT components of the B4SC, by year. In all years, completion was highest for the VHT component and lowest for the SDQ Teacher component. Approximately 52% to 62% of children completed the SDQ Teacher component, compared to 78% to 87% for the nurse components and 86% to 91% for the VHT components. Coverage was lowest in 2011/12 and highest in 2014/15.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Table 2 shows the associations between completion of each B4SC component for 2011/12 to 2014/15 (all years combined), and a range of socioeconomic, family, housing, and health status characteristics. The table shows the percentage of children completing each component, the odds ratio and 95% confidence intervals.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

Discussion

Our results demonstrate that Māori and Pacific children, those in poorer socioeconomic circumstances, with poorer health are less likely to complete the B4SC. Children in families with higher levels of deprivation, without a father named on the birth certificate, with mothers and fathers with lower levels of education, living in households with 5 or more people, having multiple changes in residence in the early years of life and living in rental accommodation have a lower likelihood of B4SC completion. Our results paint a consistent pattern, demonstrating that across a wide range of measures of vulnerability, those children who would potentially most benefit from a B4SC screen and the referrals to interventions are less likely to participate.

A strength of this study is the large, linked dataset that was used (the Integrated Data Infrastructure, IDI). The IDI is a whole population data source and therefore it allows us to include children who are often excluded from other analyses, such as those not in regular contact with health services. Furthermore, the large number of data sources included in the IDI allows us to examine a wider range of characteristics than would be available in any single source.

While this study is novel, and provides vital information for service providers, all of the analyses presented in this paper are bivariate. To run adjusted models we would have to restrict our sample to children born in NZ, with a mother and father who completed 2013 census. These restrictions would reduce the sample to less than 70% of the total sample and exclude all migrants, making the results difficult to generalise to the whole population.

Our findings are similar to those of Wood et al (7), and provide further support for the inverse care law – that those with the greatest need are the least likely to seek services (16). There is currently very little research in this area for child health screens, but the application of the inverse care law

1 is a consistent finding among free health checks for the adult population (17-20). However, the
2 reasons why people most in need do not attend are not well understood, and there is a need for
3
4 qualitative research investigating why parents are not taking children to free health checks (7).
5
6
7
8
9

10 Several potential explanations for non-attendance at adult health checks have been put forward
11 that may be applicable to child health checks including; lack of awareness, time constraints and
12
13 access issues (18), and misunderstanding the purpose/scepticism. Lack of awareness may be an
14
15 issue for some parents, as not all eligible children are enrolled on the PHO system (96%), and some
16
17 of those that are enrolled will have incorrect address information. These parents will not receive
18
19 the invitation to the B4SC. Access could also be an issue with many of the B4 School checks being
20
21 carried out by Plunket or other health services which are only open during normal office hours,
22
23 and not at weekends (21). Therefore, households where both parents work, or single-parent
24
25 working households will not easily be able to attend. Furthermore, for less densely populated
26
27 regions in New Zealand there are fewer centres offering B4 School checks, compared to more
28
29 densely populated regions such as Auckland or Wellington (21), meaning it is less convenient to
30
31 attend. Scepticism about the value of attending and the purpose of the screens is likely to differ by
32
33 ethnic group, as research persistently demonstrates that Māori receive a poorer quality and slower
34
35 service, and are less likely to receive appropriate levels of care (22-24). There are similar findings
36
37 for Pacific peoples also (25-27). Therefore these groups may be less trusting of the New Zealand
38
39 health system (28),
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Socioeconomic and ethnic Inequalities in health-seeking and health outcomes within New Zealand
51
52 are well documented for both the adult and child population (29, 30). A long standing objective of
53
54 the New Zealand government is to reduce health and socio-economic disparities, particularly for
55
56 Māori and Pacific families. Patterns of participation at the B4SC could be reinforcing existing ethnic
57
58
59
60

1 and socioeconomic disparities. It is accepted that one of the most effective means of reducing
2 inequities is through early intervention (31, 32). This appears to be the most likely and cost-
3 effective path towards converging outcomes and it appears that many children who would benefit
4 from these early interventions are not getting the opportunity to do so.
5
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 Although 100% attendance in the B4SC is unlikely, we believe that a greater effort is required to
13 reach the most vulnerable families to ensure that more children who would benefit from the B4SC
14 will get access to the interventions that arise from it. This will require greater outreach and public
15 awareness, but also examining ways of providing access to the B4SC. An area where there has
16 been some success in getting increased services to hard-to-reach populations has been through
17 mobile programs and services (33, 34). In addition, direct contact with those not participating
18 should be considered with a greater push to ensure that those with characteristics of vulnerability
19 are encouraged to attend. Further research is necessary on barriers to attendance identified and
20 remedial action taken.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 We have not followed children to determine whether missing a B4SC does in fact have an impact
36 on later life outcomes, and this clearly needs to be assessed. We plan to address this question in
37 future work, although the limited time series for the B4SC means that we will only be able to
38 examine outcomes up to age 15.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Conclusion**

49 Using a rich and diverse range of measures, we find that those children most likely to be
50 disadvantaged, are least likely to participate in the B4SC and as such get referrals for programs and
51 interventions that may increase their readiness to enter school. We believe the patterns we
52 observe in B4SC participation suggest a reinforcing of existing inequalities and require increased
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 effort to ensure that all children are tested and screened, and that those with the greatest need
2
3
4 get access to health services, programmes and interventions.
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

For peer review only

Contributorship statement

RA, BM, BT and SG conceived the study. SG extracted data and did the main data analysis. NS provided statistical advice. All authors wrote and reviewed the manuscript, gave critical feedback and approved the final version for publication

Competing interests

None

Data sharing statement

Due to privacy regulations around the Integrated Data Infrastructure, data from this study are not available for sharing

References

1. Welch NM, Saulsbury FT, Kesler RW. The value of the preschool examination in screening for health problems. *The Journal of pediatrics*. 1982;100(2):232-4.
2. Hall DM, Stewart-Brown S. Screening in child health. *British medical bulletin*. 1998;54(4):929-43.
3. Council NR. *Early Childhood Assessment: Why, What, and How*. Snow CE, Van Hemel SB, editors. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2008. 500 p.
4. Ministry of Health. B4 School Check information for the health sector 2016 [Available from: <http://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/life-stages/child-health/b4-school-check/b4-school-check-information-health-sector>].
5. Ministry of Health. Enrolment in a primary health organisation: New Zealand Government; 2017 [Available from: <http://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/primary-health-care/about-primary-health-organisations/enrolment-primary-health-organisation>].
6. . !!! INVALID CITATION !!!
7. Wood R, Stirling A, Nolan C, Chalmers J, Blair M. Trends in the coverage of ‘universal’ child health reviews: observational study using routinely available data. *BMJ Open*. 2012;2(2).
8. Statistics New Zealand. Integrated Data Infrastructure [Available from: <https://www.stats.govt.nz/integrated-data/integrated-data-infrastructure/>].
9. Ministry of Health. *The B4 School Check: A handbook for practitioners*. Wellington: Ministry of Health; 2008.
10. Health Mo. Personal communication: B4 School completion rates by ethnicity. 2017.
11. Black A. The IDI prototype spine’s creation and coverage. *Statistics New Zealand Working Paper No 16–03* [Internet]. 2016 7th september 2017. Available from: www.stats.govt.nz.
12. Reid G, Bycroft C, Gleisner F. Comparison of ethnicity information in administrative data and the census2016. Available from: www.stats.govt.nz.
13. Fahy KM, Lee A, Milne BJ. *New Zealand socio-economic index 20132017* 7th September 2017. Available from: www.stats.govt.nz.
14. Atkinson J, Salmond C, Crampton P. *NZDep2013 index of deprivation*. New Zealand, Ministry of Health. 2014.
15. Statistics New Zealand. *Classifications and related statistical standards: Urban Area Statistics New Zealand,2016* [Available from: <http://www.stats.govt.nz/methods/classifications-and-standards/classification-related-stats-standards/urban-area.aspx>].
16. Hart T. The inverse care law. *Lancet*. 1971;297:405-12.
17. Hoebel J, Starker A, Jordan S, Richter M, Lampert T. Determinants of health check attendance in adults: findings from the cross-sectional German Health Update (GEDA) study. *BMC Public Health*. 2014;14(1):913.
18. Harte E, MacLure C, Martin A, Meads C, Walter FM, Griffin SJ, et al. Reasons why people do not attend NHS Health Checks: a systematic review and qualitative synthesis. *The British Journal of General Practice*. 2018;68(666):e28-35.
19. Dryden R, Williams B, McCowan C, Themessl-Huber M. What do we know about who does and does not attend general health checks? Findings from a narrative scoping review. *BMC public health*. 2012;12(1):723.
20. Waller D, Agass M, Mant D, Coulter A, Fuller A, Jones L. Health checks in general practice: another example of inverse care? *Bmj*. 1990;300(6732):1115-8.
21. Ministry of Health. Find a Well Child Tamariki Ora provider 2016 [Available from: <https://www.health.govt.nz/your-health/pregnancy-and-kids/services-and-support-you-and-your-child/well-child-tamariki-ora-visits/find-well-child-tamariki-ora-provider>].
22. Sadler L, Priest P, Peters J, Crengle S, Jackson R. *Cervical cancer audit report. Screening of women with cervical cancer*. 2000;2002.
23. Ministry of Health. *Report on Maternity: Maternal and newborn information 2003*. . Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Health; 2006.

- 1 24. Davis P, Lay-Yee R, Dyllal L, Briant R, Sporle A, Brunt D, et al. Quality of hospital care for
2 Māori patients in New Zealand: retrospective cross-sectional assessment. *The Lancet*.
3 2006;367(9526):1920-5.
- 4 25. Jeffreys M, Stevanovic V, Tobias M, Lewis C, Ellison-Loschmann L, Pearce N, et al. Ethnic
5 inequalities in cancer survival in New Zealand: linkage study. *American Journal of Public Health*.
6 2005;95(5):834-7.
- 7 26. Lee CH, Duck IM, Sibley CG. Ethnic inequality in diagnosis with depression and anxiety
8 disorders. *The New Zealand medical journal*. 2017;130(1454):10-20.
- 9 27. Pledger MJ, Cumming J, Burnette M, Daubé J. Unmet need of GP services in Pacific people
10 and other New Zealanders. *Clinical Correspondence*. 2011.
- 11 28. Ministry of Social Development. *The Social Report 2016 – Te pūrongo oranga tangata*.
12 Wellington: Ministry of Social Development; 2016.
- 13 29. Simpson J, Duncanson M, Oben G, Adams J, Wicken A, Pierson M, et al. *Te Ohonga Ake*
14 *The Health Status of Māori Children and Young People in New Zealand Series Two (Health Status*
15 *of Children and Young People) 2017*.
- 16 30. Simpson J, Duncanson M, Oben G, Adams J, Wicken A, Pierson M, et al. *The Health Status*
17 *of Pacific Children and Young People in New Zealand 2015 (Pacific Child and Youth Health) New*
18 *Zealand Child and Youth Epidemiology Service; 2017*.
- 19 31. Irwin LG, Siddiqi A, Hertzman G. *Early child development: A powerful equalizer: Human*
20 *Early Learning Partnership (HELP) Vancouver, BC; 2007*.
- 21 32. Spencer N. European Society for Social Pediatrics and Child Health (ESSOP)* Position
22 Statement: Social inequalities in child health—towards equity and social justice in child health
23 outcomes. *Child: care, health and development*. 2008;34(5):631-4.
- 24 33. Yu SW, Hill C, Ricks ML, Bennet J, Oriol NE. The scope and impact of mobile health
25 clinics in the United States: a literature review. *International journal for equity in health*.
26 2017;16(1):178.
- 27 34. Brown-Connolly NE, Concha JB, English J. Mobile health is worth it! Economic benefit
28 and impact on health of a population-based mobile screening program in new Mexico. *Telemedicine*
29 *and e-Health*. 2014;20(1):18-23.
- 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. Percentage of children completing B4SC components, by year

Fiscal year	N	% VHT complete	% nurse checks complete	% SDQ Teacher complete
2011/12	63,714	86.2	78.5	52.9
2012/13	62,664	88.5	81.4	57.3
2013/14	63,372	90.5	85.6	60.0
2014/15	62,529	91.8	87.2	62.1

Table 2. Percentage of children completing B4SC, and odds ratios for completing, by ethnic, socioeconomic, family, housing and health characteristics

	N	% complete			OR (95% CI)		
		VHT	Nurse checks	SDQ Teacher	VHT	Nurse checks	SDQ Teacher
Sex							
Male	129,831	89.0	82.9	57.6	0.98 (1.01,0.96)	0.98 (1.00,0.96)	1.00 (1.01,0.98)
Female	122,439	89.2	83.1	57.7	-	-	-
Ethnicity							
Māori	71,196	85.3	77.9	52.8	0.60 (0.61,0.58)	0.63 (0.64,0.61)	0.76 (0.78,0.75)
Pacific	37,857	84.0	77.8	37.0	0.58 (0.60,0.56)	0.67 (0.69,0.65)	0.37 (0.38,0.36)
Asian	30,825	91.2	86.8	52.3	1.30 (1.35,1.25)	1.39 (1.45,1.35)	0.78 (0.80,0.76)
European	173,235	90.8	84.6	63.4	1.67 (1.72,1.64)	1.41 (1.45,1.39)	2.13 (2.17,2.08)
Number of siblings at time of birth							
0	123,123	89.5	84.1	58.3	-	-	-
1	70,626	91.0	84.8	60.3	1.18 (1.22,1.15)	1.05 (1.09,1.03)	1.09 (1.11,1.06)
2+	43,527	86.0	78.2	52.3	0.71 (0.74,0.69)	0.68 (0.70,0.66)	0.78 (0.80,0.77)
Socioeconomic deprivation							

	N	VHT	% complete		OR (95% CI)		
			Nurse checks	SDQ Teacher	VHT	Nurse checks	SDQ Teacher
NZDep quintile							
1 (least deprived)	50,520	92.2	86.2	63.7	-	-	-
2	46,323	91.0	84.8	60.8	0.85 (0.89,0.81)	0.89 (0.93,0.86)	0.88 (0.91,0.86)
3	45,672	90.1	83.6	60.9	0.77 (0.80,0.74)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)	0.88 (0.91,0.86)
4	47,043	88.7	82.7	58.3	0.66 (0.69,0.64)	0.77 (0.79,0.74)	0.79 (0.81,0.78)
5 (most deprived)	61,854	85.4	79.3	47.7	0.50 (0.52,0.48)	0.62 (0.64,0.60)	0.52 (0.53,0.51)
Mother's highest qualification							
No formal qualifications	27,672	86.8	81.1	55.0	0.48 (0.51,0.46)	0.61 (0.63,0.58)	0.68 (0.70,0.66)
Secondary school	67,047	90.8	85.3	59.9	0.72 (0.75,0.69)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)	0.83 (0.85,0.81)
Tertiary qualification below Bachelor degree	41,901	91.7	85.6	60.7	0.81 (0.85,0.78)	0.84 (0.87,0.81)	0.86 (0.88,0.84)
Bachelor degree or higher	57,570	93.2	87.6	64.2	-	-	-
Father highest qualification							
No formal qualification	26,712	89.0	83.3	58.2	0.65 (0.68,0.61)	0.73 (0.76,0.70)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)
Secondary school	51,177	91.6	86.2	60.5	0.86 (0.91,0.82)	0.91 (0.94,0.88)	0.90 (0.93,0.88)

	N	VHT	% complete		OR (95% CI)		
			Nurse checks	SDQ Teacher	VHT	Nurse checks	SDQ Teacher
Tertiary qualification below Bachelor degree	47,391	92.6	87.0	64.5	0.99 (1.04,0.94)	0.98 (1.02,0.94)	1.06 (1.10,1.04)
Bachelor degree or higher	39,447	92.6	87.2	63.0	-	-	-
Member of household receives benefit income							
No	158,679	92.8	87.2	63.1	-	-	-
Yes	51,720	87.9	81.4	52.9	0.56 (0.58,0.55)	0.64 (0.66,0.63)	0.66 (0.67,0.65)
Family circumstances							
Age of mother at child's birth							
<20	14,310	83.2	76.8	49.6	0.48 (0.51,0.46)	0.56 (0.59,0.54)	0.64 (0.66,0.62)
20-24	41,889	86.7	80.3	53.8	0.63 (0.66,0.61)	0.69 (0.72,0.67)	0.75 (0.77,0.74)
25-29	55,800	89.5	83.7	57.8	0.83 (0.86,0.79)	0.88 (0.90,0.85)	0.88 (0.91,0.87)
30-34	66,297	91.2	85.4	60.7	-	-	-
35+	58,977	90.3	83.9	59.6	0.90 (0.93,0.87)	0.89 (0.92,0.86)	0.95 (0.97,0.93)
Father on birth certificate							
No	12,612	83.0	75.9	45.7	0.56 (0.59,0.53)	0.61 (0.64,0.59)	0.60 (0.62,0.57)

	N	VHT	% complete		OR (95% CI)		
			Nurse checks	SDQ Teacher	VHT	Nurse checks	SDQ Teacher
Yes	224,661	89.7	83.6	58.5	-	-	-
Mother speaks English							
No	3,483	89.1	85.4	46.4	0.81 (0.90,0.72)	1.00 (1.10,0.92)	0.56 (0.60,0.53)
Yes	196,248	91.0	85.3	60.6	-	-	-
Housing							
Urban	215,775	89.4	83.2	56.3	-	-	-
Rural	35,838	88.6	82.5	66.5	0.93 (0.96,0.89)	0.95 (0.98,0.93)	1.54 (1.59,1.52)
Household size							
2-4 people	120,849	92.9	87.7	64.4	-	-	-
5-7 people	77,808	90.6	84.0	57.8	0.74 (0.76,0.71)	0.74 (0.76,0.72)	0.76 (0.77,0.75)
8+ people	11,739	84.5	78.3	39.3	0.42 (0.44,0.40)	0.51 (0.53,0.49)	0.36 (0.37,0.34)
Own home	112,458	93.7	88.4	64.5	-	-	-
Rented home	93,840	89.2	82.9	56.4	0.56 (0.58,0.54)	0.64 (0.65,0.63)	0.71 (0.72,0.70)

	N	VHT	% complete		OR (95% CI)		
			Nurse checks	SDQ Teacher	VHT	Nurse checks	SDQ Teacher
Number of residence changes age 0-4							
None	52,602	89.7	85.1	61.1	-	-	-
1	55,359	92.7	87.3	61.1	1.47 (1.52,1.41)	1.20 (1.25,1.16)	1.00 (1.02,0.98)
2	42,087	91.4	85.4	58.7	1.22 (1.28,1.18)	1.03 (1.06,0.99)	0.90 (0.93,0.88)
3	28,320	89.3	82.6	56.4	0.96 (1.01,0.92)	0.83 (0.87,0.80)	0.83 (0.85,0.80)
4	18,675	87.9	80.0	54.8	0.83 (0.88,0.79)	0.70 (0.73,0.67)	0.78 (0.80,0.75)
5+	30,282	84.5	76.6	54.2	0.63 (0.65,0.60)	0.57 (0.60,0.55)	0.76 (0.78,0.74)
Health status							
Mother smoking status							
Regular smoker	38,460	86.8	80.7	55.2	0.56 (0.57,0.53)	0.63 (0.65,0.61)	0.78 (0.79,0.76)
Ex smoker	45,420	91.7	85.7	63.1	0.94 (0.98,0.90)	0.90 (0.93,0.88)	1.08 (1.10,1.05)
Never smoked	111,219	92.2	86.9	61.3	-	-	-
Birthweight							
<2500g	14,049	83.6	79.1	54.7	0.57 (0.60,0.55)	0.73 (0.76,0.70)	0.87 (0.90,0.84)
2500-4000g	187,239	89.9	83.8	58.1	-	-	-

	N	VHT	% complete		OR (95% CI)		
			Nurse checks	SDQ Teacher	VHT	Nurse checks	SDQ Teacher
>4000g	34,746	90.0	83.3	59.0	1.01 (1.05,0.97)	0.96 (0.99,0.93)	1.04 (1.06,1.01)
Gestation							
<37 weeks	17,925	84.3	79.5	55.2	0.60 (0.63,0.57)	0.76 (0.79,0.73)	0.88 (0.91,0.85)
37-42 weeks	217,128	89.9	83.7	58.3	-	-	-
>42 weeks	1,443	90.0	83.2	48.2	1.00 (1.19,0.85)	0.97 (1.11,0.84)	0.67 (0.75,0.61)
Child referred for disability support assessment							
No	247,878	89.4	83.3	57.9	-	-	-
Yes	4,401	74.3	65.4	43.6	0.34 (0.37,0.32)	0.38 (0.40,0.36)	0.56 (0.60,0.53)
Number of quarters enrolled with GP age 0-4							
0-3	16215	67.0	58.0	38.8	0.16 (0.17,0.16)	0.20 (0.21,0.19)	0.42 (0.44,0.41)
4-7	42645	86.8	78.9	55.5	0.53 (0.55,0.51)	0.54 (0.55,0.52)	0.83 (0.85,0.81)
8-11	95298	90.4	84.5	59.4	0.76 (0.79,0.74)	0.78 (0.80,0.76)	0.98 (1.00,1.00)
12+	98118	92.5	87.4	59.9	-	-	-
Number of hospital admissions age 0-4							

	N	VHT	% complete			OR (95% CI)		
			Nurse checks	SDQ Teacher	VHT	Nurse checks	SDQ Teacher	
None	93,474	88.9	82.6	57.1	-	-	-	
1 to 2	102,696	91.3	85.3	60.2	1.32 (1.35,1.28)	1.22 (1.25,1.19)	1.14 (1.15,1.11)	
3 to 5	21,390	89.3	83.9	59.1	1.04 (1.09,0.99)	1.09 (1.14,1.05)	1.09 (1.11,1.05)	
6+	9,762	84.8	78.9	55.3	0.69 (0.74,0.65)	0.79 (0.83,0.75)	0.93 (0.97,0.89)	
Total days in hospital age 0-4								
None	123,231	89.3	83.2	57.8	-	-	-	
1 to 9	95,478	91.1	85.1	60.2	1.23 (1.27,1.19)	1.15 (1.18,1.12)	1.10 (1.12,1.09)	
10 to 19	4,953	87.3	81.6	53.8	0.83 (0.90,0.76)	0.90 (0.96,0.83)	0.85 (0.90,0.80)	
20+	3,660	80.9	74.9	49.4	0.51 (0.55,0.47)	0.61 (0.65,0.56)	0.71 (0.76,0.67)	
Total number of ED visits age 0-4								
None	193,905	89.9	84.0	60.1	-	-	-	
1 to 2	31,173	89.7	82.7	50.6	0.97 (1.01,0.93)	0.91 (0.94,0.88)	0.68 (0.69,0.66)	
3+	2,244	88.2	79.7	46.0	0.84 (0.96,0.74)	0.75 (0.83,0.68)	0.56 (0.61,0.52)	

Note: As individuals can identify as multiple ethnicities, counts for ethnic groups will sum to greater than the count for the total population.

