

# 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](mailto:info.bmjopen@bmj.com)

# BMJ Open

## Cumulative social disadvantage and hospitalisations due to ambulatory care sensitive conditions in Finland in 2011–2013: a register study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-038338
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	09-Mar-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Lumme, Sonja; Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Department of Health and Social Care Systems; University of Helsinki, Department of Psychology and Logopedics Manderbacka, Kristiina; Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Department of Health and Social Care Systems Arffman, Martti; Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Department of Health and Social Care Systems Karvonen, Sakari; Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Department of Health and Social Care Systems Keskimaki, Ilmo; Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Department of Health and Social Care Systems; Tampere University, Faculty of Social Sciences
Keywords:	Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, PRIMARY CARE, Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1  
2  
3 1 **Cumulative social disadvantage and hospitalisations due to ambulatory care sensitive conditions in**  
4  
5 2 **Finland in 2011–2013: a register study**

6  
7 3  
8  
9  
10 4 **Corresponding author** Sonja Lumme<sup>1,2</sup>

11 5 <sup>1</sup>Social and Health Systems Research Unit, Department of Health and Social Care Systems, Finnish Institute  
12 for Health and Welfare, P.O. Box 30, FI-00271 Helsinki, Finland

13 6 <sup>2</sup>Department Psychology and Logopedics, P.O. Box 21, FI-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland

14  
15 7  
16 8 email sonja.lumme@thl.fi, tel. +358 29 524 7218

17  
18  
19 9•  
20  
21 10• **Co-authors** Kristiina Manderbacka,<sup>1</sup> Martti Arffman,<sup>1</sup> Sakari Karvonen,<sup>2</sup> Ilmo Keskimäki,<sup>1,3</sup>

22 11 <sup>1</sup> Social and Health Systems Research Unit, Department of Health and Social Care Systems, Finnish Institute  
23 for Health and Welfare, P.O. Box 30, FI-00271 Helsinki, Finland

24 12 <sup>2</sup> Social Policy Research Unit, Department of Health and Social Care Systems, Finnish Institute for Health  
25 and Welfare, P.O. Box 30, FI-00271 Helsinki

26 13 <sup>3</sup> Faculty of Social Sciences, Tampere University, 33014 Tampere University, Finland

27 14  
28  
29 15  
30  
31 16  
32 17  
33  
34 18• **Word count** 5228

35  
36 19  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **1 Abstract**  
4  
5

6 **2 Objectives** To study the interplay between several indicators of social disadvantage and hospitalisations  
7  
8 **3** due to ambulatory care sensitive conditions (ACSC) in 2011–2013. To evaluate whether the accumulation of  
9  
10 **4** preceding social disadvantage in one point of time or prolongation of social disadvantage had an effect on  
11  
12 **5** hospitalisations due to ACSCs. Four common indicators of disadvantage are examined: living alone, low  
13  
14 **6** level of education, poverty, and unemployment.  
15  
16

17  
18 **7 Design** A population-based register study  
19  
20

21 **8 Setting** Nationwide individual-level register data on hospitalisations due to ACSCs for the years 2011–2013  
22  
23 **9** and data on social and socioeconomic factors for the years 2006–2010  
24  
25

26 **10 Participants** Finnish residents aged 45 or older in 2011–2013  
27  
28

29 **11 Outcome measure** Hospitalisations due to ACSCs. The effect of accumulation of disadvantage in one point  
30  
31 **12** of time and its prolongation on ACSCs was studied using logistic regression.  
32  
33

34  
35 **13 Results** People with preceding cumulative social disadvantage were more likely to be hospitalised due to  
36  
37 **14** ACSCs. The most hazardous combination was simultaneously living alone, low level of education, and  
38  
39 **15** poverty among the middle-aged (aged 45–64) and the elderly (over 64). Odds ratios (OR) of being  
40  
41 **16** hospitalized due to ACSC were 3.41 (95% confidence interval 3.26–3.56) among middle-aged men and 3.77  
42  
43 **17** (3.57–3.97) among middle-aged women compared with individuals without any of these risk factors when  
44  
45 **18** controlling for age and residential area. For the elderly, the OR was 1.81 (1.75–1.87) among men and 1.82  
46  
47 **19** (1.76–1.88) among women.  
48  
49

50  
51 **20 Conclusions** To improve social equity in health care, it is important to recognise not only patients with  
52  
53 **21** cumulative disadvantage, but – as this study shows – patients with particular combinations of disadvantage  
54  
55 **22** who may be more susceptible. The identification of these vulnerable patients groups is also necessary to  
56  
57 **23** reduce the use of more expensive treatment in specialised health care.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1 Keywords: Socioeconomic disadvantage, social disadvantage, ambulatory care sensitive conditions,  
4  
5 2 inequities, health care, register data  
6  
7

8 3  
9

10  
11 4 **Strengths and limitations of this study**  
12  
13

- 14 5 • The individual-level register-based data allowed us to study simultaneously several indicators of  
15  
16 social and socioeconomic disadvantage  
17 6  
18  
19 7 • The nationwide register data covered all hospitalisations due to ambulatory care sensitive  
20  
21 conditions (ACSCs) in Finland  
22 8  
23  
24 9 • We were able to study social disadvantage of period preceding hospitalisations and its effect on  
25  
26 being hospitalised due to ACSCs  
27 10  
28  
29 11 • Hospitalisations due to ACSCs is an indirect indicator of the effectiveness and quality of primary  
30  
31 health care  
32  
33 12  
34 13 • While the study addressed associations between social disadvantage and hospitalisations due to  
35  
36 ACSCs, the causality between morbidity and social disadvantage could not be studied  
37  
38  
39 14  
40  
41 15  
42  
43 16  
44 17  
45  
46 18  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 1           2 3   1   **Background** 4 5

6   2   Inadequate access to health care is one of the important determinants of social inequities in health.[1] Well  
7  
8   3   organised primary care has repeatedly been shown to promote population health and prevent ill-health.

9  
10   4   There is also evidence that primary care (in contrast to specialist care) is associated with a more equitable  
11  
12   5   distribution of health in populations through prevention and early management of health problems and  
13  
14   6   through facilitating entry to the rest of the health care system.[2] The Finnish health-care system provides a  
15  
16   7   good case for examining equity as the system operates on the principle of universality and therefore, in  
17  
18   8   general, supports equal access to health services according to need.[3] Simultaneously, studies from both  
19  
20   9   Finland and some other countries with universal health care systems show systematic and persistent  
21  
22   10   socioeconomic inequities in physician utilisation in relation to need.[2-5] Challenges in providing timely  
23  
24   11   access to primary care are encountered in some areas[6] and there are indications of differences in primary  
25  
26   12   health care quality between regions.[7] However, Finland has – compared to most other European  
27  
28   13   countries – a strong publicly funded primary health care.[8]

29  
30  
31  
32  
33   14   Hospitalisations due to ambulatory care sensitive conditions (ACSC) are used to indirectly evaluate the  
34  
35   15   effectiveness and quality of primary care.[9, 10] They are defined as hospitalisations that could be  
36  
37   16   prevented by primary care interventions. Earlier studies have used slightly different lists of conditions, but  
38  
39   17   have usually examined three types of conditions: conditions that can be prevented by vaccination, acute  
40  
41   18   conditions in which hospitalisation can be prevented by adequate (acute) management of the condition,  
42  
43   19   and chronic conditions where good quality and timely primary care can prevent later admissions, e.g., due  
44  
45   20   to complications of diabetes. Several studies from the U.S.,[11-13] Canada,[14-16] Australia,[17-19] New  
46  
47   21   Zealand[20] and European countries[21-27] have examined socioeconomic differences in ACSC and  
48  
49   22   reported more ACSC hospitalisations among persons with lower socioeconomic background.

50  
51  
52  
53   23   Most earlier studies examining socioeconomic differences in ACSC have used ecological data of single  
54  
55   24   socioeconomic indicators, mainly income[12, 14, 15, 22, 23, 26] or deprivation indices based on ecological  
56  
57   25   data,[17-21, 23, 25, 27] while few studies have focused on the individual-level socioeconomic indicators.