1
2
3
4 VHT = vision and hearing checks; Nurse = dental, growth, immunisations, PEDS, SDQP check
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

For peer review only

Appendix 1**Percentage of children completing each component of B4SC, by year**

	% of children completing check			
B4 School check	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
Vision	86.8	88.7	90.7	91.8
Hearing	86.8	88.6	90.6	91.8
Dental	79.4	82.1	86.7	88.4
Growth	79.4	82.1	86.7	88.4
Immunisation	79.1	81.9	86.3	87.9
PEDS	79.4	82.1	86.6	88.4
SDQP	79.3	81.9	86.5	88.2
SDQT	52.9	56.5	59.8	61.4

Appendix 2

Sensitivity analysis

The table below shows the effects of:

1. Changing the criteria for inclusion in the population (column 1). In the main analyses, children were included in the population if they were in the IDI spine AND had health or birth records.

Column 1 of the table below shows the results when the population was defined as children who were in the IDI spine OR had birth or health records.

2. Changing the overseas time cut-off for exclusion from the residential mobility and hospitalisation analyses (column 2, differences only apply to hospitalisation and meshblock change variables). In the main analyses, children were excluded if they had spent more than a year overseas. Column 2 of the table below shows the results if all children were included regardless of the amount of time spent overseas.

	Different population				Different overseas cut-off			
	OR (95% CI)				OR (95% CI)			
	N	VHT incomplete	Nurse checks incomplete	SDQ Teacher incomplete	N	VHT incomplete	Nurse checks incomplete	SDQ Teacher incomplete
Sex								
Male	136896	0.98 (1.01,0.96)	0.98 (1.00,0.96)	0.99 (1.01,0.98)	129834	0.98 (1.01,0.96)	0.98 (1.00,0.96)	1.00 (1.01,0.98)
Female	128967	-	-	-	122439	-	-	-
Ethnicity								
Māori	73092	0.76 (0.79,0.75)	0.74 (0.75,0.72)	0.81 (0.82,0.79)	71196	0.60 (0.61,0.58)	0.63 (0.64,0.61)	0.76 (0.78,0.75)
Pacific	39903	0.60 (0.62,0.59)	0.68 (0.69,0.66)	0.38 (0.39,0.37)	37857	0.58 (0.60,0.56)	0.67 (0.69,0.65)	0.37 (0.38,0.36)
Asian	33039	1.09 (1.12,1.04)	1.20 (1.23,1.16)	0.76 (0.78,0.75)	30825	1.30 (1.35,1.25)	1.39 (1.45,1.35)	0.78 (0.80,0.76)
European	180345	1.72 (1.75,1.69)	1.49 (1.52,1.47)	2.13 (2.17,2.13)	173232	1.67 (1.72,1.64)	1.41 (1.45,1.39)	2.13 (2.17,2.08)
	136896	0.98 (1.01,0.96)	0.98 (1.00,0.96)	0.99 (1.01,0.98)	129834	0.98 (1.01,0.96)	0.98 (1.00,0.96)	1.00 (1.01,0.98)
Number of siblings at time of birth								
0	123123	-	-	-	123126	-	-	-
1	70626	1.18 (1.22,1.15)	1.05 (1.09,1.03)	1.09 (1.11,1.06)	70629	1.18 (1.22,1.15)	1.05 (1.09,1.03)	1.09 (1.11,1.06)
2+	43527	0.71 (0.74,0.69)	0.68 (0.70,0.66)	0.78 (0.80,0.77)	43527	0.71 (0.74,0.69)	0.68 (0.70,0.66)	0.78 (0.80,0.77)
Socioeconomic deprivation								
NZDep quintile								
1 (least deprived)	52995	-	-	-	50517			
2	48081	0.89 (0.93,0.86)	0.92 (0.95,0.88)	0.89 (0.92,0.87)	46326	0.85 (0.89,0.81)	0.89 (0.93,0.86)	0.88 (0.91,0.86)

1									
2	3	47283	0.82 (0.85,0.79)	0.85 (0.88,0.82)	0.89 (0.92,0.88)	45672	0.77 (0.80,0.74)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)	0.88 (0.91,0.86)
3									
4	4	48720	0.72 (0.75,0.69)	0.79 (0.82,0.77)	0.81 (0.83,0.79)	47043	0.66 (0.69,0.64)	0.77 (0.79,0.74)	0.79 (0.81,0.78)
5									
6	5 (most deprived)	64308	0.54 (0.56,0.53)	0.64 (0.66,0.62)	0.53 (0.54,0.52)	61854	0.50 (0.52,0.48)	0.62 (0.64,0.60)	0.52 (0.53,0.51)
7									
8									
9	Mother highest qualification								
10									
11	No formal qualifications	27672	0.48 (0.51,0.46)	0.61 (0.63,0.58)	0.68 (0.70,0.66)	27675	0.48 (0.51,0.46)	0.61 (0.63,0.58)	0.68 (0.70,0.66)
12									
13	Secondary school	67047	0.72 (0.75,0.69)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)	0.83 (0.85,0.81)	67047	0.72 (0.75,0.69)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)	0.83 (0.85,0.81)
14									
15	Bachelors degree	41901	0.81 (0.85,0.78)	0.84 (0.87,0.81)	0.86 (0.88,0.84)	41901	0.81 (0.85,0.78)	0.84 (0.87,0.81)	0.86 (0.88,0.84)
16									
17	Postgraduate degree	57570	-	-	-	57570	-	-	-
18									
19									
20									
21	Father highest qualification								
22									
23	No formal qualification	26712	0.65 (0.68,0.61)	0.73 (0.76,0.70)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)	26712	0.65 (0.68,0.61)	0.73 (0.76,0.70)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)
24									
25	Secondary school	51177	0.86 (0.91,0.82)	0.91 (0.94,0.88)	0.90 (0.93,0.88)	51177	0.86 (0.91,0.82)	0.91 (0.94,0.88)	0.90 (0.93,0.88)
26									
27	Bachelors degree	47388	0.99 (1.04,0.94)	0.98 (1.02,0.94)	1.06 (1.10,1.04)	47388	0.99 (1.04,0.94)	0.98 (1.02,0.94)	1.06 (1.10,1.04)
28									
29	Postgraduate degree	39450	-	-	-	39450	-	-	-
30									
31									
32	Member of household receives benefit income								
33									
34	No	159069	-	-	-	158679	-	-	-
35									
36	Yes	51777	0.57 (0.59,0.55)	0.65 (0.66,0.63)	0.66 (0.67,0.65)	51720	0.56 (0.58,0.55)	0.64 (0.66,0.63)	0.66 (0.67,0.65)
37									
38									
39									
40	Family circumstances								
41									
42									
43									
44									
45									
46									

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

Age of mother at child's birth

<20	14313	0.48 (0.51,0.46)	0.56 (0.59,0.54)	0.64 (0.66,0.62)	14313	0.48 (0.51,0.46)	0.56 (0.59,0.54)	0.64 (0.66,0.62)
20-24	41889	0.63 (0.66,0.61)	0.69 (0.72,0.67)	0.75 (0.77,0.74)	41889	0.63 (0.66,0.61)	0.69 (0.72,0.67)	0.75 (0.77,0.74)
25-29	55800	0.83 (0.86,0.79)	0.88 (0.90,0.85)	0.88 (0.91,0.87)	55800	0.83 (0.86,0.79)	0.88 (0.90,0.85)	0.88 (0.91,0.87)
30-34	66297	-	-	-	66297	-	-	-
35+	58977	0.90 (0.93,0.87)	0.89 (0.92,0.86)	0.95 (0.97,0.93)	58974	0.90 (0.93,0.87)	0.89 (0.92,0.86)	0.95 (0.97,0.93)

Father on birth certificate

No	12612	0.56 (0.59,0.53)	0.61 (0.64,0.59)	0.60 (0.62,0.57)	12612	0.56 (0.59,0.53)	0.61 (0.64,0.59)	0.60 (0.62,0.57)
Yes	224664	-	-	-	224664	-	-	-

Mother speaks English

No	3483	0.81 (0.90,0.72)	1.00 (1.10,0.92)	0.56 (0.60,0.53)	3483	0.81 (0.90,0.72)	1.00 (1.10,0.92)	0.56 (0.60,0.53)
Yes	196248	-	-	-	196248	-	-	-

Housing

Urban	224976	-	-	-	215775	-	-	-
Rural	36630	1.05 (1.09,1.01)	1.03 (1.06,1.00)	1.59 (1.61,1.54)	35838	0.93 (0.96,0.89)	0.95 (0.98,0.93)	1.54 (1.59,1.52)

Household size

2-4 people	121098	-	-	-	120852	-	-	-
5-7 people	77961	0.74 (0.76,0.71)	0.75 (0.76,0.72)	0.76 (0.77,0.75)	77808	0.74 (0.76,0.71)	0.74 (0.76,0.72)	0.76 (0.77,0.75)
8+ people	11784	0.42 (0.44,0.40)	0.51 (0.53,0.49)	0.36 (0.37,0.34)	11742	0.42 (0.44,0.40)	0.51 (0.53,0.49)	0.36 (0.37,0.34)

1									
2									
3									
4	Own home	112581	-	-	-	112458	-	-	-
5	Rented home	94146	0.56	0.63	0.71	93840	0.56	0.64	0.71
6			(0.57,0.54)	(0.65,0.62)	(0.72,0.69)		(0.58,0.54)	(0.65,0.63)	(0.72,0.70)
7									
8									
9									
10	Number of residence								
11	changes age 0-4								
12									
13	None	61761	-	-	-	62412	-	-	-
14	1	57459	2.86	2.13	1.33	47994	1.16	1.01	0.90
15			(2.94,2.78)	(2.17,2.08)	(1.37,1.30)		(1.22,1.12)	(1.04,0.98)	(0.92,0.88)
16	2	42891	2.86	2.00	1.25	31935	0.96	0.85	0.83
17			(2.94,2.70)	(2.08,1.92)	(1.28,1.22)		(1.00,0.92)	(0.88,0.81)	(0.85,0.81)
18	3	28653	2.33	1.67	1.15	20745	0.85	0.73	0.78
19			(2.44,2.22)	(1.72,1.61)	(1.18,1.11)		(0.90,0.81)	(0.76,0.70)	(0.81,0.76)
20	4	18810	2.04	1.41	1.08	32235	0.66	0.60	0.76
21			(2.13,1.92)	(1.47,1.37)	(1.11,1.04)		(0.68,0.63)	(0.62,0.58)	(0.79,0.75)
22	5+	30447	1.56	1.16	1.05	62412	1.37	1.18	0.99
23			(1.61,1.49)	(1.20,1.12)	(1.09,1.03)		(1.43,1.32)	(1.22,1.14)	(1.01,0.97)
24									
25	Health status								
26									
27	Mother smoking status								
28	Regular smoker	38457	0.56	0.63	0.78	38460	0.56	0.63	0.78
29			(0.57,0.53)	(0.65,0.61)	(0.79,0.76)		(0.57,0.53)	(0.65,0.61)	(0.79,0.76)
30	Ex smoker	45420	0.94	0.90	1.08	45420	0.94	0.90	1.08
31			(0.98,0.90)	(0.93,0.88)	(1.10,1.05)		(0.98,0.90)	(0.93,0.88)	(1.10,1.05)
32	Never smoked	111219	-	-	-	111219	-	-	-
33									
34									
35	Birthweight								
36	<2500g	14049	0.57	0.73	0.87	14049	0.57	0.73	0.87
37			(0.60,0.55)	(0.76,0.70)	(0.90,0.84)		(0.60,0.55)	(0.76,0.70)	(0.90,0.84)
38	2500-4000g	187242	-	-	-	187239	-	-	-
39	>4000g	34746	1.01	0.96	1.04	34749	1.01	0.96	1.04
40			(1.05,0.97)	(0.99,0.93)	(1.06,1.01)		(1.05,0.97)	(0.99,0.93)	(1.06,1.01)
41									
42									
43									
44									
45									
46									

1									
2									
3									
4	Gestation								
5			0.60	0.76	0.88		0.60	0.76	0.88
6	<37 weeks	17922	(0.63,0.57)	(0.79,0.73)	(0.91,0.85)	17922	(0.63,0.57)	(0.79,0.73)	(0.91,0.85)
7	37-42 weeks	217128	-	-	-	217128	-	-	-
8			1.00	0.97	0.67		1.00	0.97	0.67
9	>42 weeks	1443	(1.19,0.85)	(1.11,0.84)	(0.75,0.61)	1443	(1.19,0.85)	(1.11,0.84)	(0.75,0.61)
10									
11									
12	Child referred for disability								
13	support assessment								
14	No	261408	-	-	-	247875	-	-	-
15			0.46	0.46	0.61		0.34	0.38	0.56
16	Yes	4473	(0.50,0.43)	(0.49,0.43)	(0.65,0.57)	4401	(0.37,0.32)	(0.40,0.36)	(0.60,0.53)
17									
18									
19	Number of quarters								
20	enrolled with GP age 0-4								
21			0.07	0.09	0.24		0.16	0.20	0.42
22	0-3	27360	(0.07,0.07)	(0.10,0.09)	(0.25,0.23)		(0.17,0.16)	(0.21,0.19)	(0.44, 0.41)
23			0.48	0.50	0.81		0.53	0.54	0.83
24	4-7	44112	(0.50,0.45)	(0.52,0.49)	(0.83,0.79)		(0.55,0.51)	(0.55,0.52)	(0.85, 0.81)
25			0.75	0.78	0.98		0.76	0.78 (0.80,	0.98
26	8-11	96006	(0.78,0.73)	(0.79,0.75)	(0.99,0.96)		(0.79,0.74)	0.76)	(1.00, 0.96)
27	12+	98406	-	-	-		-	-	-
28									
29									
30	Number of hospital								
31	admissions age 0-4								
32	None	104382	-	-	-	108081	-	-	-
33			2.17	1.75	1.35		1.32	1.23	1.14
34	1 to 2	104280	(2.22,2.13)	(1.82,1.72)	(1.37,1.32)	111288	(1.35,1.28)	(1.27,1.20)	(1.16,1.12)
35			1.85	1.64	1.32		1.06	1.11	1.09
36	3 to 5	21528	(1.92,1.79)	(1.72,1.59)	(1.35,1.27)	22668	(1.11,1.01)	(1.15,1.06)	(1.11,1.05)
37			1.23	1.19	1.12		0.73	0.82	0.94
38	6+	9834	(1.32,1.18)	(1.25,1.14)	(1.16,1.08)	10242	(0.77,0.69)	(0.86,0.78)	(0.98,0.91)
39									
40									
41									
42									
43									
44									
45									
46									

1
2 Total days in hospital age 0-
3 4

4 None	134751	-	-	-	141108	-	-	-
5		1.92	1.59	1.27		1.23	1.16	1.11
6 1 to 9	96537	(1.96,1.85)	(1.61,1.54)	(1.30,1.25)	102060	(1.27,1.20)	(1.19,1.14)	(1.12,1.09)
7		1.28	1.22	0.98		0.83	0.90	0.85
8 10 to 19	5022	(1.41,1.19)	(1.32,1.14)	(1.03,0.93)	5268	(0.91,0.77)	(0.96,0.84)	(0.90,0.81)
9		0.81	0.84	0.82		0.53	0.63	0.72
10 20+	3714	(0.88,0.75)	(0.91,0.78)	(0.88,0.77)	3843	(0.58,0.49)	(0.67,0.58)	(0.77,0.68)
11								

12
13 Total number of ED visits
14 age 0-4

15 None	205911	-	-	-	215601	-	-	-
16		1.20	0.96	0.63		0.99	0.93	0.69
17 1 to 2	31854	(1.37,1.06)	(1.06,0.87)	(0.69,0.58)	34218	(1.02,0.95)	(0.95,0.90)	(0.71,0.68)
18		0.98	0.98	0.99		0.85	0.76	0.58
19 3+	2262	(1.01,0.96)	(1.00,0.96)	(1.01,0.98)	2457	(0.95,0.75)	(0.85,0.69)	(0.63,0.54)
20								

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1, 2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	4, 5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	7, 8
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	7, 8
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	8-11
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	8-11
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	8, APPENDIX 2
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	7, 8
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	8-11
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	12
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	N/A
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	N/A
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	N/A
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	8, APPENDIX 2
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	13, TABLE 1
		(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	8-11
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	8-11
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	13, TABLES 1 AND 2
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	TABLE 2
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	8-11
		(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	8, APPENDIX 2
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	14
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	14
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	15, 16
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	15, 16
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	1

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

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

How Universal are Universal Pre-School Health Checks? An observational study using routine data from New Zealand's B4 School Check

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-025535.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	03-Oct-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Gibb, Sheree; University of Otago Wellington, Public Health; A Better Start National Science Challenge Milne, Barry; University of Auckland, Centre of Methods and Policy Application in the Social Sciences; University of Auckland Shackleton, Nichola; University of Auckland, Centre of Methods and Policy Application in the Social Sciences; A Better Start National Science Challenge Taylor, Barry; University of Otago, Department of the Dean; A Better Start National Science Challenge Audas, Richard; University of Otago Department of Women's and Children's Health; A Better Start National Science Challenge
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research
Keywords:	healthcare disparities, data linkage, childhood intervention

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6 **How Universal are Universal Pre-School Health Checks? An observational study using routine**
7 **data from New Zealand's B4 School Check**
8
9
10

11 Sheree Gibb 1 2 4, Barry Milne^{1 2}, Nichola Shackleton^{1 2}, Barry Taylor 1 5, Richard Audas 1 3
12
13

14
15
16 Author affiliations
17

18
19 1 A Better Start, National Science Challenge
20

21 2 Centre of Methods and Policy Application in the Social Sciences, University of Auckland,
22
23 Auckland, New Zealand.
24

25
26 3 Women's and Children's Health, Dunedin School of Medicine, University of Otago, Dunedin,
27
28 New Zealand
29

30
31 4 Department of Public Health, University of Otago Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand
32

33
34 5 Dean's Department, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand
35

36
37 Corresponding author:
38

39
40 Sheree Gibb, Department of Public Health, University of Otago Wellington, 23 Mein Street,
41

42
43 Wellington, New Zealand
44

45
46 Sheree.gibb@otago.ac.nz
47

48
49 +64 4 918 5086
50

51
52 Key words: healthcare disparities; data linkage; childhood intervention
53

54
55 Word count: 4383
56
57

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 **Funding:** This study was funded by A Better Start – National Science Challenge, New Zealand

14
15 Ministry for Business, Innovation and Employment.

16
17 **Disclaimer:** Access to the data used in this study was provided by Statistics New Zealand under
18 conditions designed to give effect to the security and confidentiality provisions of the Statistics
19 Act 1975. The results presented in this study are the work of the authors, not Statistics NZ.
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

Abstract

Objectives: We aimed to estimate how many children were attending a universal pre-school health screen and to identify characteristics associated with non-participation.

Design: Analysis of population level linked administrative data.

Participants: Children were counted in the population of resident 4-year-olds for a given year if 1) they were ever resident in New Zealand, and 2) lived in NZ for at least 6 months during the reference year, 3) were alive at the end of the reference year, and either 4) appeared in any hospital (including emergency) admissions, community pharmaceutical dispensing, or GP enrolment datasets during the reference year, or 5) had a registered birth in New Zealand. We analysed 252,273 records over 4 years, from July 1st 2011 to June 30th 2015.

Results: We found that participation rates varied for each component of the B4 School Check (in 2014/15 91.8% for Vision and Hearing tests (VHT), 87.2% for nurse checks (including height, weight, oral health, SDQ, PEDS) and 62.1% for Teacher SDQ (SDQT)), but participation rates for all components increased over time. Māori and Pacific children were less likely to complete the checks than non-Māori and non-Pacific children (for VHT tests Māori OR=0.60 (0.61,0.58), Pacific OR=0.58 (0.60,0.56), for nurse checks Māori OR=0.63 (0.64,0.61), Pacific OR=0.67 (0.69,0.65), for SDQT Māori OR=0.76 (0.78,0.75), Pacific OR=0.37 (0.38,0.36)). Children from socioeconomically deprived areas, with younger mothers, from rented homes, residing in larger households, with worse health status, and with higher rates of residential mobility were less likely to participate in the B4 School Check than other children.

Conclusion: The patterns of non-participation suggest a reinforcing of existing disparities, whereby the children most in need are not getting the services they require. There needs to be

1
2
3 an increased effort by public health organizations, community and whānau/family to ensure
4
5 that all children are tested and screened.
6
7
8
9

10 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 13 • Whole population sample of all children completing B4 School check over 4 years
14
15 (N=252,273)
16
- 18 • Using linked data from different sectors provided information about a wide range of
19
20 characteristics
21
- 23 • Only bivariate analyses were possible; sample loss due to missing data meant that
24
25 multivariate analysis was not feasible
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

Introduction

Globally, a common practice in childhood development is to screen children to determine if there are any key developmental problems that need to be assessed (1). These screens typically check for problems relating to general health, including hearing, vision, height, weight and oral health. They also often screen for emotional, behavioural, or intellectual issues that might be evident (2). Hall and Stewart-Brown categorize four types of screening programmes: i) biochemical; ii) screening involving objective measures (such as height and weight, vision and hearing; iii) screening involving physical examination; and iv) screening involving understanding of child development (3).