1 Socioeconomic position is, however, a complex construct reflecting different dimensions of the individuals'  
2 standing in the social hierarchy.[28] The persistence of health inequalities have led researchers to point out  
3 that we need to analyse multiple social circumstances simultaneously in order to assess their impact on  
4 health and health care.[29] We found few studies utilizing this approach with ACSCs. A study, which  
5 examined elderly Medicare beneficiaries in the USA, used multiple individual-level indicators of  
6 socioeconomic position but it did not examine them simultaneously.[11] Another from the Stockholm  
7 County in Sweden[24] analysed several individual-level socioeconomic variables simultaneously. And third  
8 from Ontario, Canada, examined trends and regional differences in acute diabetes complications and  
9 accounted for income and education at the community level.[16]

10 In addition to social position, social relationships may also contribute to outcomes of health care.[30, 31]  
11 Social relationships can be measured using self-reported measures of social isolation or loneliness. Using  
12 register data, it is possible to study living arrangements and to use living alone as a proxy measure for social  
13 isolation. Although previous studies have found a strong association between living alone and social  
14 isolation and loneliness,[32] these conditions are distinct. However, also living alone has been found to  
15 increase the use of health services[33, 34] and living alone has been applied as a measure of social  
16 isolation.[35] Social isolation has been identified as a risk factor for avoidable hospitalisation in one  
17 interview study from rural Australia.[36] On the other hand, a study using area-level measures of social  
18 deprivation detected lower admission rates for several chronic diseases in areas with higher proportions of  
19 elderly individuals living alone in London.[27] A study in the US found no association between living alone  
20 and hospitalisations due to ACSCs among retirement age (65+) individuals.[37] The population studied was,  
21 however, a sample of participants having access to an integrated delivery system with a preventive  
22 approach in the management of services and thus representing healthier residents than the general  
23 population.

24 Cumulative disadvantage may refer to two distinct social processes. On the one hand, it may imply  
25 accumulation of individual forms of disadvantage cross-sectionally. On the other hand, cumulative  
26 disadvantage may be observed with one or several forms of disadvantage persisting over time. The above-



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

1 mentioned studies have not examined how these social risk factors cumulate at individual-level either in  
2 one point of time or during a longer time period and whether the accumulation is associated with the risk  
3 of being hospitalised due to ACSCs. In recent literature, researchers have suggested that the effects of risk  
4 factors accumulate over time and thus increase socioeconomic disparities in health outcomes.[38, 39] A  
5 large number of studies have found associations between cumulative disadvantage and health. However,  
6 the relationship between accumulation of social disadvantage and health care in terms of effectiveness and  
7 quality, has received relatively little attention.

8 Social risk factors may have different impacts on outcomes of health care. Accumulation of the risk factors  
9 may also increase the risk of poor outcomes. Additionally, the effect of accumulation may vary depending  
10 on the combination of the risk factors and the persistence of accumulation. The main aim of the current  
11 study is to examine whether the preceding accumulation of social disadvantage increases inequities in  
12 outcomes of health care. We study hospitalisations due to ACSCs as an outcome of health care and as a  
13 study population we examine Finns aged 45 and over. The more specific study questions are: 1) What is the  
14 independent effect of different social risk factors on the risk of being hospitalised due to ACSCs? 2) What  
15 combination of social disadvantage in one point of time is the most hazardous in terms of hospitalisations  
16 due to ACSCs? 3) Does prolongation of cumulative disadvantage in time have effect on hospitalisations due  
17 to ACSCs? We examine four common indicators of social disadvantage: living alone, poverty, low level of  
18 education, and unemployment. We utilise comprehensive individual-level register data on  
19 sociodemographic and social factors and hospitalisations between 2006–2013.

## 1 **Materials**

2 This study utilised register data for years 2006–2013 for the non-institutionalised Finnish residents aged 45  
3 years or older in January 1<sup>st</sup> 2011. For this population, annual individual-level information on  
4 sociodemographic factors in 2006–2010 was obtained from different administrative registers maintained by  
5 Statistics Finland. These factors included information on gender, age and region of residence as well as  
6 factors which were used to define risk factors for disadvantage: living arrangements, income, education,  
7 and annual number of unemployment months within a calendar year. Register data on hospitalisations due  
8 to ACSCs for the population at risk were individually linked to the sociodemographic data. Our outcome  
9 measure was hospitalisations due to ACSCs in 2011–2013. Information on hospitalisations was obtained  
10 from the Care Register for Health Care maintained by the Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare. We  
11 applied the UK definition of ACSCs with an addition of unspecified pneumonia (ICD-10 code J18.9) and  
12 influenza (J09)[10] (supplementary file 1). We categorised ACSCs as acute, chronic, or vaccine-preventable  
13 conditions as suggested by previous studies.[40] We included only inpatient hospital admissions, at least  
14 one night length of stay, both emergence and elective admissions.