In New Zealand, the screen is called the Before School Check (B4SC) and it is administered to four year olds. It is the final and most comprehensive in a series of eight free Well Child Tamariki Ora visits that children receive (4), and currently the only one for which comprehensive linked data are available to examine coverage. The B4SC was implemented in New Zealand starting in September 2008, although it was not universal until 2010. There are eight key developmental areas that are assessed: vision, hearing, oral health, general health, growth measurement, strengths and difficulties (SDQ) as reported by parents and teachers and a parental evaluation of development status (PEDS). If concerns are identified in any area, children are referred for further testing or intervention. The B4SC is administered by the Ministry of Health, which has set a target 90% participation rate across the country, with parents and guardians being notified of the B4SC via enrolment with a primary health organisation (PHO, organisations that provide primary care services (5)). The Ministry's data suggests they have been meeting their target

1
2
3 since 2013, but compliance falls short of 100% (6). Furthermore, not all children are registered
4 with a PHO (95% of 0-4 year olds are registered (7)), and including unregistered children in the
5 denominator will further reduce compliance rates.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 This raises three concerns: First, that a non-trivial number of children are missing their checks.
13
14 Second, that some children may not be registered with a PHO and as such, their parents are not
15 notified that their child should attend a B4SC. And third, that these children may be more likely
16 to be in higher risk categories for later health problems and could benefit from the referrals to
17 interventions that accompany this screen. It is this final concern that is the focus of this study.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Evidence Preschool / School Entry Screening Participation**

29
30
31
32 Across different universal health checks available to the adult populations of different countries
33 certain patterns persist: those in poorer socioeconomic circumstances, with lower
34 qualifications, and at greater risk of health problems are less likely to attend such checks (8-13).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 The available evidence for universal health checks in childhood suggests a similar pattern (14-
43 16). Wood et al considered the coverage of universal child health reviews in Scotland (15). They
44 considered two cohorts of children, the first, born in 1998/99 were eligible for 5 health checks
45 (10 days/6-8 weeks/8-9 months/22-24 months and 39-42 months) and a second cohort, born in
46 2007/08, were only eligible for the first two checks. They found that coverage rates of the 10-
47 day check were very high in both cohorts (99%), but this declined as the children aged. For the
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 6-8 week review, coverage was between 94-95%, and for the 39-42 month review the coverage
4
5 rates fell to 86%. There were clear deprivation gradients, with children living in the least
6
7 deprived areas much more likely to have a health check than those in the most deprived areas,
8
9 and these gradients increased substantially with increasing age and decreasing coverage. They
10
11 conducted an audit on a subset of the areas included in the review (Glasgow and Fife).
12
13

14
15 Consistent with the inverse care law (17) they found that children who missed the 6-8 week
16
17 review were more likely to require additional health services and support in the future than
18
19 those who attended the review.
20
21

22
23 Similarly, evidence from Denmark suggests that participation declines with age. Only 76% of
24
25 eligible children attend the age 4 health screen. Child, parent and household level
26
27 characteristics predicted attendance with children who had been hospitalised at least twice
28
29 since birth, children of single, younger, less educated or immigrant parents, and children
30
31 residing in low income households or living in institutions less likely to participate (16). Similarly
32
33 in North Carolina children of mothers who were younger, less educated, black, and unmarried
34
35 were also less likely to receive an adequate number of well child visits (14).
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 The overall aim of these universal checks is to identify children who are at risk of later problems
43
44 and direct them towards interventions that will reduce this risk. The early identification of
45
46 health and developmental issues increases the efficacy and cost effectiveness of treatment and
47
48 lessens the risk of any potential comorbidities. However, evidence about whether or not
49
50 childhood screening achieves this aim is mixed (18-20). Childhood screening relies on accurate
51
52 identification of children at risk, and also on the availability of effective interventions or
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 treatments for at-risk children, which are not always available (19, 21). Regardless, universal
4
5 checks are often the only instrument to identify children in need of additional services, who
6
7 may otherwise be missed by the health system. Therefore, systematic differences in attendance
8
9 highlight a crucial issue: those children most in need are missing out on vital services.
10
11
12
13

14
15 In New Zealand we are in a unique position to examine the characteristics of those not
16
17 completing the B4SC. Many routinely collected government databases (including B4SC) are held
18
19 in the Statistics New Zealand Integrated Data Infrastructure (IDI) and each individual is assigned
20
21 a unique identifier which allows their records to be linked across data files. In this analysis we
22
23 build a population cohort using birth records and immigration/emigration files to determine
24
25 which four year-olds were in the country and eligible for the B4SC between July 1st 2011 to June
26
27 30th 2015, and then we examine the characteristics of those who do not get the B4SC.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 The aim of this paper is to identify characteristics associated with non-participation in the B4SC
36
37 by linking to deprivation, birth, census, health, disability and immunisation records, all of which
38
39 are available in the IDI.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **Methods**

52 **Study design**

1
2
3 This study was an observational study using routine data from New Zealand's Integrated Data
4
5 Infrastructure.
6
7
8
9

10 **Data sources and linkage**

11
12 All data were sourced from the Integrated Data Structure (22), a secure database containing
13
14 anonymised microdata about individuals.
15
16
17
18
19

20 B4 School Check

21
22 The main outcome measures for this study were generated from B4 School Check data. The B4
23
24 School Check (B4SC) is a universal programme offered to all families in New Zealand with four-
25
26 year-old children (23). If a child is enrolled with a primary health organisation a letter or email
27
28 will be sent to parents inviting them to bring the child along for a B4SC. Parents can also request
29
30 a check by approaching a general practitioner or other B4SC provider. The checks are carried out
31
32 by registered nurses or nurse practitioners with experience in child health, with assistance from
33
34 vision and hearing technicians (4). One component (SDQ-Teacher) is completed by a child's early
35
36 childhood education (ECE) teacher, who receives the SDQ directly from the B4SC provider and is
37
38 responsible for returning it to the provider (24). ECE coverage is high in New Zealand with more
39
40 than 95% of children enrolled in ECE in the 6 months prior to starting school (25). The B4SC is
41
42 undertaken in different locations including preschools, kōhanga reo, doctors' clinics and other
43
44 community venues such as churches and marae, depending on the needs of the community. In
45
46 some cases, parts of the B4 School Check are carried out in the child's home.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The percentage attending the B4SC was estimated as 79% in 2011/2012, 80% in 2012/2013,
4
5 91% in 2013/2014, 92% in 2014/15, and 92% in 2015-2016 (6). High coverage of vulnerable
6
7 groups (Māori children and children from areas of high socioeconomic deprivation) is
8
9 encouraged by linking a portion of District Health Board (DHB, see (26)) funding for B4SC to
10
11 achieving a specified level of coverage for these groups. In the 2015/16 year the coverage for
12
13 Māori children was 88% and for Pacific children it was 89% (27). For children from high
14
15 deprivation areas the coverage was 93% (6). This paper uses data from B4 school checks
16
17 completed between the fiscal years 2011/12 and 2014/15.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Other datasets

26
27 Datasets used to construct the other analysis variables for this study were: Census 2013;
28
29 Ministry of Health PHO enrolment and hospital discharge datasets; source ranked ethnicity;
30
31 address notification; SOCRATES; and birth registrations. More detail on the variables
32
33 constructed from these datasets can be found in the 'other analysis variables' section below.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Study population

41
42 To identify the population of children eligible for a B4SC, annual populations of four-year-old
43
44 children were constructed using methods developed previously for constructing populations
45
46 from the Integrated Data Infrastructure (IDI) (28, 29). Children were included in the
47
48 denominator population for a given year if they:
49
50
51 - Appeared in any hospital (including emergency) admissions, community pharmaceutical
52
53 dispensing, or PHO enrolment datasets during the reference year; OR
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 - Had a NZ birth record.
4

5
6 The above population was then restricted to children who lived in NZ for at least 6 months
7
8 during the reference year, were alive at the end of the reference year, were included in the IDI
9
10 spine (which aims to cover an “ever-resident” population including all those who either were
11
12 born in New Zealand, migrated to New Zealand, or paid tax in New Zealand (30)).
13

14
15 Over the four-year period we identified 288,753 children who had a health or birth record. Of
16
17 those, 277,593 (96%) were in the IDI spine, and 252,273 of those (91%) were alive and resident
18
19 in New Zealand at the end of their reference year and were used as the denominator
20
21 population.
22
23

24
25 To examine whether the above criteria had an impact on study results we conducted a
26
27 sensitivity analysis in which we replicated the analysis using two different definitions of the
28
29 study population. The main conclusions of the study were the same across all replications. The
30
31 detailed results of the sensitivity analysis can be found in Appendix 1.
32
33
34

35 36 37 **Outcomes**

38 39 B4SC completion

40
41 For the purposes of this study, B4SC was grouped into three components: Vision and Hearing
42
43 Test (VHT) checks (vision and hearing); nurse checks (growth, dental, immunisation, Parents
44
45 Evaluation of Developmental Status (PEDS), and Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ
46
47 Parent); and SDQ Teacher. These groupings were developed in consultation with the Ministry of
48
49 Health and reflect the way in which the components are typically completed (vision and hearing
50
51 checks are usually completed together by vision and hearing technicians, the nurse checks are
52
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 usually completed together, SDQ-Teacher is completed separately by a child's early childhood
4 education teacher). In some regions these groups of checks are administered in separate visits;
5
6 in other regions they are combined into a single visit. If a child had completed all checks within
7
8 a component they were considered to have completed that component. B4SC coverage was
9
10 calculated as the number of children completing a B4SC component divided by the total
11
12 number of children in the population. Completion rates for the individual component checks
13
14 can be found in Appendix 2.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Other analysis variables**

24 Ethnicity

25
26
27 Ethnicity measures were taken from the source ranked ethnicity table in IDI. The table collates
28
29 ethnicities that are reported to different administrative collections in IDI and ranks these
30
31 sources to provide an ethnic profile for each individual. Ranking is based on how closely the
32
33 ethnicities reported for an individual in the administrative source match those reported in the
34
35 census (census records have highest priority and 84.3% of the study population had ethnicity
36
37 sourced from census, followed by birth records (13.9%), followed by health (1.7%))(31). From
38
39 this we constructed four dichotomous ethnicity variables representing whether or not children
40
41 were recorded as identifying with each of the following major ethnic groups: Māori; Pacific;
42
43 Asian; European. Individuals could belong to none, one, or more than one of these ethnic
44
45 groups. Identifying as more than one ethnicity is common in New Zealand (32) and 23.9% of the
46
47 current sample belonged to multiple ethnic groups.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Socioeconomic deprivation

NZ Deprivation Score (NZDep) was calculated using the standard 2013 NZDep concordance (33) and the child's meshblock (small geographic area typically containing 30-80 dwellings (34)) of usual residence at the time of the 4th birthday, or the first meshblock recorded within 12 months after the date of the 4th birthday if no meshblock was recorded prior to that. Each meshblock was assigned a decile from 1 (least deprived) to 10 (most deprived). These were then grouped into quintiles.

Urbanicity

The child's meshblock of usual residence was also used to define urbanicity. The standard classification of urban/rural areas in New Zealand (35) is a five-point scale: 1) Main urban (centred on a city or major urban area, population of at least 30,000), 2) secondary urban (centred on larger regional centres, population 10,000-29,999), 3) minor urban (centred around smaller towns, population 1,000-9,999), 4) rural centre (population 300-999) and 5) other rural (population <300). These were collapsed into two groups: urban (main urban, secondary urban, and minor urban area) and rural (rural centre and other rural).

Residence changes

The total number of different addresses lived at from birth to fourth birthday (minus one to give the number of changes) was calculated from the address notification table in IDI which collates address updates reported to data providers.

Hospitalisations

The following variables were obtained from hospital records: total number of hospital admissions (excluding the child's birth and any emergency department visits that did not result in hospital admission) from birth to fourth birthday; the total number of days spent in hospital for those visits; total number of emergency department visits from birth to fourth birthday.

GP enrolment

The extent to which a child had continuous enrolment with a general practitioner was estimated by counting the number of quarters in which a child was enrolled with a Primary Health Organisation (umbrella organisations for general practitioners) from birth to fourth birthday.

Disability

Children who received a referral to Disability Support Services before their fourth birthday were classified as having a disability.

Information from birth record

Birth records were available for 94.1% of the total sample. The following variables were obtained from the child's birth record: the child's birth weight, in grams; gestational age, categorised into <37 weeks, 37-42 weeks, and >42 weeks; whether or not a father was recorded on the child's birth certificate; age of the child's mother at the time of the child's birth, grouped into under 20; 20-24; 25-29; 30-34; 35 and over.

Variables from census records

Additional variables were obtained by linking to census records. Household variables were obtained by linking to the household form connected to the child's census record, 82.9% of children had census household information available. Mother and father variables were obtained by first linking to the child's birth record to identify mother and father, and then linking to census records for the mother and father. 79.8% of children had mother census information available; 68.5% had father census information available. All census variables are recorded as at Census day (5 March 2013). The variables from Census were: size of household (including child), grouped into: 2 to 4 people; 5 to 7 people; 8 or more people; whether the dwelling was rented or owned (including those held in family trusts); whether or not any member of the child's household received benefit income in the year to 5 March 2013; whether or not the child's mother spoke enough English to have a conversation about everyday things; the highest qualification of the child's mother and father at the time of the 2013 census, classified into: no formal qualifications; high school qualifications; tertiary qualification below Bachelor degree; Bachelor degree or higher; the current smoking status of the child's mother at the time of the census, classified into: current regular smoker; ex-smoker; never smoked.

Analysis

All analyses were conducted using SAS Enterprise Guide version 9 within the secure data lab environment. First, we constructed the population, and calculated rates of those who completed components (VHT, nurse checks, SDQT) of the B4SC. Second, we compared the characteristics of those who did not complete a component compared to those who did by

1
2
3 fitting logistic regression models in which B4SC completion was modelled as a function of the
4
5 relevant predictor. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals were calculated from the logistic
6
7 regression coefficients.
8
9

10 11 12 13 **Patient and public involvement**

14
15 Patients and public were not involved in the design or conduct of this study.
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

Results

Table 1 shows the total number of children in the denominator (eligible) population for each year, and the number and percentage of children who completed the VHT, nurse and SDQT components of the B4SC, by year. In all years, completion was highest for the VHT component and lowest for the SDQ Teacher component. Approximately 52% to 62% of children completed the SDQ Teacher component, compared to 78% to 87% for the nurse components and 86% to 91% for the VHT components. Coverage was lowest in 2011/12 and highest in 2014/15.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Tables 2 and 3 show the associations between completion of each B4SC component for 2011/12 to 2014/15 (all years combined), and a range of characteristics. Sociodemographic characteristics are reported in Table 1 and health and perinatal characteristics in Table 2. The tables show the number and percentage of children completing each B4SC component, the odds ratio and 95% confidence intervals.

Most of the sociodemographic characteristics presented in Table 1 were significantly associated with B4SC completion. Children were more likely to complete a check if they: were of European (compared to not European) or Asian (compared to not Asian) ethnicity; had fewer siblings; came from areas of lower socioeconomic deprivation; had a mother with a Bachelor degree; had mothers aged 30-34; lived in a home that was owned rather than rented; lived in a smaller (2-4 person) household; and lived in a household that does not receive benefit income.

1
2
3 The health and perinatal characteristics presented in Table 2 were all significantly associated
4 with B4SC completion. Children were more likely to complete a B4SC if they: had a mother that
5 had never smoked; weighed between 2500 and 4000 grams at birth; had a gestational age of
6 between 37 and 42 weeks; were not referred for disability support; spent more time enrolled
7 with a GP; had lower numbers of hospital and emergency department admissions and spent
8 fewer days in hospital.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 INSERT TABLE 2 HERE
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

Discussion

Our results demonstrate that Māori and Pacific children, those in poorer socioeconomic circumstances, and with poorer health are less likely to complete the B4SC. Children living in areas of higher socioeconomic deprivation, without a father named on the birth certificate, with mothers and fathers with lower levels of education, living in households with 5 or more people, having multiple changes in residence in the early years of life and living in rental accommodation have a lower likelihood of B4SC completion. Children with indicators of poor health outcomes including having a mother who smokes and having a low birth weight also have a lower likelihood of B4SC completion. Given that these factors tend to be associated with poorer child health outcomes (36, 37), our results paint a consistent pattern, demonstrating that across a wide range of measures of vulnerability, those children who would potentially most benefit from a B4SC screen and the referrals to interventions are less likely to participate.

A strength of this study is the large, linked dataset that was used (the Integrated Data Infrastructure, IDI). The IDI is a whole population data source and therefore it allows us to include children who are often excluded from other analyses, such as those not in regular contact with health services. Furthermore, the large number of data sources included in the IDI allows us to examine a wider range of characteristics than would be available in any single source.

While this study is novel, and provides vital information for service providers, all of the analyses presented in this paper are bivariate. It is likely that children who are disadvantaged in one area are also at a disadvantage in other areas (that is, the predictors of B4SC completion are correlated). Multivariate analysis would provide more detailed information about the joint or relative impact of different predictors on B4 School check completion. However, to run multivariate analysis we would have to restrict our sample to children born in NZ, with a mother and father

1 who completed 2013 census. These restrictions would reduce the sample to less than 70% of the
2 total sample and would exclude all migrants, making the results difficult to generalise to the whole
3 population. For this reason we have chosen not to undertake multivariate analysis in this paper.
4
5
6
7

8
9
10 Our findings are consistent with existing literature on the coverage of child health checks (14-16),
11 and provide further support for the inverse care law – that those with the greatest need are the
12 least likely to seek services (17). There is currently very little research in this area for child health
13 screens, but the application of the inverse care law is a consistent finding among free health
14 checks for the adult population (8-13). However, the reasons why people most in need do not
15 attend are not well understood, and there is a need for qualitative research investigating why
16 parents are not taking children to free health checks.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Several potential explanations for non-attendance at adult health checks have been put forward
30 that may be applicable to child health checks including lack of awareness, time constraints and
31 access issues (10), and misunderstanding the purpose/scepticism. Focus groups conducted with
32 low income Māori and Pacific parents have identified concerns about relevance of the B4SC
33 checks, children and parents being judged, and language and cultural understanding as potential
34 barriers to participation (38). Lack of awareness of the checks was also identified as a problem, and
35 this may be a particular issue for children who are not enrolled on the PHO system (5% of children)
36 or who have incorrect address information and thus do not receive the invitation letter. Access
37 could also be an issue with many of the B4 School checks being carried out by Plunket or other
38 health services which are only open during normal office hours, and not at weekends (38, 39).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52 Therefore, households where both parents work, or single-parent working households will not
53 easily be able to attend. Furthermore, for less densely populated regions in New Zealand there are
54 fewer centres offering B4 School checks, compared to more densely populated regions such as
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Auckland, Wellington or Christchurch (39), meaning it is less convenient to attend. Scepticism
2
3 about the value of attending and the purpose of the screens is likely to differ by ethnic group, as
4
5 research persistently demonstrates that Māori receive a poorer quality and slower service, and are
6
7 less likely to receive appropriate levels of care (40-42). There are similar findings for Pacific peoples
8
9 also (43-45). Therefore these groups may be less trusting of the New Zealand health system (46).
10
11
12
13
14

15 Socioeconomic and ethnic inequalities in health-seeking and health outcomes within New Zealand
16
17 are well documented for both the adult and child population (44, 45, 47). A long standing objective
18
19 of the New Zealand government is to reduce health and socio-economic disparities, particularly for
20
21 Māori and Pacific families. Patterns of participation at the B4SC could be reinforcing existing ethnic
22
23 and socioeconomic disparities. Early intervention is one means of reducing inequities (48, 49).
24
25

26 Although evidence for the effectiveness of childhood screening is mixed, at present it appears that
27
28 any potential benefits that do result from the B4SC will be unevenly distributed across ethnic and
29
30 socioeconomic groups. Improving B4SC participation would be a cost-effective path towards
31
32 converging outcomes and would ensure that any benefits from the screen are reaching children
33
34 who are most at risk of later health concerns.
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Although 100% attendance in the B4SC is unlikely, we believe that a greater effort is required to
42
43 reach the most vulnerable families to ensure that more children who would benefit from the B4SC
44
45 will get access to the interventions that arise from it. This will require greater outreach and public
46
47 awareness, but also examining whether access and cultural relevance of the B4SC could be
48
49 improved.
50
51
52
53

54 An area where there has been some success in getting increased services to hard-to-reach
55
56 populations has been through mobile programs and services (50, 51). For example, in America
57
58
59
60

1
2 community health vans have shown success in reaching underserved populations such a low-
3
4 income minority groups and immigrants for a range of health needs including earlier access to
5
6 prenatal care and disease prevention screening (52-54). The Family Van run by Harvard Medical
7
8 School offers a diverse range of health services, and has saved an estimated \$2.8 million in avoided
9
10 emergency room visits over the last 5 years with an estimated \$23 saving per \$1 spent (55). In
11
12 addition, direct contact with those not participating should be considered with a greater push to
13
14 ensure that those with characteristics of vulnerability are encouraged to attend. Further research
15
16 is necessary on barriers to attendance identified and remedial action taken.
17
18
19
20

21 We have not followed children to determine whether missing a B4SC does in fact have an impact
22
23 on later life outcomes, and this clearly needs to be assessed. We plan to address this question in
24
25 future work, although the limited time series for the B4SC means that we will only be able to
26
27 examine outcomes up to age 15.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Conclusion**

35
36 Using a rich and diverse range of measures, we find that children with indicators of socioeconomic
37
38 deprivation or poor health are less likely to participate in the B4SC and as such they may miss
39
40 referrals for programs and interventions that may increase their readiness to enter school. We
41
42 believe the patterns we observe in B4SC participation suggest a potential reinforcing of existing
43
44 inequalities and require increased effort to ensure that all children are tested and screened, and
45
46 that those with the greatest need get access to health services, programmes and interventions.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Footnotes

Contributorship statement

8 RA, BM, BT and SG conceived the study. SG extracted data and did the main data analysis. NS
9 provided statistical advice. All authors wrote and reviewed the manuscript, gave critical feedback
10 and approved the final version for publication.
11
12
13
14
15

Competing interests

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

None.

Data sharing statement

Due to privacy regulations around the Integrated Data Infrastructure, data from this study are not available for sharing.

Ethical approval: This study was approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee (ref D16/088).

References

1. Wilson P, Wood R, Lykke K, Hauskov Graungaard A, Ertmann RK, Andersen MK, et al. International variation in programmes for assessment of children's neurodevelopment in the community: Understanding disparate approaches to evaluation of motor, social, emotional, behavioural and cognitive function. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*. 2018.
2. Welch NM, Saulsbury FT, Kesler RW. The value of the preschool examination in screening for health problems. *The Journal of Pediatrics*. 1982;100(2):232-4.
3. Hall DM, Stewart-Brown S. Screening in child health. *British Medical Bulletin*. 1998;54(4):929-43.
4. Ministry of Health. Well Child / Tamariki Ora Programme Practitioner Handbook: Supporting families and whānau to promote their child's health and development – Revised 2014. Wellington: Ministry of Health; 2013.
5. Ministry of Health. About primary health organisations 2018 [Available from: <https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/primary-health-care/about-primary-health-organisations>.]
6. Ministry of Health. B4 School Check information for the health sector 2016 [Available from: <http://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/life-stages/child-health/b4-school-check/b4-school-check-information-health-sector>.]
7. Ministry of Health. Access to primary care as at October 2015: New Zealand Government; 2017 [Available from: <https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/primary-health-care/about-primary-health-organisations/enrolment-primary-health-organisation>.]
8. Sogaard AJ, Selmer R, Bjertness E, Thelle D. The Oslo Health Study: The impact of self-selection in a large, population-based survey. *International Journal for Equity in Health*. 2004;3(1):3.
9. Holland C, Cooper Y, Shaw R, Pattison H, Cooke R. Effectiveness and uptake of screening programmes for coronary heart disease and diabetes: a realist review of design components used in interventions. *BMJ Open*. 2013;3(11).
10. Harte E, MacLure C, Martin A, Meads C, Walter FM, Griffin SJ, et al. Reasons why people do not attend NHS Health Checks: a systematic review and qualitative synthesis. *The British Journal of General Practice*. 2018;68(666):e28-35.
11. Hoebel J, Starker A, Jordan S, Richter M, Lampert T. Determinants of health check attendance in adults: findings from the cross-sectional German Health Update (GEDA) study. *BMC Public Health*. 2014;14(1):913.
12. Dryden R, Williams B, McCowan C, Themessl-Huber M. What do we know about who does and does not attend general health checks? Findings from a narrative scoping review. *BMC Public Health*. 2012;12(1):723.
13. Waller D, Agass M, Mant D, Coulter A, Fuller A, Jones L. Health checks in general practice: another example of inverse care? *BMJ*. 1990;300(6732):1115-8.
14. Freed GL, Clark SJ, Pathman DE, Schectman R. Influences on the receipt of well-child visits in the first two years of life. *Pediatrics*. 1999;103(Supplement 1):864-9.
15. Wood R, Stirling A, Nolan C, Chalmers J, Blair M. Trends in the coverage of 'universal' child health reviews: observational study using routinely available data. *BMJ Open*. 2012;2(2).
16. Søndergaard G, Biering-Sørensen S, Ishøy Michelsen S, Schnor O, Nybo Andersen AM. Non-participation in preventive child health examinations at the general practitioner in Denmark: a register-based study. *Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care*. 2008;26(1):5-11.
17. Hart T. The inverse care law. *Lancet*. 1971;297:405-12.
18. National Research Council. Early Childhood Assessment: Why, What, and How. Snow CE, Van Hemel SB, editors. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2008. 500 p.
19. Alexander KE, Mazza D. The Healthy Kids Check—is it evidence-based? *Medical Journal of Australia*. 2010;192(4):207.
20. Guevara JP, Gerdes M, Localio R, Huang YV, Pinto-Martin J, Minkovitz CS, et al. Effectiveness of developmental screening in an urban setting. *Pediatrics*. 2013;130(1):30-7.

- 1 21. US Preventive Services Task Force. Screening and interventions for overweight in children
2 and adolescents: recommendation statement. *Pediatrics*. 2005;116(1):205-9.
- 3 22. Statistics New Zealand. Integrated Data Infrastructure [Available from:
4 <https://www.stats.govt.nz/integrated-data/integrated-data-infrastructure/>.]
- 5 23. Ministry of Health. The B4 School Check: A handbook for practitioners. Wellington:
6 Ministry of Health; 2008.
- 7 24. Ministry of Health. B4 School Check information for early learning services 2015
8 [Available from: [https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/life-stages/child-health/b4-school-check/b4-](https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/life-stages/child-health/b4-school-check/b4-school-check-information-early-learning-services)
9 [school-check-information-early-learning-services.](https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/life-stages/child-health/b4-school-check/b4-school-check-information-early-learning-services)]
- 10 25. Ministry of Education. Indicator Report: Prior Participation in ECE. Wellington: Ministry of
11 Education; 2017.
- 12 26. Ministry of Health. District Health Boards [Available from:
13 [https://www.health.govt.nz/new-zealand-health-system/key-health-sector-organisations-and-](https://www.health.govt.nz/new-zealand-health-system/key-health-sector-organisations-and-people/district-health-boards)
14 [people/district-health-boards.](https://www.health.govt.nz/new-zealand-health-system/key-health-sector-organisations-and-people/district-health-boards)]
- 15 27. Ministry of Health. Personal communication: B4 School completion rates by ethnicity. 2017.
- 16 28. Zhao J, Gibb S, Jackson R, Mehta S, Exeter DJ. Constructing whole of population cohorts
17 for health and social research using the New Zealand Integrated Data Infrastructure. *Australian and*
18 *New Zealand Journal of Public Health*. 2018.
- 19 29. Gibb S, Bycroft C, Matheson-Dunning N. Identifying the New Zealand resident population
20 in the Integrated Data Infrastructure (IDI). Wellington: Statistics New Zealand; 2016.
- 21 30. Black A. The IDI prototype spine's creation and coverage. Wellington, New Zealand:
22 Statistics New Zealand; 2016.
- 23 31. Reid G, Bycroft C, Gleisner F. Comparison of ethnicity information in administrative data
24 and the census. Wellington, New Zealand: Statistics New Zealand; 2016.
- 25 32. Fahy KM, Lee A, Milne BJ. New Zealand socio-economic index 2013. 2017.
- 26 33. Atkinson J, Salmond C, Crampton P. NZDep2013 index of deprivation. Wellington:
27 Ministry of Health; 2014.
- 28 34. Statistics New Zealand. Statistical Standard for Meshblock [Available from:
29 [http://archive.stats.govt.nz/methods/classifications-and-standards/classification-related-stats-](http://archive.stats.govt.nz/methods/classifications-and-standards/classification-related-stats-standards/meshblock.aspx)
30 [standards/meshblock.aspx.](http://archive.stats.govt.nz/methods/classifications-and-standards/classification-related-stats-standards/meshblock.aspx)]
- 31 35. Statistics New Zealand. Classifications and related statistical standards: Urban Area
32 Statistics New Zealand, 2016 [Available from: [http://www.stats.govt.nz/methods/classifications-and-](http://www.stats.govt.nz/methods/classifications-and-standards/classification-related-stats-standards/urban-area.aspx)
33 [standards/classification-related-stats-standards/urban-area.aspx.](http://www.stats.govt.nz/methods/classifications-and-standards/classification-related-stats-standards/urban-area.aspx)]
- 34 36. Ministry of Health. Annual Data Explorer 2016/17: New Zealand Health Survey 2017
35 [Available from: [https://minhealthnz.shinyapps.io/nz-health-survey-2016-17-annual-update.](https://minhealthnz.shinyapps.io/nz-health-survey-2016-17-annual-update/)]
- 36 37. Morton S, Grant C, Berry SD, Walker C, Corkin M, Ly K, et al. Growing Up in New
37 Zealand: A longitudinal study of New Zealand children and their families. *Now We Are Four:*
38 *Describing the preschool years*. 2017.
- 39 38. Premium Research Limited. Before School Checks Consumer Research: Report
40 commissioned by the Health Promotion Agency. Wellington: Health Promotion Agency; 2014.
- 41 39. Ministry of Health. Find a Well Child Tamariki Ora provider 2016 [Available from:
42 [https://www.health.govt.nz/your-health/pregnancy-and-kids/services-and-support-you-and-your-](https://www.health.govt.nz/your-health/pregnancy-and-kids/services-and-support-you-and-your-child/well-child-tamariki-ora-visits/find-well-child-tamariki-ora-provider)
43 [child/well-child-tamariki-ora-visits/find-well-child-tamariki-ora-provider](https://www.health.govt.nz/your-health/pregnancy-and-kids/services-and-support-you-and-your-child/well-child-tamariki-ora-visits/find-well-child-tamariki-ora-provider)]
- 44 40. Sadler L, Priest P, Peters J, Crengle S, Jackson R. Cervical cancer audit report. 2000.
- 45 41. Ministry of Health. Report on Maternity: Maternal and newborn information 2003. .
46 Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Health; 2006.
- 47 42. Davis P, Lay-Yee R, Dyall L, Briant R, Sporle A, Brunt D, et al. Quality of hospital care for
48 Māori patients in New Zealand: retrospective cross-sectional assessment. *The Lancet*.
49 2006;367(9526):1920-5.
- 50 43. Jeffreys M, Stevanovic V, Tobias M, Lewis C, Ellison-Loschmann L, Pearce N, et al. Ethnic
51 inequalities in cancer survival in New Zealand: linkage study. *American Journal of Public Health*.
52 2005;95(5):834-7.

- 1 44. Lee CH, Duck IM, Sibley CG. Ethnic inequality in diagnosis with depression and anxiety
2 disorders. *The New Zealand Medical Journal*. 2017;130(1454):10-20.
- 3 45. Pledger MJ, Cumming J, Burnette M, Daubé J. Unmet need of GP services in Pacific people
4 and other New Zealanders. *Clinical Correspondence*. 2011.
- 5 46. Ministry of Social Development. *The Social Report 2016 – Te pūrongo oranga tangata*.
6 Wellington: Ministry of Social Development; 2016.
- 7 47. Simpson J, Duncanson M, Oben G, Adams J, Wicken A, Pierson M, et al. *The Health Status
8 of Pacific Children and Young People in New Zealand 2015 (Pacific Child and Youth Health)* New
9 Zealand Child and Youth Epidemiology Service; 2017.
- 10 48. Irwin LG, Siddiqi A, Hertzman G. *Early child development: A powerful equalizer: Human
11 Early Learning Partnership (HELP)* Vancouver, BC; 2007.
- 12 49. Spencer N. European Society for Social Pediatrics and Child Health (ESSOP)* Position
13 Statement: Social inequalities in child health—towards equity and social justice in child health
14 outcomes. *Child: Care, Health and Development*. 2008;34(5):631-4.
- 15 50. Yu SW, Hill C, Ricks ML, Bennet J, Oriol NE. The scope and impact of mobile health
16 clinics in the United States: a literature review. *International Journal for Equity in Health*.
17 2017;16(1):178.
- 18 51. Brown-Connolly NE, Concha JB, English J. Mobile health is worth it! Economic benefit
19 and impact on health of a population-based mobile screening program in new Mexico. *Telemedicine
20 and e-Health*. 2014;20(1):18-23.
- 21 52. Edgerley LP, El-Sayed YY, Druzin ML, Kiernan M, Daniels KI. Use of a community mobile
22 health van to increase early access to prenatal care. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*.
23 2007;11(3):235-9.
- 24 53. O’Connell E, Zhang G, Leguen F, Prince J. Impact of a mobile van on prenatal care
25 utilization and birth outcomes in Miami-Dade County. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*.
26 2010;14(4):528-34.
- 27 54. Hill C, Zurakowski D, Bennet J, Walker-White R, Osman JL, Quarles A, et al.
28 Knowledgeable Neighbors: a mobile clinic model for disease prevention and screening in
29 underserved communities. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2012;102(3):406-10.
- 30 55. The Family Van: Harvard Medical School. Our impact 2018 [Available from:
31 [http://www.familyvan.org/impact/.](http://www.familyvan.org/impact/)]
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. Percentage of children completing B4SC components, by year

Fiscal year	N	N (%) VHT ^a complete	N (%) nurse ^b checks complete	N (%) SDQ ^c Teacher complete
2011/12	63,714	54,924 (86.2)	49,986 (78.5)	33,690 (52.9)
2012/13	62,664	55,344 (88.5)	50,814 (81.4)	35,433 (57.3)
2013/14	63,372	57,294 (90.5)	54,183 (85.6)	37,881 (60.0)
2014/15	62,529	57,282 (91.8)	54,348 (87.2)	38,379 (62.1)

^a VHT = vision and hearing checks

^b Nurse = dental, growth, immunisations, PEDS (Parent Evaluation of Developmental Status), SDQ-P (Strengths and difficulties questionnaire – Parent) check

^c SDQ = Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire

Table 2. Percentage of children completing B4SC, and odds ratios for completing, by sociodemographic, family and housing characteristics

	N (%)	N (%) complete			OR (95% CI)		
		VHT ^a	Nurse ^b checks	SDQ ^c Teacher	VHT	Nurse checks	SDQ Teacher
Sex							
Male	129,831 (51.5)	115,611 (89.0)	107,565 (82.9)	74,754 (57.6)	0.98 (1.01,0.96)	0.98 (1.00,0.96)	1.00 (1.01,0.98)
Female	122,439 (48.5)	109,227 (89.2)	101,766 (83.1)	70,629 (57.7)	-	-	-
missing	0 (0.0)						
Ethnicity							
Māori	71,196 (28.2)	60,714 (85.3)	55,491 (77.9)	37,575 (52.8)	0.60 (0.61,0.58)	0.63 (0.64,0.61)	0.76 (0.78,0.75)
Pacific	37,857 (15.0)	31,788 (84.0)	29,436 (77.8)	14,004 (37.0)	0.58 (0.60,0.56)	0.67 (0.69,0.65)	0.37 (0.38,0.36)
Asian	30,825 (12.2)	28,116 (91.2)	26,745 (86.8)	16,110 (52.3)	1.30 (1.35,1.25)	1.39 (1.45,1.35)	0.78 (0.80,0.76)
European	173,235 (68.7)	157,269 (90.8)	146,526 (84.6)	109,842 (63.4)	1.67 (1.72,1.64)	1.41 (1.45,1.39)	2.13 (2.17,2.08)
missing	0 (0.0)						
Number of siblings at time of birth							

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

0	123,123 (48.8)	110,223 (89.5)	103,509 (84.1)	71,829 (58.3)	-	-	-
1	70,626 (28.0)	64,260 (91.0)	59,877 (84.8)	42,615 (60.3)	1.18 (1.22,1.15)	1.05 (1.09,1.03)	1.09 (1.11,1.06)
2+	43,527 (17.3)	37,413 (86.0)	34,053 (78.2)	22,782 (52.3)	0.71 (0.74,0.69)	0.68 (0.70,0.66)	0.78 (0.80,0.77)
missing	15,003 (5.9)						

Socioeconomic deprivation

NZDep quintile

1 (least deprived)	50,520 (20.0)	46,584 (92.2)	43,530 (86.2)	32,199 (63.7)	-	-	-
2	46,323 (18.4)	42,150 (91.0)	39,282 (84.8)	28,182 (60.8)	0.85 (0.89,0.81)	0.89 (0.93,0.86)	0.88 (0.91,0.86)
3	45,672 (18.1)	41,145 (90.1)	38,199 (83.6)	27,810 (60.9)	0.77 (0.80,0.74)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)	0.88 (0.91,0.86)
4	47,043 (18.6)	41,736 (88.7)	38,895 (82.7)	27,423 (58.3)	0.66 (0.69,0.64)	0.77 (0.79,0.74)	0.79 (0.81,0.78)
5 (most deprived)	61,854 (24.5)	52,848 (85.4)	49,080 (79.3)	29,502 (47.7)	0.50 (0.52,0.48)	0.62 (0.64,0.60)	0.52 (0.53,0.51)
missing	867 (0.3)						

Mother's highest qualification

No formal qualifications	27,672 (11.0)	24,012 (86.8)	22,452 (81.1)	15,213 (55.0)	0.48 (0.51,0.46)	0.61 (0.63,0.58)	0.68 (0.70,0.66)
--------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

1								
2								
3								
4	Secondary school	67,047	60,861	57,180	40,173	0.72	0.82	0.83
5		(26.6)	(90.8)	(85.3)	(59.9)	(0.75,0.69)	(0.85,0.79)	(0.85,0.81)
6								
7	Tertiary qualification below	41,901	38,430	35,868	25,452	0.81	0.84	0.86
8	Bachelor degree	(16.6)	(91.7)	(85.6)	(60.7)	(0.85,0.78)	(0.87,0.81)	(0.88,0.84)
9								
10	Bachelor degree or higher	57,570	53,631	50,442	36,972	-	-	-
11		(22.8)	(93.2)	(87.6)	(64.2)			
12	missing	58,089						
13		(23.0)						
14								
15								
16	Father highest qualification							
17								
18	No formal qualification	26,712	23,784	22,251	15,549	0.65	0.73	0.82
19		(10.6)	(89.0)	(83.3)	(58.2)	(0.68,0.61)	(0.76,0.70)	(0.85,0.79)
20								
21	Secondary school	51,177	46,866	44,094	30,960	0.86	0.91	0.90
22		(20.3)	(91.6)	(86.2)	(60.5)	(0.91,0.82)	(0.94,0.88)	(0.93,0.88)
23								
24	Tertiary qualification below	47,391	43,878	41,253	30,579	0.99	0.98	1.06
25	Bachelor degree	(18.8)	(92.6)	(87.0)	(64.5)	(1.04,0.94)	(1.02,0.94)	(1.10,1.04)
26								
27	Bachelor degree or higher	39,447	36,546	34,413	24,840	-	-	-
28		(15.6)	(92.6)	(87.2)	(63.0)			
29	missing	87,552						
30		(34.7)						
31								
32								
33	Member of household receives benefit income							
34								
35	No	158,679	147,216	138,420	100,071	-	-	-
36		(62.9)	(92.8)	(87.2)	(63.1)			
37								
38	Yes	51,720	45,438	42,093	27,339	0.56	0.64	0.66
39		(20.5)	(87.9)	(81.4)	(52.9)	(0.58,0.55)	(0.66,0.63)	(0.67,0.65)
40								

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

missing 41,880
(16.6)

Family circumstances

Age of mother at child's birth

<20	14,310 (5.7)	11,910 (83.2)	10,983 (76.8)	7,104 (49.6)	0.48 (0.51,0.46)	0.56 (0.59,0.54)	0.64 (0.66,0.62)
20-24	41,889 (16.6)	36,333 (86.7)	33,624 (80.3)	22,518 (53.8)	0.63 (0.66,0.61)	0.69 (0.72,0.67)	0.75 (0.77,0.74)
25-29	55,800 (22.1)	49,950 (89.5)	46,698 (83.7)	32,247 (57.8)	0.83 (0.86,0.79)	0.88 (0.90,0.85)	0.88 (0.91,0.87)
30-34	66,297 (26.3)	60,441 (91.2)	56,631 (85.4)	40,233 (60.7)	-	-	-
35+	58,977 (23.4)	53,259 (90.3)	49,500 (83.9)	35,121 (59.6)	0.90 (0.93,0.87)	0.89 (0.92,0.86)	0.95 (0.97,0.93)
missing	15,006 (5.9)						

Father on birth certificate

No	196,248 (77.8)	10,467 (83.0)	9,567 (75.9)	5,763 (45.7)	0.56 (0.59,0.53)	0.61 (0.64,0.59)	0.60 (0.62,0.57)
Yes	3,483 (1.4)	201,429 (89.7)	187,872 (83.6)	131,463 (58.5)	-	-	-
missing	52,548 (20.8)						

1
2
3
4 **Mother speaks English**

5								
6	No	3,483	3,102	2,973	1,617	0.81	1.00	0.56
7		(1.4)	(89.1)	(85.4)	(46.4)	(0.90,0.72)	(1.10,0.92)	(0.60,0.53)
8	Yes	196,248	178,578	167,448	119,013	-	-	-
9		(77.8)	(91.0)	(85.3)	(60.6)			
10	missing	52,548						
11		(20.8)						

12
13
14
15 **Housing**

16								
17	Urban	35,838	31,767	29,565	23,832	-	-	-
18		(14.2)	(88.6)	(82.5)	(66.5)			
19	Rural	215,775	192,864	179,577	121,410	0.93	0.95	1.54
20		(85.5)	(89.4)	(83.2)	(56.3)	(0.96,0.89)	(0.98,0.93)	(1.59,1.52)
21	missing	666						
22		(0.3)						

23
24
25
26 **Household size**

27								
28	2-4 people	120,849	112,266	105,930	77,817	-	-	-
29		(47.9)	(92.9)	(87.7)	(64.4)			
30	5-7 people	77,808	70,464	65,388	44,976	0.74	0.74	0.76
31		(30.8)	(90.6)	(84.0)	(57.8)	(0.76,0.71)	(0.76,0.72)	(0.77,0.75)
32	8+ people	11,739	9,921	9,195	4,617	0.42	0.51	0.36
33		(4.7)	(84.5)	(78.3)	(39.3)	(0.44,0.40)	(0.53,0.49)	(0.37,0.34)
34	missing	41,883						
35		(16.6)						

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

Own home	112,458 (44.6)	105,333 (93.7)	99,384 (88.4)	72,561 (64.5)	-	-	-
Rented home	93,840 (37.2)	83,745 (89.2)	77,823 (82.9)	52,911 (56.4)	0.56 (0.58,0.54)	0.64 (0.65,0.63)	0.71 (0.72,0.70)
missing	45,981 (18.2)						

Number of residence changes age 0-4

None	52,602 (20.9)	47,184 (89.7)	44,745 (85.1)	32,124 (61.1)	-	-	-
1	55,359 (21.9)	51,327 (92.7)	48,315 (87.3)	33,813 (61.1)	1.47 (1.52,1.41)	1.20 (1.25,1.16)	1.00 (1.02,0.98)
2	42,087 (16.7)	38,481 (91.4)	35,949 (85.4)	24,696 (58.7)	1.22 (1.28,1.18)	1.03 (1.06,0.99)	0.90 (0.93,0.88)
3	28,320 (11.2)	25,299 (89.3)	23,397 (82.6)	15,963 (56.4)	0.96 (1.01,0.92)	0.83 (0.87,0.80)	0.83 (0.85,0.80)
4	18,675 (7.4)	16,407 (87.9)	14,937 (80.0)	10,236 (54.8)	0.83 (0.88,0.79)	0.70 (0.73,0.67)	0.78 (0.80,0.75)
5+	30,282 (12.0)	25,599 (84.5)	23,181 (76.6)	16,419 (54.2)	0.63 (0.65,0.60)	0.57 (0.60,0.55)	0.76 (0.78,0.74)
missing	24,957 (9.9)						

Note: As individuals can identify as multiple ethnicities, counts for ethnic groups will sum to greater than the count for the total population. The reference groups for ethnicities are people not identifying with that ethnic group (for example, Māori is compared to non-Māori).

^a VHT = vision and hearing checks

1
2
3
4 ^b Nurse = dental, growth, immunisations, PEDS (Parent Evaluation of Developmental Status), SDQ-P (Strengths and difficulties questionnaire – Parent)

5
6 check

7
8 ^c SDQ = Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire
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

For peer review only

Table 3. Percentage of children completing B4SC, and odds ratios for completing, by perinatal and health characteristics

	N	% complete			OR (95% CI)		
		VHT ^a	Nurse ^b checks	SDQ ^c Teacher	VHT	Nurse checks	SDQ Teacher
Mother smoking status							
Regular smoker	38,460 (15.2)	33,366 (86.8)	31,026 (80.7)	21,240 (55.2)	0.56 (0.57,0.53)	0.63 (0.65,0.61)	0.78 (0.79,0.76)
Ex smoker	45,420 (18.0)	41,670 (91.7)	38,925 (85.7)	28,647 (63.1)	0.94 (0.98,0.90)	0.90 (0.93,0.88)	1.08 (1.10,1.05)
Never smoked	111,219 (44.1)	102,540 (92.2)	96,642 (86.9)	68,214 (61.3)	-	-	-
missing	57,180 (22.7)						
Birthweight							
<2500g	14,049 (5.6)	11,751 (83.6)	11,112 (79.1)	7,680 (54.7)	0.57 (0.60,0.55)	0.73 (0.76,0.70)	0.87 (0.90,0.84)
2500-4000g	187,239 (74.2)	168,387 (89.9)	156,939 (83.8)	108,762 (58.1)	-	-	-
>4000g	34,746 (13.8)	31,287 (90.0)	28,947 (83.3)	20,496 (59.0)	1.01 (1.05,0.97)	0.96 (0.99,0.93)	1.04 (1.06,1.01)
missing	16,245 (6.4)						
Gestation							

1								
2								
3								
4	<37 weeks	17,925	15,105	14,256	9,888	0.60	0.76	0.88
5		(7.1)	(84.3)	(79.5)	(55.2)	(0.63,0.57)	(0.79,0.73)	(0.91,0.85)
6								
7	37-42 weeks	217,128	195,228	181,734	126,483	-	-	-
8		(86.1)	(89.9)	(83.7)	(58.3)			
9								
10	>42 weeks	1,443	1,299	1,200	0,696	1.00	0.97	0.67
11		(0.6)	(90.0)	(83.2)	(48.2)	(1.19,0.85)	(1.11,0.84)	(0.75,0.61)
12								
13	missing	15,783						
14		(6.3)						
15								
16	Child referred for disability							
17	support assessment							
18								
19	No	247,878	221,568	206,451	143,463	-	-	-
20		(98.3)	(89.4)	(83.3)	(57.9)			
21								
22	Yes	4,401	3,270	2,880	1,917	0.34	0.38	0.56
23		(1.7)	(74.3)	(65.4)	(43.6)	(0.37,0.32)	(0.40,0.36)	(0.60,0.53)
24								
25	missing	0						
26		(0.0)						
27								
28	Number of quarters enrolled with GP							
29	age 0-4							
30								
31	0-3	9,438	5,328	4,464	2,826	0.10	0.13	0.29
32		(3.7)	(56.5)	(47.3)	(29.9)	(0.11,0.10)	(0.13,0.12)	(0.30,0.27)
33								
34	4-7	37,671	32,592	29,547	20,919	0.52	0.52	0.83
35		(14.9)	(86.5)	(78.4)	(55.5)	(0.54,0.50)	(0.54,0.51)	(0.85,0.81)
36								
37	8-11	92,856	83,955	78,396	55,284	0.76	0.78	0.98
38		(36.8)	(90.4)	(84.4)	(59.5)	(0.79,0.74)	(0.80,0.76)	(1.00,0.96)
39								
40								
41								
42								
43								
44								
45								
46								
47								

12+	97,800 (38.8)	90,510 (92.5)	85,527 (87.5)	58,638 (60.0)	-	-	-
missing	14,505 (5.7)						
Number of hospital admissions age 0-4							
None	93,474 (37.1)	83,109 (88.9)	77,238 (82.6)	53,415 (57.1)	-	-	-
1 to 2	102,696 (40.7)	93,810 (91.3)	87,636 (85.3)	61,803 (60.2)	1.32 (1.35,1.28)	1.22 (1.25,1.19)	1.14 (1.15,1.11)
3 to 5	21,390 (8.5)	19,101 (89.3)	17,937 (83.9)	12,633 (59.1)	1.04 (1.09,0.99)	1.09 (1.14,1.05)	1.09 (1.11,1.05)
6+	9,762 (3.9)	8,277 (84.8)	7,707 (78.9)	5,397 (55.3)	0.69 (0.74,0.65)	0.79 (0.83,0.75)	0.93 (0.97,0.89)
missing	24,957 (9.9)						
Total days in hospital age 0-4							
None	123,231 (48.8)	110,022 (89.3)	102,492 (83.2)	71,280 (57.8)	-	-	-
1 to 9	95,478 (37.8)	86,991 (91.1)	81,243 (85.1)	57,501 (60.2)	1.23 (1.27,1.19)	1.15 (1.18,1.12)	1.10 (1.12,1.09)
10 to 19	4,953 (2.0)	4,323 (87.3)	4,041 (81.6)	2,664 (53.8)	0.83 (0.90,0.76)	0.90 (0.96,0.83)	0.85 (0.90,0.80)
20+	3,660 (1.5)	2,961 (80.9)	2,742 (74.9)	1,809 (49.4)	0.51 (0.55,0.47)	0.61 (0.65,0.56)	0.71 (0.76,0.67)

missing	24,957 (9.9)						
Total number of ED visits age 0-4							
None	193,905 (76.9)	174,354 (89.9)	162,942 (84.0)	116,460 (60.1)	-	-	-
1 to 2	31,173 (12.4)	27,960 (89.7)	25,791 (82.7)	15,759 (50.6)	0.97 (1.01,0.93)	0.91 (0.94,0.88)	0.68 (0.69,0.66)
3+	2,244 (0.9)	1,980 (88.2)	1,788 (79.7)	1,032 (46.0)	0.84 (0.96,0.74)	0.75 (0.83,0.68)	0.56 (0.61,0.52)
missing	24,957 (9.9)						

Note: As individuals can identify as multiple ethnicities, counts for ethnic groups will sum to greater than the count for the total population. The reference groups for ethnicities are people not identifying with that ethnic group (for example, Māori is compared to non-Māori).