15 We examined the data in two age groups: individuals aged 45–64 (the middle-aged) and 65 and older (the  
16 elderly) and studied them separately in all analyses. This allowed us to study whether there were  
17 differences between the middle-aged and the elderly in the association between ACSC hospitalisations and  
18 cumulative disadvantage and enabled us to include unemployment as a risk factor in the analysis in the  
19 younger age group. In addition, there are structural differences in access to ambulatory care services  
20 between the working aged population and others due to occupational health care.[3] We studied men and  
21 women mainly separately due to differing levels of hospitalisations due to ACSCs[7] and effects of risk  
22 factors. We used 20 hospital districts, based on an administrative division of the Finnish hospital care  
23 system, as an indicator of region of residence.

24 The situation of living arrangements on December 31<sup>st</sup> in each year was used to define a dichotomous  
25 variable indicating whether an individual had lived alone during the year. We studied disposable family net

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

1 income as an indicator for income. The family income was adjusted for family size using the OECD modified  
2 equivalence scale. Poverty was defined as net family income lower than 60% of the median family  
3 income.[41] Data on level of education was used to categorize the risk factor related to education. Low  
4 level of education was defined as having no degrees after comprehensive school. We defined the individual  
5 as being unemployed for that year if being unemployed for 6-12 months during the year. For the older age  
6 group in this study we did not use unemployment as a risk factor as they are rarely in paid labour in  
7 Finland.

## 8 **Ethics**

9 Ethical approval for the study was received from the Research Ethics Committee of the Finnish Institute for  
10 Health and Welfare.

## 11 **Patient and Public Involvement**

12 Patients were not involved in the design or the implementation of the study.

## 1 **Statistical methods**

2 We treated ACSC hospitalisations as a binary outcome variable, combining those with one and several ACSC  
3 hospitalisations into one category and thus we used logistic regression method in analysing the data. Our  
4 main interest was the effect of preceding social and socioeconomic factors on hospitalisations due to ACSCs  
5 in 2011–2013. The studied social and socioeconomic risk factors were living alone, poverty, and low level of  
6 education (and also unemployment for the younger age group) and these explanatory variables were also  
7 included in the model as binary variables. All analyses throughout the study were adjusted for region of  
8 residence and age, age treated as categorical variable by 5-year age groups. The modest correlations  
9 between the explanatory variables were taken into account by creating composite variables.

10 **Objective 1:** We aimed to study the independent effect of each social risk factor on hospitalisations due to  
11 ACSCs by analysing separately each risk factor including only that variable as an explanatory variable in the  
12 model in addition to age and region. In these analyses we assessed the effect of each social risk factor  
13 separately for those who had experienced only that social disadvantage in 2006–2010 (at least in one year)  
14 compared with individuals who had none of the risk factors during the whole period. Additionally, the  
15 differences of the independent effects of the risk factors were tested by creating a composite variable  
16 made up of all social risk factor variables indicating independent risks and using pairwise contrast effects  
17 procedure.

18 **Objective 2:** We aimed to identify the most hazardous combination of social disadvantage in terms of  
19 hospitalisations due to ACSCs for the combinations of two, three (and four among the younger age group)  
20 risk factors. This was done by creating composite variables of different combinations of the risk factors in  
21 2006–2010 and these composite variables were modelled separately as the explanatory variables. If this  
22 risk factor was present at least in one year, it was considered as a risk factor and the prolongation was not  
23 taken into consideration in these analyses. Those who had none of the social risk factors during the years  
24 served as the reference group.

1  
2  
3 1 **Objective 3:** The effect of prolongation of cumulative disadvantage on hospitalisations due to ACSCs was  
4  
5 2 studied for the most hazardous combination of the risk factors found in the analyses of the Objective 2. We  
6  
7 3 studied how the prolongation of the cumulative disadvantage modified the risk by categorising the number  
8  
9 4 of years (0 to 5 years) of cumulative disadvantage during the period and treating this categorical variable as  
10  
11 5 an explanatory variable. For instance, if an individual had simultaneously all studied risk factors in each year  
12  
13 6 between 2006–2010, he/she was categorised as having 5 years of prolonged cumulative disadvantage.  
14  
15 7 Again, those who had none of the risk factors in 2006–2010 served as the reference group. Additionally, we  
16  
17 8 performed pairwise comparison tests using contrast effects to study whether the number of years of  
18  
19 9 prolongation of cumulative disadvantage had an effect on the ORs among those who had experienced  
20  
21 10 cumulative disadvantage.