^a VHT = vision and hearing checks

^b Nurse = dental, growth, immunisations, PEDS (Parent Evaluation of Developmental Status), SDQ-P (Strengths and difficulties questionnaire – Parent) check

^c SDQ = Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire

Appendix 1

Sensitivity analysis

The table below shows the effects of:

1. Changing the criteria for inclusion in the population (column 1). In the main analyses, children were included in the population if they were in the IDI spine AND had health or birth records.

Column 1 of the table below shows the results when the population was defined as children who were in the IDI spine OR had birth or health records.

2. Changing the overseas time cut-off for exclusion from the residential mobility and hospitalisation analyses (column 2, differences only apply to hospitalisation and meshblock change variables). In the main analyses, children were excluded if they had spent more than a year overseas. Column 2 of the table below shows the results if all children were included regardless of the amount of time spent overseas.

	Different population				Different overseas cut-off			
	OR (95% CI)				OR (95% CI)			
	N	VHT incomplete	Nurse checks incomplete	SDQ Teacher incomplete	N	VHT incomplete	Nurse checks incomplete	SDQ Teacher incomplete
Sex								
Male	136896	0.98 (1.01,0.96)	0.98 (1.00,0.96)	0.99 (1.01,0.98)	129834	0.98 (1.01,0.96)	0.98 (1.00,0.96)	1.00 (1.01,0.98)
Female	128967	-	-	-	122439	-	-	-
Ethnicity								
Māori	73092	0.76 (0.79,0.75)	0.74 (0.75,0.72)	0.81 (0.82,0.79)	71196	0.60 (0.61,0.58)	0.63 (0.64,0.61)	0.76 (0.78,0.75)
Pacific	39903	0.60 (0.62,0.59)	0.68 (0.69,0.66)	0.38 (0.39,0.37)	37857	0.58 (0.60,0.56)	0.67 (0.69,0.65)	0.37 (0.38,0.36)
Asian	33039	1.09 (1.12,1.04)	1.20 (1.23,1.16)	0.76 (0.78,0.75)	30825	1.30 (1.35,1.25)	1.39 (1.45,1.35)	0.78 (0.80,0.76)
European	180345	1.72 (1.75,1.69)	1.49 (1.52,1.47)	2.13 (2.17,2.13)	173232	1.67 (1.72,1.64)	1.41 (1.45,1.39)	2.13 (2.17,2.08)
	136896	0.98 (1.01,0.96)	0.98 (1.00,0.96)	0.99 (1.01,0.98)	129834	0.98 (1.01,0.96)	0.98 (1.00,0.96)	1.00 (1.01,0.98)
Number of siblings at time of birth								
0	123123	-	-	-	123126	-	-	-
1	70626	1.18 (1.22,1.15)	1.05 (1.09,1.03)	1.09 (1.11,1.06)	70629	1.18 (1.22,1.15)	1.05 (1.09,1.03)	1.09 (1.11,1.06)
2+	43527	0.71 (0.74,0.69)	0.68 (0.70,0.66)	0.78 (0.80,0.77)	43527	0.71 (0.74,0.69)	0.68 (0.70,0.66)	0.78 (0.80,0.77)
Socioeconomic deprivation								
NZDep quintile								
1 (least deprived)	52995	-	-	-	50517			
2	48081	0.89 (0.93,0.86)	0.92 (0.95,0.88)	0.89 (0.92,0.87)	46326	0.85 (0.89,0.81)	0.89 (0.93,0.86)	0.88 (0.91,0.86)

1									
2	3	47283	0.82 (0.85,0.79)	0.85 (0.88,0.82)	0.89 (0.92,0.88)	45672	0.77 (0.80,0.74)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)	0.88 (0.91,0.86)
3									
4	4	48720	0.72 (0.75,0.69)	0.79 (0.82,0.77)	0.81 (0.83,0.79)	47043	0.66 (0.69,0.64)	0.77 (0.79,0.74)	0.79 (0.81,0.78)
5									
6	5 (most deprived)	64308	0.54 (0.56,0.53)	0.64 (0.66,0.62)	0.53 (0.54,0.52)	61854	0.50 (0.52,0.48)	0.62 (0.64,0.60)	0.52 (0.53,0.51)
7									
8									
9	Mother highest qualification								
10									
11	No formal qualifications	27672	0.48 (0.51,0.46)	0.61 (0.63,0.58)	0.68 (0.70,0.66)	27675	0.48 (0.51,0.46)	0.61 (0.63,0.58)	0.68 (0.70,0.66)
12									
13	Secondary school	67047	0.72 (0.75,0.69)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)	0.83 (0.85,0.81)	67047	0.72 (0.75,0.69)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)	0.83 (0.85,0.81)
14									
15	Bachelors degree	41901	0.81 (0.85,0.78)	0.84 (0.87,0.81)	0.86 (0.88,0.84)	41901	0.81 (0.85,0.78)	0.84 (0.87,0.81)	0.86 (0.88,0.84)
16									
17	Postgraduate degree	57570	-	-	-	57570	-	-	-
18									
19									
20									
21	Father highest qualification								
22									
23	No formal qualification	26712	0.65 (0.68,0.61)	0.73 (0.76,0.70)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)	26712	0.65 (0.68,0.61)	0.73 (0.76,0.70)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)
24									
25	Secondary school	51177	0.86 (0.91,0.82)	0.91 (0.94,0.88)	0.90 (0.93,0.88)	51177	0.86 (0.91,0.82)	0.91 (0.94,0.88)	0.90 (0.93,0.88)
26									
27	Bachelors degree	47388	0.99 (1.04,0.94)	0.98 (1.02,0.94)	1.06 (1.10,1.04)	47388	0.99 (1.04,0.94)	0.98 (1.02,0.94)	1.06 (1.10,1.04)
28									
29	Postgraduate degree	39450	-	-	-	39450	-	-	-
30									
31									
32	Member of household receives benefit income								
33									
34	No	159069	-	-	-	158679	-	-	-
35									
36	Yes	51777	0.57 (0.59,0.55)	0.65 (0.66,0.63)	0.66 (0.67,0.65)	51720	0.56 (0.58,0.55)	0.64 (0.66,0.63)	0.66 (0.67,0.65)
37									
38									
39									
40	Family circumstances								
41									
42									
43									
44									
45									
46									

Age of mother at child's birth

			0.48	0.56	0.64		0.48	0.56	0.64
	<20	14313	(0.51,0.46)	(0.59,0.54)	(0.66,0.62)	14313	(0.51,0.46)	(0.59,0.54)	(0.66,0.62)
			0.63	0.69	0.75		0.63	0.69	0.75
	20-24	41889	(0.66,0.61)	(0.72,0.67)	(0.77,0.74)	41889	(0.66,0.61)	(0.72,0.67)	(0.77,0.74)
			0.83	0.88	0.88		0.83	0.88	0.88
	25-29	55800	(0.86,0.79)	(0.90,0.85)	(0.91,0.87)	55800	(0.86,0.79)	(0.90,0.85)	(0.91,0.87)
			-	-	-		-	-	-
	30-34	66297				66297			
			0.90	0.89	0.95		0.90	0.89	0.95
	35+	58977	(0.93,0.87)	(0.92,0.86)	(0.97,0.93)	58974	(0.93,0.87)	(0.92,0.86)	(0.97,0.93)

Father on birth certificate

	No	12612	(0.59,0.53)	(0.64,0.59)	(0.62,0.57)	12612	(0.59,0.53)	(0.64,0.59)	(0.62,0.57)
	Yes	224664	-	-	-	224664	-	-	-

Mother speaks English

	No	3483	(0.90,0.72)	(1.10,0.92)	(0.60,0.53)	3483	(0.90,0.72)	(1.10,0.92)	(0.60,0.53)
	Yes	196248	-	-	-	196248	-	-	-

Housing

	Urban	224976	-	-	-	215775	-	-	-
	Rural	36630	(1.09,1.01)	(1.06,1.00)	(1.61,1.54)	35838	(0.96,0.89)	(0.98,0.93)	(1.59,1.52)

Household size

	2-4 people	121098	-	-	-	120852	-	-	-
			0.74	0.75	0.76		0.74	0.74	0.76
	5-7 people	77961	(0.76,0.71)	(0.76,0.72)	(0.77,0.75)	77808	(0.76,0.71)	(0.76,0.72)	(0.77,0.75)
			0.42	0.51	0.36		0.42	0.51	0.36
	8+ people	11784	(0.44,0.40)	(0.53,0.49)	(0.37,0.34)	11742	(0.44,0.40)	(0.53,0.49)	(0.37,0.34)

1									
2									
3									
4	Own home	112581	-	-	-	112458	-	-	-
5	Rented home	94146	0.56	0.63	0.71	93840	0.56	0.64	0.71
6			(0.57,0.54)	(0.65,0.62)	(0.72,0.69)		(0.58,0.54)	(0.65,0.63)	(0.72,0.70)
7									
8									
9									
10	Number of residence								
11	changes age 0-4								
12									
13	None	61761	-	-	-	62412	-	-	-
14	1	57459	2.86	2.13	1.33	47994	1.16	1.01	0.90
15			(2.94,2.78)	(2.17,2.08)	(1.37,1.30)		(1.22,1.12)	(1.04,0.98)	(0.92,0.88)
16	2	42891	2.86	2.00	1.25	31935	0.96	0.85	0.83
17			(2.94,2.70)	(2.08,1.92)	(1.28,1.22)		(1.00,0.92)	(0.88,0.81)	(0.85,0.81)
18	3	28653	2.33	1.67	1.15	20745	0.85	0.73	0.78
19			(2.44,2.22)	(1.72,1.61)	(1.18,1.11)		(0.90,0.81)	(0.76,0.70)	(0.81,0.76)
20	4	18810	2.04	1.41	1.08	32235	0.66	0.60	0.76
21			(2.13,1.92)	(1.47,1.37)	(1.11,1.04)		(0.68,0.63)	(0.62,0.58)	(0.79,0.75)
22	5+	30447	1.56	1.16	1.05	62412	1.37	1.18	0.99
23			(1.61,1.49)	(1.20,1.12)	(1.09,1.03)		(1.43,1.32)	(1.22,1.14)	(1.01,0.97)
24									
25	Health status								
26									
27	Mother smoking status								
28	Regular smoker	38457	0.56	0.63	0.78	38460	0.56	0.63	0.78
29			(0.57,0.53)	(0.65,0.61)	(0.79,0.76)		(0.57,0.53)	(0.65,0.61)	(0.79,0.76)
30	Ex smoker	45420	0.94	0.90	1.08	45420	0.94	0.90	1.08
31			(0.98,0.90)	(0.93,0.88)	(1.10,1.05)		(0.98,0.90)	(0.93,0.88)	(1.10,1.05)
32	Never smoked	111219	-	-	-	111219	-	-	-
33									
34									
35	Birthweight								
36	<2500g	14049	0.57	0.73	0.87	14049	0.57	0.73	0.87
37			(0.60,0.55)	(0.76,0.70)	(0.90,0.84)		(0.60,0.55)	(0.76,0.70)	(0.90,0.84)
38	2500-4000g	187242	-	-	-	187239	-	-	-
39									
40	>4000g	34746	1.01	0.96	1.04	34749	1.01	0.96	1.04
41			(1.05,0.97)	(0.99,0.93)	(1.06,1.01)		(1.05,0.97)	(0.99,0.93)	(1.06,1.01)
42									
43									
44									
45									
46									

Gestation

<37 weeks	17922	0.60 (0.63,0.57)	0.76 (0.79,0.73)	0.88 (0.91,0.85)	17922	0.60 (0.63,0.57)	0.76 (0.79,0.73)	0.88 (0.91,0.85)
37-42 weeks	217128	-	-	-	217128	-	-	-
>42 weeks	1443	1.00 (1.19,0.85)	0.97 (1.11,0.84)	0.67 (0.75,0.61)	1443	1.00 (1.19,0.85)	0.97 (1.11,0.84)	0.67 (0.75,0.61)

Child referred for disability support assessment

No	261408	-	-	-	247875	-	-	-
Yes	4473	0.46 (0.50,0.43)	0.46 (0.49,0.43)	0.61 (0.65,0.57)	4401	0.34 (0.37,0.32)	0.38 (0.40,0.36)	0.56 (0.60,0.53)

Number of quarters enrolled with GP age 0-4

0-3	25407	0.16 (0.17,0.16)	0.23 (0.24,0.22)	0.41 (0.42,0.39)	16215	0.16 (0.17,0.16)	0.20 (0.21,0.19)	0.42 (0.44,0.41)
4-7	41286	0.74 (0.77,0.72)	0.81 (0.83,0.78)	0.91 (0.93,0.89)	42645	0.53 (0.55,0.51)	0.54 (0.55,0.52)	0.83 (0.85,0.81)
8-11	90621	0.95 (0.98,0.92)	0.97 (1.00,0.94)	0.99 (1.01,0.97)	95298	0.76 (0.79,0.74)	0.78 (0.80,0.76)	0.98 (1.00,1.00)
12+	93174	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Number of hospital admissions age 0-4

None	104382	-	-	-	108081	-	-	-
1 to 2	104280	2.17 (2.22,2.13)	1.75 (1.82,1.72)	1.35 (1.37,1.32)	111288	1.32 (1.35,1.28)	1.23 (1.27,1.20)	1.14 (1.16,1.12)
3 to 5	21528	1.85 (1.92,1.79)	1.64 (1.72,1.59)	1.32 (1.35,1.27)	22668	1.06 (1.11,1.01)	1.11 (1.15,1.06)	1.09 (1.11,1.05)
6+	9834	1.23 (1.32,1.18)	1.19 (1.25,1.14)	1.12 (1.16,1.08)	10242	0.73 (0.77,0.69)	0.82 (0.86,0.78)	0.94 (0.98,0.91)

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

Total days in hospital age 0-4

None	134751	-	-	-	141108	-	-	-
1 to 9	96537	1.92 (1.96,1.85)	1.59 (1.61,1.54)	1.27 (1.30,1.25)	102060	1.23 (1.27,1.20)	1.16 (1.19,1.14)	1.11 (1.12,1.09)
10 to 19	5022	1.28 (1.41,1.19)	1.22 (1.32,1.14)	0.98 (1.03,0.93)	5268	0.83 (0.91,0.77)	0.90 (0.96,0.84)	0.85 (0.90,0.81)
20+	3714	0.81 (0.88,0.75)	0.84 (0.91,0.78)	0.82 (0.88,0.77)	3843	0.53 (0.58,0.49)	0.63 (0.67,0.58)	0.72 (0.77,0.68)

Total number of ED visits age 0-4

None	205911	-	-	-	215601	-	-	-
1 to 2	31854	1.20 (1.37,1.06)	0.96 (1.06,0.87)	0.63 (0.69,0.58)	34218	0.99 (1.02,0.95)	0.93 (0.95,0.90)	0.69 (0.71,0.68)
3+	2262	0.98 (1.01,0.96)	0.98 (1.00,0.96)	0.99 (1.01,0.98)	2457	0.85 (0.95,0.75)	0.76 (0.85,0.69)	0.58 (0.63,0.54)

Appendix 2Percentage of children completing each component of B4SC, by year

	% of children completing check			
B4 School check	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
Vision	86.8	88.7	90.7	91.8
Hearing	86.8	88.6	90.6	91.8
Dental	79.4	82.1	86.7	88.4
Growth	79.4	82.1	86.7	88.4
Immunisation	79.1	81.9	86.3	87.9
PEDS	79.4	82.1	86.6	88.4
SDQP	79.3	81.9	86.5	88.2
SDQT	52.9	56.5	59.8	61.4

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1 (title)
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5,6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	8
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	8
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	9-11
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	10-11
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	11-15
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	11-15
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	11, APPENDIX 2
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	11
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	11-15
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	15-16
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	N/A
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	N/A
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	N/A
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	11, APPENDIX 2
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	11
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	11
		(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	12-14, Tables 2 and 3
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Tables 2 and 3
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	Tables 2 and 3
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	Tables 2 and 3
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	11-15
		(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	APPENDIX 2
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	19
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	19-20
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	20-21
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	19
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	23

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

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

How Universal are Universal Pre-School Health Checks? An observational study using routine data from New Zealand's B4 School Check

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-025535.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	27-Feb-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Gibb, Sheree; University of Otago Wellington, Public Health; A Better Start National Science Challenge Milne, Barry; University of Auckland, Centre of Methods and Policy Application in the Social Sciences; University of Auckland Shackleton, Nichola; University of Auckland, Centre of Methods and Policy Application in the Social Sciences; A Better Start National Science Challenge Taylor, Barry; University of Otago, Department of the Dean; A Better Start National Science Challenge Audas, Richard; University of Otago Department of Women's and Children's Health; A Better Start National Science Challenge
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research
Keywords:	healthcare disparities, data linkage, childhood intervention

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6 **How Universal are Universal Pre-School Health Checks? An observational study using routine**
7 **data from New Zealand's B4 School Check**
8
9
10

11 Sheree Gibb 1 2 4, Barry Milne^{1 2}, Nichola Shackleton^{1 2}, Barry Taylor 1 5, Richard Audas 1 3
12
13

14
15
16 Author affiliations
17

18
19 1 A Better Start, National Science Challenge
20

21 2 Centre of Methods and Policy Application in the Social Sciences, University of Auckland,
22
23 Auckland, New Zealand.
24

25
26 3 Women's and Children's Health, Dunedin School of Medicine, University of Otago, Dunedin,
27
28 New Zealand
29

30
31 4 Department of Public Health, University of Otago Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand
32

33
34 5 Dean's Department, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand
35

36
37 Corresponding author:
38

39
40 Sheree Gibb, Department of Public Health, University of Otago Wellington, 23 Mein Street,
41

42 Wellington, New Zealand
43

44
45 Sheree.gibb@otago.ac.nz
46

47
48 +64 4 918 5086
49
50

51
52 Key words: healthcare disparities; data linkage; childhood intervention
53

54
55 Word count: 4383
56
57

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14 **Funding:** This study was funded by A Better Start – National Science Challenge, New Zealand
15
16 Ministry for Business, Innovation and Employment.

17
18
19 **Disclaimer:** Access to the data used in this study was provided by Statistics New Zealand under
20
21 conditions designed to give effect to the security and confidentiality provisions of the Statistics
22
23 Act 1975. The results presented in this study are the work of the authors, not Statistics NZ.
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

Abstract

Objectives: We aimed to estimate how many children were attending a universal pre-school health screen and to identify characteristics associated with non-participation.

Design: Analysis of population level linked administrative data.

Participants: Children were counted in the population of resident 4-year-olds for a given year if 1) they were ever resident in New Zealand, and 2) lived in NZ for at least 6 months during the reference year, 3) were alive at the end of the reference year, and either 4) appeared in any hospital (including emergency) admissions, community pharmaceutical dispensing, or GP enrolment datasets during the reference year, or 5) had a registered birth in New Zealand. We analysed 252,273 records over 4 years, from July 1st 2011 to June 30th 2015.

Results: We found that participation rates varied for each component of the B4 School Check (in 2014/15 91.8% for Vision and Hearing tests (VHT), 87.2% for nurse checks (including height, weight, oral health, SDQ, PEDS) and 62.1% for Teacher SDQ (SDQT)), but participation rates for all components increased over time. Māori and Pacific children were less likely to complete the checks than non-Māori and non-Pacific children (for VHT tests Māori OR=0.60 (0.61,0.58), Pacific OR=0.58 (0.60,0.56), for nurse checks Māori OR=0.63 (0.64,0.61), Pacific OR=0.67 (0.69,0.65), for SDQT Māori OR=0.76 (0.78,0.75), Pacific OR=0.37 (0.38,0.36)). Children from socioeconomically deprived areas, with younger mothers, from rented homes, residing in larger households, with worse health status, and with higher rates of residential mobility were less likely to participate in the B4 School Check than other children.

Conclusion: The patterns of non-participation suggest a reinforcing of existing disparities, whereby the children most in need are not getting the services they potentially require. There

1
2
3 needs to be an increased effort by public health organizations, community and whānau/family
4
5
6 to ensure that all children are tested and screened.
7
8
9

10 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 13 • Whole population sample of all children completing B4 School check over 4 years
14
15 (N=252,273)
16
- 17 • Using linked data from different sectors provided information about a wide range of
18
19 characteristics
20
21
- 22 • Only bivariate analyses were possible; sample loss due to missing data meant that
23
24 multivariate analysis was not feasible
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

Introduction

Globally, a common practice in childhood development is to screen children to determine if there are any key developmental problems that need to be assessed (1). These screens typically check for problems relating to general health, including hearing, vision, height, weight and oral health. They also often screen for emotional, behavioural, or intellectual issues that might be evident (2). Hall and Stewart-Brown categorize four types of screening programmes: i) biochemical; ii) screening involving objective measures (such as height and weight, vision and hearing; iii) screening involving physical examination; and iv) screening involving understanding of child development (3).

In New Zealand, the screen is called the Before School Check (B4SC) and it is administered to four year olds. It is the final and most comprehensive in a series of eight free Well Child Tamariki Ora visits that children receive (4), and currently the only one for which comprehensive linked data are available to examine coverage. The B4SC was implemented in New Zealand starting in September 2008, although it was not universal until 2010. There are eight key developmental areas that are assessed: vision, hearing, oral health, general health, growth measurement, strengths and difficulties (SDQ) as reported by parents and teachers and a parental evaluation of development status (PEDS). If concerns are identified in any area, children are referred for further testing or intervention. The B4SC is administered by the Ministry of Health, which has set a target 90% participation rate across the country, with parents and guardians being notified of the B4SC via enrolment with a primary health organisation (PHO, organisations that provide primary care services (5)). The Ministry's data

1
2
3 suggests they have been meeting their target since 2013, but compliance falls short of 100%

4
5 (6). Furthermore, not all children are registered with a PHO (95% of 0-4 year olds are registered
6
7 (7)), and including unregistered children in the denominator will further reduce compliance
8
9 rates.
10
11

12
13
14
15 This raises three concerns: First, that a non-trivial number of children are missing their checks.
16
17 Second, that some children may not be registered with a PHO and as such, their parents are not
18
19 notified that their child should attend a B4SC. And third, that these children may be more likely
20
21 to be in higher risk categories for later health problems and could benefit from the referrals to
22
23 interventions that accompany this screen. It is this final concern that is the focus of this study.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Evidence Preschool / School Entry Screening Participation**

31
32
33
34

35 Across different universal health checks available to the adult populations of different countries
36
37 certain patterns persist: those in poorer socioeconomic circumstances, with lower
38
39 qualifications, and at greater risk of health problems are less likely to attend such checks (8-13).
40
41
42
43

44
45 The available evidence for universal health checks in childhood suggests a similar pattern (14-
46
47 16). Wood et al considered the coverage of universal child health reviews in Scotland (15).
48
49 They considered two cohorts of children, the first, born in 1998/99 were eligible for 5 health
50
51 checks (10 days/6-8 weeks/8-9 months/22-24 months and 39-42 months) and a second cohort,
52
53 born in 2007/08, were only eligible for the first two checks. They found that coverage rates of
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 the 10-day check were very high in both cohorts (99%), but this declined as the children aged.
4
5 For the 6-8 week review, coverage was between 94-95%, and for the 39-42 month review the
6
7 coverage rates fell to 86%. There were clear deprivation gradients, with children living in the
8
9 least deprived areas much more likely to have a health check than those in the most deprived
10
11 areas, and these gradients increased substantially with increasing age and decreasing coverage.
12
13 They conducted an audit on a subset of the areas included in the review (Glasgow and Fife).
14
15 Consistent with the inverse care law (17) they found that children who missed the 6-8 week
16
17 review were more likely to require additional health services and support in the future than
18
19 those who attended the review.
20
21 Similarly, evidence from Denmark suggests that participation declines with age. Only 76% of
22
23 eligible children attend the age 4 health screen. Child, parent and household level
24
25 characteristics predicted attendance with children who had been hospitalised at least twice
26
27 since birth, children of single, younger, less educated or immigrant parents, and children
28
29 residing in low income households or living in institutions less likely to participate (16). Similarly
30
31 in North Carolina children of mothers who were younger, less educated, black, and unmarried
32
33 were also less likely to receive an adequate number of well child visits (14).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 The overall aim of these universal checks is to identify children who are at risk of later problems
46
47 and direct them towards interventions that will reduce this risk. The early identification of
48
49 health and developmental issues increases the efficacy and cost effectiveness of treatment and
50
51 lessens the risk of any potential comorbidities. However, evidence about whether or not
52
53 childhood screening achieves this aim is mixed (18-20). Childhood screening relies on accurate
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 identification of children at risk, and also on the availability of effective interventions or
4
5 treatments for at-risk children, which are not always available (19, 21). Regardless, universal
6
7 checks are often the only instrument to identify children in need of additional services, who
8
9 may otherwise be missed by the health system. Therefore, systematic differences in attendance
10
11 highlight a crucial issue: those children most in need are missing out on vital services.
12
13
14
15

16
17
18 In New Zealand we are in a unique position to examine the characteristics of those not
19
20 completing the B4SC. Many routinely collected government databases (including B4SC) are held
21
22 in the Statistics New Zealand Integrated Data Infrastructure (IDI) and each individual is assigned
23
24 a unique identifier which allows their records to be linked across data files. In this analysis we
25
26 build a population cohort using birth records and immigration/emigration files to determine
27
28 which four year-olds were in the country and eligible for the B4SC between July 1st 2011 to June
29
30 30th 2015, and then we examine the characteristics of those who do not get the B4SC.
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 The aim of this paper is to identify characteristics associated with non-participation in the B4SC
38
39 by linking to deprivation, birth, census, health, disability and immunisation records, all of which
40
41 are available in the IDI.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Methods**

50 51 52 53 54 **Study design**

1
2
3 This study was an observational study using routine data from New Zealand's Integrated Data
4
5
6 Infrastructure.

10 **Data sources and linkage**

11
12 All data were sourced from the Integrated Data Structure (22), a secure database containing
13
14
15 anonymised microdata about individuals.
16
17

19 B4 School Check

20
21
22 The main outcome measures for this study were generated from B4 School Check data. The B4
23
24 School Check (B4SC) is a universal programme offered to all families in New Zealand with four-
25
26
27 year-old children (23). If a child is enrolled with a primary health organisation a letter or email
28
29
30 will be sent to parents inviting them to bring the child along for a B4SC. Parents can also
31
32
33 request a check by approaching a general practitioner or other B4SC provider. The checks are
34
35
36 carried out by registered nurses or nurse practitioners with experience in child health, with
37
38
39 assistance from vision and hearing technicians (4). One component (SDQ-Teacher) is completed
40
41
42 by a child's early childhood education (ECE) teacher, who receives the SDQ directly from the
43
44
45 B4SC provider and is responsible for returning it to the provider (24). ECE coverage is high in
46
47
48 New Zealand with more than 95% of children enrolled in ECE in the 6 months prior to starting
49
50
51 school (25). The B4SC is undertaken in different locations including preschools, kōhanga reo
52
53
54 (Māori language immersion early childhood education centres), doctors' clinics and other
55
56
57 community venues such as churches and marae (meeting grounds and focal points for Māori
58
59
60

1
2
3 communities), depending on the needs of the community. In some cases, parts of the B4 School
4
5 Check are carried out in the child's home.
6
7

8 The percentage attending the B4SC was estimated as 79% in 2011/2012, 80% in 2012/2013,
9
10 91% in 2013/2014, 92% in 2014/15, and 92% in 2015-2016 (6). High coverage of vulnerable
11
12 groups (Māori children and children from areas of high socioeconomic deprivation) is
13
14 encouraged by linking a portion of District Health Board (DHB, see (26)) funding for B4SC to
15
16 achieving a specified level of coverage for these groups. In the 2015/16 year the coverage for
17
18 Māori children was 88% and for Pacific children it was 89% (27). For children from high
19
20 deprivation areas the coverage was 93% (6). This paper uses data from B4 school checks
21
22 completed between the fiscal years 2011/12 and 2014/15.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Other datasets

31
32 Datasets used to construct the other analysis variables for this study were: Census 2013;
33
34 Ministry of Health PHO enrolment and hospital discharge datasets; source ranked ethnicity;
35
36 address notification; SOCRATES; and birth registrations. More detail on the variables
37
38 constructed from these datasets can be found in the 'other analysis variables' section below.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Study population

46
47 To identify the population of children eligible for a B4SC, annual populations of four-year-old
48
49 children were constructed using methods developed previously for constructing populations
50
51 from the Integrated Data Infrastructure (IDI) (28, 29). Children were included in the
52
53 denominator population for a given year if they:
54
55
56
57

- 1
2
3 - Appeared in any hospital (including emergency) admissions, community pharmaceutical
4 dispensing, or PHO enrolment datasets during the reference year; OR
5
6
7
8 - Had a NZ birth record.
9

10 The above population was then restricted to children who lived in NZ for at least 6 months
11 during the reference year, were alive at the end of the reference year, were included in the IDI
12 spine (which aims to cover an “ever-resident” population including all those who either were
13 born in New Zealand, migrated to New Zealand, or paid tax in New Zealand (30)).
14
15

16 Over the four-year period we identified 288,753 children who had a health or birth record. Of
17 those, 277,593 (96%) were in the IDI spine, and 252,273 of those (91%) were alive and resident
18 in New Zealand at the end of their reference year and were used as the denominator
19 population.
20
21

22 To examine whether the above criteria had an impact on study results we conducted a
23 sensitivity analysis in which we replicated the analysis using two different definitions of the
24 study population. The main conclusions of the study were the same across all replications. The
25 detailed results of the sensitivity analysis can be found in Appendix 1.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **Outcomes**

43 B4SC completion

44 For the purposes of this study, B4SC was grouped into three components: Vision and Hearing
45 Test (VHT) checks (vision and hearing); nurse checks (growth, dental, immunisation, Parents
46 Evaluation of Developmental Status (PEDS), and Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)
47 Parent); and SDQ Teacher. These groupings were developed in consultation with the Ministry of
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 Health and reflect the way in which the components are typically completed (vision and hearing
4 checks are usually completed together by vision and hearing technicians, the nurse checks are
5 usually completed together, SDQ-Teacher is completed separately by a child's early childhood
6 education teacher). In some regions these groups of checks are administered in separate visits;
7
8 in other regions they are combined into a single visit. If a child had completed all checks within
9
10 a component they were considered to have completed that component. B4SC coverage was
11
12 calculated as the number of children completing a B4SC component divided by the total
13
14 number of children in the population. Completion rates for the individual component checks
15
16 can be found in Appendix 2.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Other analysis variables**

29 Ethnicity

30
31
32 Ethnicity measures were taken from the source ranked ethnicity table in IDI. The table collates
33
34 ethnicities that are reported to different administrative collections in IDI and ranks these
35
36 sources to provide an ethnic profile for each individual. Ranking is based on how closely the
37
38 ethnicities reported for an individual in the administrative source match those reported in the
39
40 census (census records have highest priority and 84.3% of the study population had ethnicity
41
42 sourced from census, followed by birth records (13.9%), followed by health (1.7%))(31). From
43
44 this we constructed four dichotomous ethnicity variables representing whether or not children
45
46 were recorded as identifying with each of the following major ethnic groups: Māori; Pacific;
47
48 Asian; European. Individuals could belong to none, one, or more than one of these ethnic
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 groups. Identifying as more than one ethnicity is common in New Zealand (32) and 23.9% of the
4
5 current sample belonged to multiple ethnic groups.
6
7
8
9

10 11 Socioeconomic deprivation 12

13 NZ Deprivation Score (NZDep) was calculated using the standard 2013 NZDep concordance (33)
14
15 and the child's meshblock (small geographic area typically containing 30-80 dwellings (34)) of
16
17 usual residence at the time of the 4th birthday, or the first meshblock recorded within 12
18
19 months after the date of the 4th birthday if no meshblock was recorded prior to that. Each
20
21 meshblock was assigned a decile from 1 (least deprived) to 10 (most deprived). These were
22
23 then grouped into quintiles.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Urbanicity 32

33 The child's meshblock of usual residence was also used to define urbanicity. The standard
34
35 classification of urban/rural areas in New Zealand (35) is a five-point scale: 1) Main urban
36
37 (centred on a city or major urban area, population of at least 30,000), 2) secondary urban
38
39 (centred on larger regional centres, population 10,000-29,999), 3) minor urban (centred around
40
41 smaller towns, population 1,000–9,999), 4) rural centre (population 300-999) and 5) other rural
42
43 (population <300). These were collapsed into two groups: urban (main urban, secondary urban,
44
45 and minor urban area) and rural (rural centre and other rural).
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Residence changes 55 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 The total number of different addresses lived at from birth to fourth birthday (minus one to
4 give the number of changes) was calculated from the address notification table in IDI which
5
6
7
8 collates address updates reported to data providers.
9

10 11 12 13 Hospitalisations

14
15 The following variables were obtained from hospital records: total number of hospital
16
17 admissions (excluding the child's birth and any emergency department visits that did not result
18
19 in hospital admission) from birth to fourth birthday; the total number of days spent in hospital
20
21 in hospital admission) from birth to fourth birthday; the total number of days spent in hospital
22
23 for those visits; total number of emergency department visits from birth to fourth birthday.
24
25

26 27 28 GP enrolment

29
30 The extent to which a child had continuous enrolment with a general practitioner was
31
32 estimated by counting the number of quarters in which a child was enrolled with a Primary
33
34 Health Organisation (umbrella organisations for general practitioners) from birth to fourth
35
36 birthday.
37
38
39
40
41

42 43 Disability

44
45 Children who received a referral to Disability Support Services before their fourth birthday were
46
47 classified as having a disability.
48
49
50
51

52 53 Information from birth record

1
2
3 Birth records were available for 94.1% of the total sample. The following variables were
4
5 obtained from the child's birth record: the child's birth weight, in grams; gestational age,
6
7 categorised into <37 weeks, 37-42 weeks, and >42 weeks; whether or not a father was
8
9 recorded on the child's birth certificate; age of the child's mother at the time of the child's
10
11 birth, grouped into under 20; 20-24; 25-29; 30-34; 35 and over.
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 Variables from census records

19
20 Additional variables were obtained by linking to census records. Household variables were
21
22 obtained by linking to the household form connected to the child's census record, 82.9% of
23
24 children had census household information available. Mother and father variables were
25
26 obtained by first linking to the child's birth record to identify mother and father, and then
27
28 linking to census records for the mother and father. 79.8% of children had mother census
29
30 information available; 68.5% had father census information available. All census variables are
31
32 recorded as at Census day (5 March 2013). The variables from Census were: size of household
33
34 (including child), grouped into: 2 to 4 people; 5 to 7 people; 8 or more people; whether the
35
36 dwelling was rented or owned (including those held in family trusts); whether or not any
37
38 member of the child's household received benefit income in the year to 5 March 2013; whether
39
40 or not the child's mother spoke enough English to have a conversation about everyday things;
41
42 the highest qualification of the child's mother and father at the time of the 2013 census,
43
44 classified into: no formal qualifications; high school qualifications; tertiary qualification below
45
46 Bachelor degree; Bachelor degree or higher; the current smoking status of the child's mother at
47
48 the time of the census, classified into: current regular smoker; ex-smoker; never smoked.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Analysis

All analyses were conducted using SAS Enterprise Guide version 9 within the secure data lab environment. First, we constructed the population, and calculated rates of those who completed components (VHT, nurse checks, SDQT) of the B4SC. Second, we compared the characteristics of those who did not complete a component compared to those who did by fitting logistic regression models in which B4SC completion was modelled as a function of the relevant predictor. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals were calculated from the logistic regression coefficients.

Patient and public involvement

Patients and public were not involved in the design or conduct of this study.

Results

Table 1 shows the total number of children in the denominator (eligible) population for each year, and the number and percentage of children who completed the VHT, nurse and SDQT components of the B4SC, by year. In all years, completion was highest for the VHT component and lowest for the SDQ Teacher component. Approximately 52% to 62% of children completed the SDQ Teacher component, compared to 78% to 87% for the nurse components and 86% to 91% for the VHT components. Coverage was lowest in 2011/12 and highest in 2014/15.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Tables 2 and 3 show the associations between completion of each B4SC component for 2011/12 to 2014/15 (all years combined), and a range of characteristics. Sociodemographic characteristics are reported in Table 1 and health and perinatal characteristics in Table 2. The tables show the number and percentage of children completing each B4SC component, the odds ratio and 95% confidence intervals.

Most of the sociodemographic characteristics presented in Table 1 were significantly associated with B4SC completion. Children were more likely to complete a check if they: were of European (compared to not European) or Asian (compared to not Asian) ethnicity; had fewer siblings; came from areas of lower socioeconomic deprivation; had a mother with a Bachelor degree; had mothers aged 30-34; lived in a home that was owned rather than rented; lived in a smaller (2-4 person) household; and lived in a household that does not receive benefit income.

1
2
3 The health and perinatal characteristics presented in Table 2 were all significantly associated
4 with B4SC completion. Children were more likely to complete a B4SC if they: had a mother that
5 had never smoked; weighed between 2500 and 4000 grams at birth; had a gestational age of
6 between 37 and 42 weeks; were not referred for disability support; spent more time enrolled
7 with a GP; had lower numbers of hospital and emergency department admissions and spent
8 fewer days in hospital.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 INSERT TABLE 2 HERE
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

Discussion

Our results demonstrate that Māori and Pacific children, those in poorer socioeconomic circumstances, and with poorer health are less likely to complete the B4SC. Children living in areas of higher socioeconomic deprivation, without a father named on the birth certificate, with mothers and fathers with lower levels of education, living in households with 5 or more people, having multiple changes in residence in the early years of life and living in rental accommodation have a lower likelihood of B4SC completion. Children with indicators of poor health outcomes including having a mother who smokes and having a low birth weight also have a lower likelihood of B4SC completion. Given that these factors tend to be associated with poorer child health outcomes (36, 37), our results paint a consistent pattern, demonstrating that across a wide range of measures of vulnerability, those children who would potentially most benefit from a B4SC screen and the referrals to interventions are less likely to participate.

A strength of this study is the large, linked dataset that was used (the Integrated Data Infrastructure, IDI). The IDI is a whole population data source and therefore it allows us to include children who are often excluded from other analyses, such as those not in regular contact with health services. Furthermore, the large number of data sources included in the IDI allows us to examine a wider range of characteristics than would be available in any single source.

While this study is novel, and provides vital information for service providers, all of the analyses presented in this paper are bivariate. It is likely that children who are disadvantaged in one area are also at a disadvantage in other areas (that is, the predictors of B4SC completion are correlated). Multivariate analysis would provide more detailed information about the joint or relative impact of different predictors on B4 School check completion. However, to run multivariate analysis we would have to restrict our sample to children born in NZ, with a mother

1
2 and father who completed 2013 census. These restrictions would reduce the sample to less than
3
4 70% of the total sample and would exclude all migrants, making the results difficult to generalise
5
6 to the whole population. For this reason we have chosen not to undertake multivariate analysis in
7
8 this paper.
9
10

11
12
13
14 Our findings are consistent with existing literature on the coverage of child health checks (14-16),
15
16 and provide further support for the inverse care law – that those with the greatest need are the
17
18 least likely to seek services (17). There is currently very little research in this area for child health
19
20 screens, but the application of the inverse care law is a consistent finding among free health
21
22 checks for the adult population (8-13). However, the reasons why people most in need do not
23
24 attend are not well understood, and there is a need for qualitative research investigating why
25
26 parents are not taking children to free health checks.
27
28
29
30

31
32
33
34 Several potential explanations for non-attendance at adult health checks have been put forward
35
36 that may be applicable to child health checks including lack of awareness, time constraints and
37
38 access issues (10), and misunderstanding the purpose/scepticism. Focus groups conducted with
39
40 low income Māori and Pacific parents have identified concerns about relevance of the B4SC
41
42 checks, children and parents being judged, and language and cultural understanding as potential
43
44 barriers to participation (38). Lack of awareness of the checks was also identified as a problem,
45
46 and this may be a particular issue for children who are not enrolled on the PHO system (5% of
47
48 children) or who have incorrect address information and thus do not receive the invitation letter.
49
50
51
52
53 Access could also be an issue with many of the B4 School checks being carried out by Plunket or
54
55 other health services which are only open during normal office hours, and not at weekends (38,
56
57 39). Therefore, households where both parents work, or single-parent working households will not
58
59 easily be able to attend. Furthermore, for less densely populated regions in New Zealand there are
60

1
2 fewer centres offering B4 School checks, compared to more densely populated regions such as
3
4 Auckland, Wellington or Christchurch (39), meaning it is less convenient to attend. Scepticism
5
6 about the value of attending and the purpose of the screens is likely to differ by ethnic group, as
7
8 research persistently demonstrates that Māori receive a poorer quality and slower service, and are
9
10 less likely to receive appropriate levels of care (40-42). There are similar findings for Pacific
11
12 peoples also (43-45). Therefore these groups may be less trusting of the New Zealand health
13
14 system (46).
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Socioeconomic and ethnic inequalities in health-seeking and health outcomes within New Zealand
22
23 are well documented for both the adult and child population (44, 45, 47). A long standing
24
25 objective of the New Zealand government is to reduce health and socio-economic disparities,
26
27 particularly for Māori and Pacific families. Patterns of participation at the B4SC could be
28
29 reinforcing existing ethnic and socioeconomic disparities. Early intervention is one means of
30
31 reducing inequities (48, 49). Although evidence for the effectiveness of childhood screening is
32
33 mixed, at present it appears that any potential benefits that do result from the B4SC will be
34
35 unevenly distributed across ethnic and socioeconomic groups. Improving B4SC participation would
36
37 be a cost-effective path towards converging outcomes and would ensure that any benefits from
38
39 the screen are reaching children who are most at risk of later health concerns.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Although 100% attendance in the B4SC is unlikely, we believe that a greater effort is required to
49
50 reach the most vulnerable families to ensure that more children who would benefit from the B4SC
51
52 will get access to the interventions that arise from it. This will require greater outreach and public
53
54 awareness, but also examining whether access and cultural relevance of the B4SC could be
55
56 improved. Interventions such as phone, letter or text message reminders have been shown to
57
58
59
60

1
2 increase the uptake of health checks and are one option that could be explored to increase B4SC
3
4 uptake (50, 51).
5
6
7
8

9 An area where there has been some success in getting increased services to hard-to-reach
10 populations has been through mobile programs and services (52, 53). For example, in America
11 community health vans have shown success in reaching underserved populations such a low-
12 income minority groups and immigrants for a range of health needs including earlier access to
13 prenatal care and disease prevention screening (54-56). The Family Van run by Harvard Medical
14 School offers a diverse range of health services, and has saved an estimated \$2.8 million in
15 avoided emergency room visits over the last 5 years with an estimated \$23 saving per \$1 spent
16 (57). In addition, direct contact with those not participating should be considered with a greater
17 push to ensure that those with characteristics of vulnerability are encouraged to attend. Further
18 research is necessary on barriers to attendance identified and remedial action taken.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 We have not followed children to determine whether missing a B4SC does in fact have an impact
36 on later life outcomes, and this clearly needs to be assessed. We plan to address this question in
37 future work, although the limited time series for the B4SC means that we will only be able to
38 examine outcomes up to age 15.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Conclusion**

49
50 Using a rich and diverse range of measures, we find that children with indicators of socioeconomic
51 deprivation or poor health are less likely to participate in the B4SC and as such they may miss
52 referrals for programs and interventions that may increase their readiness to enter school. We
53 believe the patterns we observe in B4SC participation suggest a potential reinforcing of existing
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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

inequalities and require increased effort to ensure that all children are tested and screened, and that those with the greatest need get access to health services, programmes and interventions.