22  
23  
24  
25  
26 11 We analysed men and women separately but we performed additional analyses and tested gender  
27  
28 12 differences in the associations of risk factors (as independent, cumulative, and prolonged cumulative) and  
29  
30 13 hospitalisations due to ACSCs. This was done by including an interaction term between gender and risk  
31  
32 14 factors in analyses combining both genders.

### 33 15 ***Sensitivity analyses***

34  
35  
36  
37  
38 16 We conducted additional analyses for analyses concerning the Objective 2. In these additional analyses we  
39  
40 17 included only incident hospitalisations due to ACSCs and excluded those patients who had preceding  
41  
42 18 hospitalisation due to ACSCs in 1987–2010. Otherwise, the assumptions and definitions were similar to the  
43  
44 19 main analyses.

45  
46  
47  
48 20 Additionally, to study the Objective 2 in more detail, we performed analyses treating the number of ACSC  
49  
50 21 hospitalisations as an ordinal response variable and these analyses were conducted using ordinal logistic  
51  
52 22 regression model. Otherwise, the assumptions and definitions were similar to the main analyses.

53  
54  
55 23 We used SAS (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA) version 9.4 to analyse the data.

56  
57 24  
58  
59  
60 25

## 1 Results

2 In the study period 2006–2013, the population at risk comprised altogether 1 530 397 (50% men)  
3 individuals aged 45–64 and 927 152 (42% men) individuals aged 65 or over. The number of hospitalisations  
4 due to ambulatory care sensitive conditions in 2011–2013 was 50 121 (58% men) among the middle-aged  
5 and 133 341 (45% men) among the elderly. Of those men, who had ACSC hospitalisations, 75% had only  
6 one ACSC hospitalisation during the study period among the middle-aged and 64% among the elderly.  
7 Among women, the corresponding proportions were 79% and 67%.

### 8 *Results concerning the Objective 1*

9 All the studied social and socioeconomic risk factors had an independent effect on hospitalisations due to  
10 ACSCs after controlling for area of residence and age (Table 1). Each of the risk factors increased  
11 significantly the odds of being hospitalized due to ACSCs after adjustment for age and area of residence  
12 compared to individuals who had none of the risk factors in 2006–2010. Poverty and low level of education  
13 had the strongest independent effect on ACSCs among both age groups and genders. The independent  
14 effect of unemployment was statistically significantly smaller than the effect of all the other studied risk  
15 factors among middle-aged men (p-values < 0.0001). Among middle-aged women, the independent effect  
16 of unemployment was statistically smaller than the effect of poverty and low level of education (p-values <  
17 0.0001). The independent effect of living alone was statistically significantly smaller than the effect of  
18 poverty and low level of education among the elderly (p-values < 0.0001). The effect of living alone was  
19 significantly larger for men among the middle-aged (p-value for interaction between gender and living  
20 alone < 0.0001) and the effect of low level of education was greater for women among the elderly (p-value  
21 for interaction between gender and low level of education 0.005).

1  
2  
3 1 Table 1. Independent effects of the risk factors on hospitalisations due to ambulatory care sensitive  
4  
5 2 conditions by age and gender in Finland in 2011–2013  
6  
7

	Men aged 45-64		Women aged 45-64	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Living alone	1.41	1.35–1.46	1.21	1.16–1.26
Poverty	1.56	1.48–1.64	1.56	1.48–1.64
Low level of education	1.44	1.39–1.49	1.57	1.51–1.64
Unemployment	1.19	1.13–1.25	1.15	1.08–1.23
	Men aged ≥ 65		Women aged ≥ 65	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
Living alone	1.21	1.16–1.26	1.14	1.10–1.19
Poverty	1.34	1.27–1.41	1.37	1.29–1.45
Low level of education	1.32	1.28–1.35	1.35	1.31–1.40

27 The reference category is those individuals who had none of the risk factors during  
28 the period 2006–2010. ORs estimated from separate models for each risk factor.  
29 Adjusted for age and region of residence.  
30