For peer review only

1
2 **Footnotes**
3
4
5

6
7 **Contributorship statement**
8

9 RA, BM, BT and SG conceived the study. SG extracted data and did the main data analysis. NS
10 provided statistical advice. All authors wrote and reviewed the manuscript, gave critical feedback
11 and approved the final version for publication.
12
13
14
15

16
17
18
19 **Competing interests**
20

21 None.
22
23
24
25

26 **Data sharing statement**
27

28 Due to privacy regulations around the Integrated Data Infrastructure, data from this study are not
29 available for sharing.
30
31
32
33

34
35
36 **Ethical approval:** This study was approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee
37 (ref D16/088).
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. Wilson P, Wood R, Lykke K, Hauskov Graungaard A, Ertmann RK, Andersen MK, et al. International variation in programmes for assessment of children's neurodevelopment in the community: Understanding disparate approaches to evaluation of motor, social, emotional, behavioural and cognitive function. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*. 2018.
2. Welch NM, Saulsbury FT, Kesler RW. The value of the preschool examination in screening for health problems. *The Journal of Pediatrics*. 1982;100(2):232-4.
3. Hall DM, Stewart-Brown S. Screening in child health. *British Medical Bulletin*. 1998;54(4):929-43.
4. Ministry of Health. Well Child / Tamariki Ora Programme Practitioner Handbook: Supporting families and whānau to promote their child's health and development – Revised 2014. Wellington: Ministry of Health; 2013.
5. Ministry of Health. About primary health organisations 2018 [Available from: <https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/primary-health-care/about-primary-health-organisations>.]
6. Ministry of Health. B4 School Check information for the health sector 2016 [Available from: <http://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/life-stages/child-health/b4-school-check/b4-school-check-information-health-sector>.]
7. Ministry of Health. Access to primary care as at October 2015: New Zealand Government; 2017 [Available from: <https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/primary-health-care/about-primary-health-organisations/enrolment-primary-health-organisation>.]
8. Sogaard AJ, Selmer R, Bjertness E, Thelle D. The Oslo Health Study: The impact of self-selection in a large, population-based survey. *International Journal for Equity in Health*. 2004;3(1):3.
9. Holland C, Cooper Y, Shaw R, Pattison H, Cooke R. Effectiveness and uptake of screening programmes for coronary heart disease and diabetes: a realist review of design components used in interventions. *BMJ Open*. 2013;3(11).
10. Harte E, MacLure C, Martin A, Meads C, Walter FM, Griffin SJ, et al. Reasons why people do not attend NHS Health Checks: a systematic review and qualitative synthesis. *The British Journal of General Practice*. 2018;68(666):e28-35.
11. Hoebel J, Starker A, Jordan S, Richter M, Lampert T. Determinants of health check attendance in adults: findings from the cross-sectional German Health Update (GEDA) study. *BMC Public Health*. 2014;14(1):913.
12. Dryden R, Williams B, McCowan C, Themessl-Huber M. What do we know about who does and does not attend general health checks? Findings from a narrative scoping review. *BMC Public Health*. 2012;12(1):723.
13. Waller D, Agass M, Mant D, Coulter A, Fuller A, Jones L. Health checks in general practice: another example of inverse care? *BMJ*. 1990;300(6732):1115-8.
14. Freed GL, Clark SJ, Pathman DE, Schectman R. Influences on the receipt of well-child visits in the first two years of life. *Pediatrics*. 1999;103(Supplement 1):864-9.
15. Wood R, Stirling A, Nolan C, Chalmers J, Blair M. Trends in the coverage of 'universal' child health reviews: observational study using routinely available data. *BMJ Open*. 2012;2(2).
16. Søndergaard G, Biering-Sørensen S, Ishøy Michelsen S, Schnor O, Nybo Andersen AM. Non-participation in preventive child health examinations at the general practitioner in Denmark: a register-based study. *Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care*. 2008;26(1):5-11.
17. Hart T. The inverse care law. *Lancet*. 1971;297:405-12.
18. National Research Council. Early Childhood Assessment: Why, What, and How. Snow CE, Van Hemel SB, editors. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2008. 500 p.
19. Alexander KE, Mazza D. The Healthy Kids Check—is it evidence-based? *Medical Journal of Australia*. 2010;192(4):207.
20. Guevara JP, Gerdes M, Localio R, Huang YV, Pinto-Martin J, Minkovitz CS, et al. Effectiveness of developmental screening in an urban setting. *Pediatrics*. 2013;130(1):30-7.

21. US Preventive Services Task Force. Screening and interventions for overweight in children and adolescents: recommendation statement. *Pediatrics*. 2005;116(1):205-9.
22. Statistics New Zealand. Integrated Data Infrastructure [Available from: <https://www.stats.govt.nz/integrated-data/integrated-data-infrastructure/>.]
23. Ministry of Health. The B4 School Check: A handbook for practitioners. Wellington: Ministry of Health; 2008.
24. Ministry of Health. B4 School Check information for early learning services 2015 [Available from: <https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/life-stages/child-health/b4-school-check/b4-school-check-information-early-learning-services>.]
25. Ministry of Education. Indicator Report: Prior Participation in ECE. Wellington: Ministry of Education; 2017.
26. Ministry of Health. District Health Boards [Available from: <https://www.health.govt.nz/new-zealand-health-system/key-health-sector-organisations-and-people/district-health-boards>.]
27. Ministry of Health. Personal communication: B4 School completion rates by ethnicity. 2017.
28. Zhao J, Gibb S, Jackson R, Mehta S, Exeter DJ. Constructing whole of population cohorts for health and social research using the New Zealand Integrated Data Infrastructure. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*. 2018.
29. Gibb S, Bycroft C, Matheson-Dunning N. Identifying the New Zealand resident population in the Integrated Data Infrastructure (IDI). Wellington: Statistics New Zealand; 2016.
30. Black A. The IDI prototype spine's creation and coverage. Wellington, New Zealand: Statistics New Zealand; 2016.
31. Reid G, Bycroft C, Gleisner F. Comparison of ethnicity information in administrative data and the census. Wellington, New Zealand: Statistics New Zealand; 2016.
32. Fahy KM, Lee A, Milne BJ. New Zealand socio-economic index 2013. 2017.
33. Atkinson J, Salmond C, Crampton P. NZDep2013 index of deprivation. Wellington: Ministry of Health; 2014.
34. Statistics New Zealand. Statistical Standard for Meshblock [Available from: <http://archive.stats.govt.nz/methods/classifications-and-standards/classification-related-stats-standards/meshblock.aspx>.]
35. Statistics New Zealand. Classifications and related statistical standards: Urban Area Statistics New Zealand, 2016 [Available from: <http://www.stats.govt.nz/methods/classifications-and-standards/classification-related-stats-standards/urban-area.aspx>.]
36. Ministry of Health. Annual Data Explorer 2016/17: New Zealand Health Survey 2017 [Available from: <https://minhealthnz.shinyapps.io/nz-health-survey-2016-17-annual-update>.]
37. Morton S, Grant C, Berry SD, Walker C, Corkin M, Ly K, et al. Growing Up in New Zealand: A longitudinal study of New Zealand children and their families. *Now We Are Four: Describing the preschool years*. 2017.
38. Premium Research Limited. Before School Checks Consumer Research: Report commissioned by the Health Promotion Agency. Wellington: Health Promotion Agency; 2014.
39. Ministry of Health. Find a Well Child Tamariki Ora provider 2016 [Available from: <https://www.health.govt.nz/your-health/pregnancy-and-kids/services-and-support-you-and-your-child/well-child-tamariki-ora-visits/find-well-child-tamariki-ora-provider>]
40. Sadler L, Priest P, Peters J, Crengle S, Jackson R. Cervical cancer audit report. 2000.
41. Ministry of Health. Report on Maternity: Maternal and newborn information 2003. . Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Health; 2006.
42. Davis P, Lay-Yee R, Dyall L, Briant R, Sporle A, Brunt D, et al. Quality of hospital care for Māori patients in New Zealand: retrospective cross-sectional assessment. *The Lancet*. 2006;367(9526):1920-5.

- 1
2 43. Jeffreys M, Stevanovic V, Tobias M, Lewis C, Ellison-Loschmann L, Pearce N, et al. Ethnic
3 inequalities in cancer survival in New Zealand: linkage study. *American Journal of Public Health*.
4 2005;95(5):834-7.
5 44. Lee CH, Duck IM, Sibley CG. Ethnic inequality in diagnosis with depression and anxiety
6 disorders. *The New Zealand Medical Journal*. 2017;130(1454):10-20.
7 45. Pledger MJ, Cumming J, Burnette M, Daubé J. Unmet need of GP services in Pacific people
8 and other New Zealanders. *Clinical Correspondence*. 2011.
9 46. Ministry of Social Development. *The Social Report 2016 – Te pūrongo oranga tangata*.
10 Wellington: Ministry of Social Development; 2016.
11 47. Simpson J, Duncanson M, Oben G, Adams J, Wicken A, Pierson M, et al. *The Health Status*
12 *of Pacific Children and Young People in New Zealand 2015 (Pacific Child and Youth Health)* New
13 Zealand Child and Youth Epidemiology Service; 2017.
14 48. Irwin LG, Siddiqi A, Hertzman G. *Early child development: A powerful equalizer: Human*
15 *Early Learning Partnership (HELP) Vancouver, BC; 2007*.
16 49. Spencer N. European Society for Social Pediatrics and Child Health (ESSOP)* Position
17 Statement: Social inequalities in child health—towards equity and social justice in child health
18 outcomes. *Child: Care, Health and Development*. 2008;34(5):631-4.
19 50. Alpsten T. Saving lives through effective patient engagement around NHS health checks.
20 *Clinical Governance: An International Journal*. 2015;20(3):108-12.
21 51. Gidlow CJ, Ellis NJ, Riley V, Chadborn T, Bunten A, Iqbal Z, et al. Randomised controlled
22 trial comparing uptake of NHS Health Check in response to standard letters, risk-personalised
23 letters and telephone invitations. *BMC Public Health*. 2019;19(1):224.
24 52. Yu SW, Hill C, Ricks ML, Bennet J, Oriol NE. The scope and impact of mobile health
25 clinics in the United States: a literature review. *International Journal for Equity in Health*.
26 2017;16(1):178.
27 53. Brown-Connolly NE, Concha JB, English J. Mobile health is worth it! Economic benefit
28 and impact on health of a population-based mobile screening program in new Mexico.
29 *Telemedicine and e-Health*. 2014;20(1):18-23.
30 54. Edgerley LP, El-Sayed YY, Druzin ML, Kiernan M, Daniels KI. Use of a community
31 mobile health van to increase early access to prenatal care. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*.
32 2007;11(3):235-9.
33 55. O’Connell E, Zhang G, Leguen F, Prince J. Impact of a mobile van on prenatal care
34 utilization and birth outcomes in Miami-Dade County. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*.
35 2010;14(4):528-34.
36 56. Hill C, Zurakowski D, Bennet J, Walker-White R, Osman JL, Quarles A, et al.
37 Knowledgeable Neighbors: a mobile clinic model for disease prevention and screening in
38 underserved communities. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2012;102(3):406-10.
39 57. The Family Van: Harvard Medical School. Our impact 2018 [Available from:
40 [http://www.familyvan.org/impact/.](http://www.familyvan.org/impact/)]
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Percentage of children completing B4SC components, by year

Fiscal year	N	N (%) VHT ^a complete	N (%) nurse ^b checks complete	N (%) SDQ ^c Teacher complete
2011/12	63,714	54,924 (86.2)	49,986 (78.5)	33,690 (52.9)
2012/13	62,664	55,344 (88.5)	50,814 (81.4)	35,433 (57.3)
2013/14	63,372	57,294 (90.5)	54,183 (85.6)	37,881 (60.0)
2014/15	62,529	57,282 (91.8)	54,348 (87.2)	38,379 (62.1)

^a VHT = vision and hearing checks

^b Nurse = dental, growth, immunisations, PEDS (Parent Evaluation of Developmental Status), SDQ-P (Strengths and difficulties questionnaire – Parent) check

^c SDQ = Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire

Table 2. Percentage of children completing B4SC, and odds ratios for completing, by sociodemographic, family and housing characteristics

	N (%)	N (%) complete			OR (95% CI)		
		VHT ^a	Nurse ^b checks	SDQ ^c Teacher	VHT	Nurse checks	SDQ Teacher
Sex							
Male	129,831 (51.5)	115,611 (89.0)	107,565 (82.9)	74,754 (57.6)	0.98 (1.01,0.96)	0.98 (1.00,0.96)	1.00 (1.01,0.98)
Female	122,439 (48.5)	109,227 (89.2)	101,766 (83.1)	70,629 (57.7)	-	-	-
missing	0 (0.0)						
Ethnicity							
Māori	71,196 (28.2)	60,714 (85.3)	55,491 (77.9)	37,575 (52.8)	0.60 (0.61,0.58)	0.63 (0.64,0.61)	0.76 (0.78,0.75)
Pacific	37,857 (15.0)	31,788 (84.0)	29,436 (77.8)	14,004 (37.0)	0.58 (0.60,0.56)	0.67 (0.69,0.65)	0.37 (0.38,0.36)
Asian	30,825 (12.2)	28,116 (91.2)	26,745 (86.8)	16,110 (52.3)	1.30 (1.35,1.25)	1.39 (1.45,1.35)	0.78 (0.80,0.76)
European	173,235 (68.7)	157,269 (90.8)	146,526 (84.6)	109,842 (63.4)	1.67 (1.72,1.64)	1.41 (1.45,1.39)	2.13 (2.17,2.08)
missing	0 (0.0)						
Number of siblings at time of birth							

0	123,123 (48.8)	110,223 (89.5)	103,509 (84.1)	71,829 (58.3)	-	-	-
1	70,626 (28.0)	64,260 (91.0)	59,877 (84.8)	42,615 (60.3)	1.18 (1.22,1.15)	1.05 (1.09,1.03)	1.09 (1.11,1.06)
2+	43,527 (17.3)	37,413 (86.0)	34,053 (78.2)	22,782 (52.3)	0.71 (0.74,0.69)	0.68 (0.70,0.66)	0.78 (0.80,0.77)
missing	15,003 (5.9)						

Socioeconomic deprivation

NZDep quintile

1 (least deprived)	50,520 (20.0)	46,584 (92.2)	43,530 (86.2)	32,199 (63.7)	-	-	-
2	46,323 (18.4)	42,150 (91.0)	39,282 (84.8)	28,182 (60.8)	0.85 (0.89,0.81)	0.89 (0.93,0.86)	0.88 (0.91,0.86)
3	45,672 (18.1)	41,145 (90.1)	38,199 (83.6)	27,810 (60.9)	0.77 (0.80,0.74)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)	0.88 (0.91,0.86)
4	47,043 (18.6)	41,736 (88.7)	38,895 (82.7)	27,423 (58.3)	0.66 (0.69,0.64)	0.77 (0.79,0.74)	0.79 (0.81,0.78)
5 (most deprived)	61,854 (24.5)	52,848 (85.4)	49,080 (79.3)	29,502 (47.7)	0.50 (0.52,0.48)	0.62 (0.64,0.60)	0.52 (0.53,0.51)
missing	867 (0.3)						

Mother's highest qualification

No formal qualifications	27,672 (11.0)	24,012 (86.8)	22,452 (81.1)	15,213 (55.0)	0.48 (0.51,0.46)	0.61 (0.63,0.58)	0.68 (0.70,0.66)
--------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

1								
2		67,047	60,861	57,180	40,173	0.72	0.82	0.83
3	Secondary school	(26.6)	(90.8)	(85.3)	(59.9)	(0.75,0.69)	(0.85,0.79)	(0.85,0.81)
4								
5	Tertiary qualification below	41,901	38,430	35,868	25,452	0.81	0.84	0.86
6	Bachelor degree	(16.6)	(91.7)	(85.6)	(60.7)	(0.85,0.78)	(0.87,0.81)	(0.88,0.84)
7								
8	Bachelor degree or higher	57,570	53,631	50,442	36,972	-	-	-
9		(22.8)	(93.2)	(87.6)	(64.2)			
10								
11	missing	58,089						
12		(23.0)						
13								
14								
15	Father highest qualification							
16								
17	No formal qualification	26,712	23,784	22,251	15,549	0.65	0.73	0.82
18		(10.6)	(89.0)	(83.3)	(58.2)	(0.68,0.61)	(0.76,0.70)	(0.85,0.79)
19								
20	Secondary school	51,177	46,866	44,094	30,960	0.86	0.91	0.90
21		(20.3)	(91.6)	(86.2)	(60.5)	(0.91,0.82)	(0.94,0.88)	(0.93,0.88)
22								
23	Tertiary qualification below	47,391	43,878	41,253	30,579	0.99	0.98	1.06
24	Bachelor degree	(18.8)	(92.6)	(87.0)	(64.5)	(1.04,0.94)	(1.02,0.94)	(1.10,1.04)
25								
26	Bachelor degree or higher	39,447	36,546	34,413	24,840	-	-	-
27		(15.6)	(92.6)	(87.2)	(63.0)			
28								
29	missing	87,552						
30		(34.7)						
31								
32								
33	Member of household receives benefit income							
34								
35	No	158,679	147,216	138,420	100,071	-	-	-
36		(62.9)	(92.8)	(87.2)	(63.1)			
37								
38	Yes	51,720	45,438	42,093	27,339	0.56	0.64	0.66
39		(20.5)	(87.9)	(81.4)	(52.9)	(0.58,0.55)	(0.66,0.63)	(0.67,0.65)
40								
41								
42								
43								
44								
45								
46								

missing	41,880 (16.6)							
Family circumstances								
Age of mother at child's birth								
<20	14,310 (5.7)	11,910 (83.2)	10,983 (76.8)	7,104 (49.6)	0.48 (0.51,0.46)	0.56 (0.59,0.54)	0.64 (0.66,0.62)	
20-24	41,889 (16.6)	36,333 (86.7)	33,624 (80.3)	22,518 (53.8)	0.63 (0.66,0.61)	0.69 (0.72,0.67)	0.75 (0.77,0.74)	
25-29	55,800 (22.1)	49,950 (89.5)	46,698 (83.7)	32,247 (57.8)	0.83 (0.86,0.79)	0.88 (0.90,0.85)	0.88 (0.91,0.87)	
30-34	66,297 (26.3)	60,441 (91.2)	56,631 (85.4)	40,233 (60.7)	-	-	-	
35+	58,977 (23.4)	53,259 (90.3)	49,500 (83.9)	35,121 (59.6)	0.90 (0.93,0.87)	0.89 (0.92,0.86)	0.95 (0.97,0.93)	
missing	15,006 (5.9)							
Father on birth certificate								
No	196,248 (77.8)	10,467 (83.0)	9,567 (75.9)	5,763 (45.7)	0.56 (0.59,0.53)	0.61 (0.64,0.59)	0.60 (0.62,0.57)	
Yes	3,483 (1.4)	201,429 (89.7)	187,872 (83.6)	131,463 (58.5)	-	-	-	
missing	52,548 (20.8)							

1								
2	Mother speaks English							
3								
4	No	3,483 (1.4)	3,102 (89.1)	2,973 (85.4)	1,617 (46.4)	0.81 (0.90,0.72)	1.00 (1.10,0.92)	0.56 (0.60,0.53)
5								
6	Yes	196,248 (77.8)	178,578 (91.0)	167,448 (85.3)	119,013 (60.6)	-	-	-
7								
8	missing	52,548 (20.8)						
9								
10								
11								
12								
13								
14	Housing							
15								
16	Urban	35,838 (14.2)	31,767 (88.6)	29,565 (82.5)	23,832 (66.5)	-	-	-
17								
18	Rural	215,775 (85.5)	192,864 (89.4)	179,577 (83.2)	121,410 (56.3)	0.93 (0.96,0.89)	0.95 (0.98,0.93)	1.54 (1.59,1.52)
19								
20	missing	666 (0.3)						
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								
26	Household size							
27								
28	2-4 people	120,849 (47.9)	112,266 (92.9)	105,930 (87.7)	77,817 (64.4)	-	-	-
29								
30	5-7 people	77,808 (30.8)	70,464 (90.6)	65,388 (84.0)	44,976 (57.8)	0.74 (0.76,0.71)	0.74 (0.76,0.72)	0.76 (0.77,0.75)
31								
32	8+ people	11,739 (4.7)	9,921 (84.5)	9,195 (78.3)	4,617 (39.3)	0.42 (0.44,0.40)	0.51 (0.53,0.49)	0.36 (0.37,0.34)
33								
34	missing	41,883 (16.6)						
35								
36								
37								
38								
39								
40								
41								
42								
43								
44								
45								
46								

1									
2		112,458	105,333	99,384	72,561				
3	Own home	(44.6)	(93.7)	(88.4)	(64.5)	-	-	-	
4									
5	Rented home	93,840	83,745	77,823	52,911	0.56	0.64	0.71	
6		(37.2)	(89.2)	(82.9)	(56.4)	(0.58,0.54)	(0.65,0.63)	(0.72,0.70)	
7									
8	missing	45,981							
9		(18.2)							
10									
11									
12	Number of residence changes age 0-4								
13									
14	None	52,602	47,184	44,745	32,124	-	-	-	
15		(20.9)	(89.7)	(85.1)	(61.1)				
16									
17	1	55,359	51,327	48,315	33,813	1.47	1.20	1.00	
18		(21.9)	(92.7)	(87.3)	(61.1)	(1.52,1.41)	(1.25,1.16)	(1.02,0.98)	
19									
20	2	42,087	38,481	35,949	24,696	1.22	1.03	0.90	
21		(16.7)	(91.4)	(85.4)	(58.7)	(1.28,1.18)	(1.06,0.99)	(0.93,0.88)	
22									
23	3	28,320	25,299	23,397	15,963	0.96	0.83	0.83	
24		(11.2)	(89.3)	(82.6)	(56.4)	(1.01,0.92)	(0.87,0.80)	(0.85,0.80)	
25									
26	4	18,675	16,407	14,937	10,236	0.83	0.70	0.78	
27		(7.4)	(87.9)	(80.0)	(54.8)	(0.88,0.79)	(0.73,0.67)	(0.80,0.75)	
28									
29	5+	30,282	25,599	23,181	16,419	0.63	0.57	0.76	
30		(12.0)	(84.5)	(76.6)	(54.2)	(0.65,0.60)	(0.60,0.55)	(0.78,0.74)	
31									
32	missing	24,957							
33		(9.9)							

Note: As individuals can identify as multiple ethnicities, counts for ethnic groups will sum to greater than the count for the total population. The reference groups for ethnicities are people not identifying with that ethnic group (for example, Māori is compared to non-Māori).

^a VHT = vision and hearing checks

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

^b Nurse = dental, growth, immunisations, PEDS (Parent Evaluation of Developmental Status), SDQ-P (Strengths and difficulties questionnaire – Parent)

check

^c SDQ = Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire

For peer review only

Table 3. Percentage of children completing B4SC, and odds ratios for completing, by perinatal and health characteristics

	N	% complete			OR (95% CI)		
		VHT ^a	Nurse ^b checks	SDQ ^c Teacher	VHT	Nurse checks	SDQ Teacher
Mother smoking status							
Regular smoker	38,460 (15.2)	33,366 (86.8)	31,026 (80.7)	21,240 (55.2)	0.56 (0.57,0.53)	0.63 (0.65,0.61)	0.78 (0.79,0.76)
Ex smoker	45,420 (18.0)	41,670 (91.7)	38,925 (85.7)	28,647 (63.1)	0.94 (0.98,0.90)	0.90 (0.93,0.88)	1.08 (1.10,1.05)
Never smoked	111,219 (44.1)	102,540 (92.2)	96,642 (86.9)	68,214 (61.3)	-	-	-
missing	57,180 (22.7)						
Birthweight							
<2500g	14,049 (5.6)	11,751 (83.6)	11,112 (79.1)	7,680 (54.7)	0.57 (0.60,0.55)	0.73 (0.76,0.70)	0.87 (0.90,0.84)
2500-4000g	187,239 (74.2)	168,387 (89.9)	156,939 (83.8)	108,762 (58.1)	-	-	-
>4000g	34,746 (13.8)	31,287 (90.0)	28,947 (83.3)	20,496 (59.0)	1.01 (1.05,0.97)	0.96 (0.99,0.93)	1.04 (1.06,1.01)
missing	16,245 (6.4)						
Gestation							

1								
2		17,925	15,105	14,256	9,888	0.60	0.76	0.88
3	<37 weeks	(7.1)	(84.3)	(79.5)	(55.2)	(0.63,0.57)	(0.79,0.73)	(0.91,0.85)
4								
5		217,128	195,228	181,734	126,483	-	-	-
6	37-42 weeks	(86.1)	(89.9)	(83.7)	(58.3)			
7								
8		1,443	1,299	1,200	0,696	1.00	0.97	0.67
9	>42 weeks	(0.6)	(90.0)	(83.2)	(48.2)	(1.19,0.85)	(1.11,0.84)	(0.75,0.61)
10								
11	missing	15,783						
12		(6.3)						
13								
14								
15	Child referred for disability							
16	support assessment							
17								
18		247,878	221,568	206,451	143,463	-	-	-
19	No	(98.3)	(89.4)	(83.3)	(57.9)			
20								
21		4,401	3,270	2,880	1,917	0.34	0.38	0.56
22	Yes	(1.7)	(74.3)	(65.4)	(43.6)	(0.37,0.32)	(0.40,0.36)	(0.60,0.53)
23								
24	missing	0						
25		(0.0)						
26								
27								
28	Number of quarters enrolled with GP							
29	age 0-4							
30								
31		9,438	5,328	4,464	2,826	0.10	0.13	0.29
32	0-3	(3.7)	(56.5)	(47.3)	(29.9)	(0.11,0.10)	(0.13,0.12)	(0.30,0.27)
33								
34		37,671	32,592	29,547	20,919	0.52	0.52	0.83
35	4-7	(14.9)	(86.5)	(78.4)	(55.5)	(0.54,0.50)	(0.54,0.51)	(0.85,0.81)
36								
37		92,856	83,955	78,396	55,284	0.76	0.78	0.98
38	8-11	(36.8)	(90.4)	(84.4)	(59.5)	(0.79,0.74)	(0.80,0.76)	(1.00,0.96)
39								
40								
41								
42								
43								
44								
45								
46								

12+	97,800 (38.8)	90,510 (92.5)	85,527 (87.5)	58,638 (60.0)	-	-	-
missing	14,505 (5.7)						
Number of hospital admissions age 0-4							
None	93,474 (37.1)	83,109 (88.9)	77,238 (82.6)	53,415 (57.1)	-	-	-
1 to 2	102,696 (40.7)	93,810 (91.3)	87,636 (85.3)	61,803 (60.2)	1.32 (1.35,1.28)	1.22 (1.25,1.19)	1.14 (1.15,1.11)
3 to 5	21,390 (8.5)	19,101 (89.3)	17,937 (83.9)	12,633 (59.1)	1.04 (1.09,0.99)	1.09 (1.14,1.05)	1.09 (1.11,1.05)
6+	9,762 (3.9)	8,277 (84.8)	7,707 (78.9)	5,397 (55.3)	0.69 (0.74,0.65)	0.79 (0.83,0.75)	0.93 (0.97,0.89)
missing	24,957 (9.9)						
Total days in hospital age 0-4							
None	123,231 (48.8)	110,022 (89.3)	102,492 (83.2)	71,280 (57.8)	-	-	-
1 to 9	95,478 (37.8)	86,991 (91.1)	81,243 (85.1)	57,501 (60.2)	1.23 (1.27,1.19)	1.15 (1.18,1.12)	1.10 (1.12,1.09)
10 to 19	4,953 (2.0)	4,323 (87.3)	4,041 (81.6)	2,664 (53.8)	0.83 (0.90,0.76)	0.90 (0.96,0.83)	0.85 (0.90,0.80)
20+	3,660 (1.5)	2,961 (80.9)	2,742 (74.9)	1,809 (49.4)	0.51 (0.55,0.47)	0.61 (0.65,0.56)	0.71 (0.76,0.67)

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

missing	24,957 (9.9)						
Total number of ED visits age 0-4							
None	193,905 (76.9)	174,354 (89.9)	162,942 (84.0)	116,460 (60.1)	-	-	-
1 to 2	31,173 (12.4)	27,960 (89.7)	25,791 (82.7)	15,759 (50.6)	0.97 (1.01,0.93)	0.91 (0.94,0.88)	0.68 (0.69,0.66)
3+	2,244 (0.9)	1,980 (88.2)	1,788 (79.7)	1,032 (46.0)	0.84 (0.96,0.74)	0.75 (0.83,0.68)	0.56 (0.61,0.52)
missing	24,957 (9.9)						

Note: As individuals can identify as multiple ethnicities, counts for ethnic groups will sum to greater than the count for the total population. The reference groups for ethnicities are people not identifying with that ethnic group (for example, Māori is compared to non-Māori).

^a VHT = vision and hearing checks

^b Nurse = dental, growth, immunisations, PEDS (Parent Evaluation of Developmental Status), SDQ-P (Strengths and difficulties questionnaire – Parent) check

^c SDQ = Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire

Appendix 1

Sensitivity analysis

The table below shows the effects of:

1. Changing the criteria for inclusion in the population (column 1). In the main analyses, children were included in the population if they were in the IDI spine AND had health or birth records.

Column 1 of the table below shows the results when the population was defined as children who were in the IDI spine OR had birth or health records.

2. Changing the overseas time cut-off for exclusion from the residential mobility and hospitalisation analyses (column 2, differences only apply to hospitalisation and meshblock change variables). In the main analyses, children were excluded if they had spent more than a year overseas. Column 2 of the table below shows the results if all children were included regardless of the amount of time spent overseas.

	Different population				Different overseas cut-off			
	OR (95% CI)				OR (95% CI)			
	N	VHT incomplete	Nurse checks incomplete	SDQ Teacher incomplete	N	VHT incomplete	Nurse checks incomplete	SDQ Teacher incomplete
Sex								
Male	136896	0.98 (1.01,0.96)	0.98 (1.00,0.96)	0.99 (1.01,0.98)	129834	0.98 (1.01,0.96)	0.98 (1.00,0.96)	1.00 (1.01,0.98)
Female	128967	-	-	-	122439	-	-	-
Ethnicity								
Māori	73092	0.76 (0.79,0.75)	0.74 (0.75,0.72)	0.81 (0.82,0.79)	71196	0.60 (0.61,0.58)	0.63 (0.64,0.61)	0.76 (0.78,0.75)
Pacific	39903	0.60 (0.62,0.59)	0.68 (0.69,0.66)	0.38 (0.39,0.37)	37857	0.58 (0.60,0.56)	0.67 (0.69,0.65)	0.37 (0.38,0.36)
Asian	33039	1.09 (1.12,1.04)	1.20 (1.23,1.16)	0.76 (0.78,0.75)	30825	1.30 (1.35,1.25)	1.39 (1.45,1.35)	0.78 (0.80,0.76)
European	180345	1.72 (1.75,1.69)	1.49 (1.52,1.47)	2.13 (2.17,2.13)	173232	1.67 (1.72,1.64)	1.41 (1.45,1.39)	2.13 (2.17,2.08)
	136896	0.98 (1.01,0.96)	0.98 (1.00,0.96)	0.99 (1.01,0.98)	129834	0.98 (1.01,0.96)	0.98 (1.00,0.96)	1.00 (1.01,0.98)
Number of siblings at time of birth								
0	123123	-	-	-	123126	-	-	-
1	70626	1.18 (1.22,1.15)	1.05 (1.09,1.03)	1.09 (1.11,1.06)	70629	1.18 (1.22,1.15)	1.05 (1.09,1.03)	1.09 (1.11,1.06)
2+	43527	0.71 (0.74,0.69)	0.68 (0.70,0.66)	0.78 (0.80,0.77)	43527	0.71 (0.74,0.69)	0.68 (0.70,0.66)	0.78 (0.80,0.77)
Socioeconomic deprivation								
NZDep quintile								
1 (least deprived)	52995	-	-	-	50517			
2	48081	0.89 (0.93,0.86)	0.92 (0.95,0.88)	0.89 (0.92,0.87)	46326	0.85 (0.89,0.81)	0.89 (0.93,0.86)	0.88 (0.91,0.86)

1									
2	3	47283	0.82 (0.85,0.79)	0.85 (0.88,0.82)	0.89 (0.92,0.88)	45672	0.77 (0.80,0.74)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)	0.88 (0.91,0.86)
3									
4	4	48720	0.72 (0.75,0.69)	0.79 (0.82,0.77)	0.81 (0.83,0.79)	47043	0.66 (0.69,0.64)	0.77 (0.79,0.74)	0.79 (0.81,0.78)
5									
6	5 (most deprived)	64308	0.54 (0.56,0.53)	0.64 (0.66,0.62)	0.53 (0.54,0.52)	61854	0.50 (0.52,0.48)	0.62 (0.64,0.60)	0.52 (0.53,0.51)
7									
8									
9	Mother highest qualification								
10									
11	No formal qualifications	27672	0.48 (0.51,0.46)	0.61 (0.63,0.58)	0.68 (0.70,0.66)	27675	0.48 (0.51,0.46)	0.61 (0.63,0.58)	0.68 (0.70,0.66)
12									
13	Secondary school	67047	0.72 (0.75,0.69)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)	0.83 (0.85,0.81)	67047	0.72 (0.75,0.69)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)	0.83 (0.85,0.81)
14									
15	Bachelors degree	41901	0.81 (0.85,0.78)	0.84 (0.87,0.81)	0.86 (0.88,0.84)	41901	0.81 (0.85,0.78)	0.84 (0.87,0.81)	0.86 (0.88,0.84)
16									
17	Postgraduate degree	57570	-	-	-	57570	-	-	-
18									
19									
20									
21	Father highest qualification								
22									
23	No formal qualification	26712	0.65 (0.68,0.61)	0.73 (0.76,0.70)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)	26712	0.65 (0.68,0.61)	0.73 (0.76,0.70)	0.82 (0.85,0.79)
24									
25	Secondary school	51177	0.86 (0.91,0.82)	0.91 (0.94,0.88)	0.90 (0.93,0.88)	51177	0.86 (0.91,0.82)	0.91 (0.94,0.88)	0.90 (0.93,0.88)
26									
27	Bachelors degree	47388	0.99 (1.04,0.94)	0.98 (1.02,0.94)	1.06 (1.10,1.04)	47388	0.99 (1.04,0.94)	0.98 (1.02,0.94)	1.06 (1.10,1.04)
28									
29	Postgraduate degree	39450	-	-	-	39450	-	-	-
30									
31									
32	Member of household receives benefit income								
33									
34	No	159069	-	-	-	158679	-	-	-
35									
36	Yes	51777	0.57 (0.59,0.55)	0.65 (0.66,0.63)	0.66 (0.67,0.65)	51720	0.56 (0.58,0.55)	0.64 (0.66,0.63)	0.66 (0.67,0.65)
37									
38									
39									
40	Family circumstances								
41									
42									
43									
44									
45									
46									

1									
2	Age of mother at child's								
3	birth								
4			0.48	0.56	0.64		0.48	0.56	0.64
5	<20	14313	(0.51,0.46)	(0.59,0.54)	(0.66,0.62)	14313	(0.51,0.46)	(0.59,0.54)	(0.66,0.62)
6			0.63	0.69	0.75		0.63	0.69	0.75
7	20-24	41889	(0.66,0.61)	(0.72,0.67)	(0.77,0.74)	41889	(0.66,0.61)	(0.72,0.67)	(0.77,0.74)
8			0.83	0.88	0.88		0.83	0.88	0.88
9	25-29	55800	(0.86,0.79)	(0.90,0.85)	(0.91,0.87)	55800	(0.86,0.79)	(0.90,0.85)	(0.91,0.87)
10	30-34	66297	-	-	-	66297	-	-	-
11			0.90	0.89	0.95		0.90	0.89	0.95
12	35+	58977	(0.93,0.87)	(0.92,0.86)	(0.97,0.93)	58974	(0.93,0.87)	(0.92,0.86)	(0.97,0.93)
13									
14									
15	Father on birth								
16	certificate								
17	No	12612	0.56	0.61	0.60	12612	0.56	0.61	0.60
18			(0.59,0.53)	(0.64,0.59)	(0.62,0.57)		(0.59,0.53)	(0.64,0.59)	(0.62,0.57)
19	Yes	224664	-	-	-	224664	-	-	-
20									
21									
22	Mother speaks English								
23	No	3483	0.81	1.00	0.56	3483	0.81	1.00	0.56
24			(0.90,0.72)	(1.10,0.92)	(0.60,0.53)		(0.90,0.72)	(1.10,0.92)	(0.60,0.53)
25	Yes	196248	-	-	-	196248	-	-	-
26									
27									
28									
29	Housing								
30	Urban	224976	-	-	-	215775	-	-	-
31									
32	Rural	36630	1.05	1.03	1.59	35838	0.93	0.95	1.54
33			(1.09,1.01)	(1.06,1.00)	(1.61,1.54)		(0.96,0.89)	(0.98,0.93)	(1.59,1.52)
34									
35	Household size								
36									
37	2-4 people	121098	-	-	-	120852	-	-	-
38			0.74	0.75	0.76		0.74	0.74	0.76
39	5-7 people	77961	(0.76,0.71)	(0.76,0.72)	(0.77,0.75)	77808	(0.76,0.71)	(0.76,0.72)	(0.77,0.75)
40			0.42	0.51	0.36		0.42	0.51	0.36
41	8+ people	11784	(0.44,0.40)	(0.53,0.49)	(0.37,0.34)	11742	(0.44,0.40)	(0.53,0.49)	(0.37,0.34)
42									
43									
44									
45									
46									

1									
2									
3									
4	Own home	112581	-	-	-	112458	-	-	-
5	Rented home	94146	0.56	0.63	0.71	93840	0.56	0.64	0.71
6			(0.57,0.54)	(0.65,0.62)	(0.72,0.69)		(0.58,0.54)	(0.65,0.63)	(0.72,0.70)
7									
8									
9									
10	Number of residence								
11	changes age 0-4								
12									
13	None	61761	-	-	-	62412	-	-	-
14	1	57459	2.86	2.13	1.33	47994	1.16	1.01	0.90
15			(2.94,2.78)	(2.17,2.08)	(1.37,1.30)		(1.22,1.12)	(1.04,0.98)	(0.92,0.88)
16	2	42891	2.86	2.00	1.25	31935	0.96	0.85	0.83
17			(2.94,2.70)	(2.08,1.92)	(1.28,1.22)		(1.00,0.92)	(0.88,0.81)	(0.85,0.81)
18	3	28653	2.33	1.67	1.15	20745	0.85	0.73	0.78
19			(2.44,2.22)	(1.72,1.61)	(1.18,1.11)		(0.90,0.81)	(0.76,0.70)	(0.81,0.76)
20	4	18810	2.04	1.41	1.08	32235	0.66	0.60	0.76
21			(2.13,1.92)	(1.47,1.37)	(1.11,1.04)		(0.68,0.63)	(0.62,0.58)	(0.79,0.75)
22	5+	30447	1.56	1.16	1.05	62412	1.37	1.18	0.99
23			(1.61,1.49)	(1.20,1.12)	(1.09,1.03)		(1.43,1.32)	(1.22,1.14)	(1.01,0.97)
24									
25	Health status								
26									
27	Mother smoking status								
28	Regular smoker	38457	0.56	0.63	0.78	38460	0.56	0.63	0.78
29			(0.57,0.53)	(0.65,0.61)	(0.79,0.76)		(0.57,0.53)	(0.65,0.61)	(0.79,0.76)
30	Ex smoker	45420	0.94	0.90	1.08	45420	0.94	0.90	1.08
31			(0.98,0.90)	(0.93,0.88)	(1.10,1.05)		(0.98,0.90)	(0.93,0.88)	(1.10,1.05)
32	Never smoked	111219	-	-	-	111219	-	-	-
33									
34									
35	Birthweight								
36	<2500g	14049	0.57	0.73	0.87	14049	0.57	0.73	0.87
37			(0.60,0.55)	(0.76,0.70)	(0.90,0.84)		(0.60,0.55)	(0.76,0.70)	(0.90,0.84)
38	2500-4000g	187242	-	-	-	187239	-	-	-
39	>4000g	34746	1.01	0.96	1.04	34749	1.01	0.96	1.04
40			(1.05,0.97)	(0.99,0.93)	(1.06,1.01)		(1.05,0.97)	(0.99,0.93)	(1.06,1.01)
41									
42									
43									
44									
45									
46									

1									
2									
3									
4	Gestation								
5	<37 weeks	17922	0.60 (0.63,0.57)	0.76 (0.79,0.73)	0.88 (0.91,0.85)	17922	0.60 (0.63,0.57)	0.76 (0.79,0.73)	0.88 (0.91,0.85)
6									
7	37-42 weeks	217128	-	-	-	217128	-	-	-
8									
9	>42 weeks	1443	1.00 (1.19,0.85)	0.97 (1.11,0.84)	0.67 (0.75,0.61)	1443	1.00 (1.19,0.85)	0.97 (1.11,0.84)	0.67 (0.75,0.61)
10									
11									
12	Child referred for disability support assessment								
13									
14	No	261408	-	-	-	247875	-	-	-
15									
16	Yes	4473	0.46 (0.50,0.43)	0.46 (0.49,0.43)	0.61 (0.65,0.57)	4401	0.34 (0.37,0.32)	0.38 (0.40,0.36)	0.56 (0.60,0.53)
17									
18									
19	Number of quarters enrolled with GP age 0-4								
20									
21	0-3	25407	0.16 (0.17,0.16)	0.23 (0.24,0.22)	0.41 (0.42,0.39)	16215	0.16 (0.17,0.16)	0.20 (0.21,0.19)	0.42 (0.44,0.41)
22									
23									
24	4-7	41286	0.74 (0.77,0.72)	0.81 (0.83,0.78)	0.91 (0.93,0.89)	42645	0.53 (0.55,0.51)	0.54 (0.55,0.52)	0.83 (0.85,0.81)
25									
26									
27	8-11	90621	0.95 (0.98,0.92)	0.97 (1.00,0.94)	0.99 (1.01,0.97)	95298	0.76 (0.79,0.74)	0.78 (0.80,0.76)	0.98 (1.00,1.00)
28									
29	12+	93174	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
30									
31									
32	Number of hospital admissions age 0-4								
33									
34	None	104382	-	-	-	108081	-	-	-
35									
36	1 to 2	104280	2.17 (2.22,2.13)	1.75 (1.82,1.72)	1.35 (1.37,1.32)	111288	1.32 (1.35,1.28)	1.23 (1.27,1.20)	1.14 (1.16,1.12)
37									
38	3 to 5	21528	1.85 (1.92,1.79)	1.64 (1.72,1.59)	1.32 (1.35,1.27)	22668	1.06 (1.11,1.01)	1.11 (1.15,1.06)	1.09 (1.11,1.05)
39									
40	6+	9834	1.23 (1.32,1.18)	1.19 (1.25,1.14)	1.12 (1.16,1.08)	10242	0.73 (0.77,0.69)	0.82 (0.86,0.78)	0.94 (0.98,0.91)
41									
42									
43									
44									
45									
46									

1
2
3
4 Total days in hospital age 0-
5 4

6	None	134751	-	-	-	141108	-	-	-
7			1.92	1.59	1.27		1.23	1.16	1.11
8	1 to 9	96537	(1.96,1.85)	(1.61,1.54)	(1.30,1.25)	102060	(1.27,1.20)	(1.19,1.14)	(1.12,1.09)
9			1.28	1.22	0.98		0.83	0.90	0.85
10	10 to 19	5022	(1.41,1.19)	(1.32,1.14)	(1.03,0.93)	5268	(0.91,0.77)	(0.96,0.84)	(0.90,0.81)
11	20+	3714	0.81	0.84	0.82	3843	0.53	0.63	0.72
12			(0.88,0.75)	(0.91,0.78)	(0.88,0.77)		(0.58,0.49)	(0.67,0.58)	(0.77,0.68)

13
14
15 Total number of ED visits
16 age 0-4

17	None	205911	-	-	-	215601	-	-	-
18			1.20	0.96	0.63		0.99	0.93	0.69
19	1 to 2	31854	(1.37,1.06)	(1.06,0.87)	(0.69,0.58)	34218	(1.02,0.95)	(0.95,0.90)	(0.71,0.68)
20			0.98	0.98	0.99		0.85	0.76	0.58
21	3+	2262	(1.01,0.96)	(1.00,0.96)	(1.01,0.98)	2457	(0.95,0.75)	(0.85,0.69)	(0.63,0.54)

Appendix 2Percentage of children completing each component of B4SC, by year

% of children completing check

B4 School check	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
Vision	86.8	88.7	90.7	91.8
Hearing	86.8	88.6	90.6	91.8
Dental	79.4	82.1	86.7	88.4
Growth	79.4	82.1	86.7	88.4
Immunisation	79.1	81.9	86.3	87.9
PEDS	79.4	82.1	86.6	88.4
SDQP	79.3	81.9	86.5	88.2
SDQT	52.9	56.5	59.8	61.4

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1 (title)
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5,6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	8
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	8
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	9-11
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	10-11
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	11-15
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	11-15
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	11, APPENDIX 2
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	11
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	11-15
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	15-16
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	N/A
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	N/A
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	N/A
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	11, APPENDIX 2
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	11
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	11
		(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	12-14, Tables 2 and 3
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Tables 2 and 3
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	Tables 2 and 3
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	Tables 2 and 3
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	11-15
		(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	APPENDIX 2
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	19
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	19-20
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	20-21
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	19
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	23

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

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.