### 33 **Results concerning the Objective 2**

34 3  
35  
36 4 Next we studied the associations between different combinations of cumulative disadvantage and  
37  
38 5 hospitalisations due to ACSCs (Table 2). All combinations of two, and three (and four among the middle-  
39  
40 6 aged) risk factors increased significantly the odds of being hospitalized due to ACSC compared with the  
41  
42 7 reference group who had none of the risk factors. The only exception was the combination of living alone  
43  
44 8 and unemployment, which was not statistically significant among middle-aged women. Among the middle-  
45  
46 9 aged, the most hazardous combination of two risk factors was living alone and poverty among both  
47  
48 10 genders; the OR was 2.77 (95% confidence interval 2.66–2.89) among men and 2.62 (2.49–2.76) among  
49  
50 11 women. Those risk combinations which included unemployment had the smallest ORs. The most hazardous  
51  
52 12 combination of three risk factors was living alone, poverty, and low level of education with OR of 3.41  
53  
54 13 (3.26–3.56) among men and 3.77 (3.57–3.97) among women. The effect of cumulative disadvantage on  
55  
56 14 hospitalisations due to ACSCs was not statistically different between men and women. When all the four  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 risk factors were present, the ORs were 2.34 (2.18–2.51) and 2.03 (1.84–2.24), respectively and the effect  
 2 was larger for men (p-value for interaction between gender and cumulative disadvantage 0.005). Among  
 3 elderly men, the most hazardous combination of two risk factors was living alone and poverty: the OR was  
 4 1.63 (1.55–1.72). Among elderly women, the present of poverty and low level of education was the most  
 5 hazardous combination of two risk factors: the OR was 1.57 (1.51–1.64). When all the three risk factors  
 6 (living alone, poverty, and low level of education) were present, the OR was 1.81 (1.75–1.87) and 1.82  
 7 (1.76–1.88), respectively.

8 Table 2. The effect of different combinations of the risk factors on hospitalisations due to ambulatory care  
 9 sensitive conditions in Finland in 2011–2013

Living alone	Poverty	Low level of education	Unemployment	Men aged 45-64		Women aged 45-64	
				OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
<i>Combinations of two risk factors</i>							
X	X	–	–	2.77	2.66–2.89	2.62	2.49–2.76
X	–	X	–	1.74	1.66–1.84	1.60	1.49–1.71
X	–	–	X	1.41	1.29–1.54	1.08	0.94–1.24
–	X	X	–	2.10	1.99–2.22	2.61	2.46–2.77
–	X	–	X	1.64	1.52–1.78	1.53	1.41–1.67
–	–	X	X	1.25	1.17–1.35	1.28	1.18–1.39
<i>Combinations of three risk factors</i>							
X	X	X	–	3.41	3.26–3.56	3.77	3.57–3.97
X	X	–	X	2.19	2.07–2.32	1.78	1.64–1.94
X	–	X	X	1.42	1.24–1.62	1.41	1.17–1.70
–	X	X	X	1.83	1.67–2.02	1.87	1.69–2.07
<i>All four risk factors</i>							
X	X	X	X	2.34	2.18–2.51	2.03	1.84–2.24
				Men ≥ 65		Women ≥ 65	
Living alone	Poverty	Low level of education		OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
<i>Combinations of two risk factors</i>							
X	X	–		1.63	1.55–1.72	1.51	1.44–1.57
X	–	X		1.52	1.46–1.57	1.43	1.37–1.48
–	X	X		1.40	1.36–1.45	1.57	1.51–1.64
<i>All three risk factors</i>							
X	X	X		1.81	1.75–1.87	1.82	1.76–1.88

10 The reference category is those individuals who had none of the risk factors during the period 2006–2010. ORs  
 11 estimated from separate models for each combination of risk factors.  
 12 Adjusted for age and region of residence



### 1 **Results concerning the Objective 3**

2 The effect of prolonged cumulative disadvantage between 2006–2010 on ACSCs in 2011–2013 was  
 3 examined for the most hazardous combination of the risk factors, i.e. simultaneously living alone,  
 4 experiencing poverty and low level of education. All ORs for being hospitalised due to ACSCs for those  
 5 experiencing one or more years of cumulative disadvantage were statistically significant compared with  
 6 those individuals who had none of the risk factors during the period 2006–2010 among both genders and  
 7 age groups (Table 3). The OR for being hospitalized was 4.36 (4.11–4.62) for those middle-aged men who  
 8 had all the three risk factors in each year compared with those who had none of the risk factors between  
 9 2006–2010. Among middle-aged women, the corresponding OR was 5.23 (4.86–5.62). For the elderly, the  
 10 OR was 1.88 (1.81–1.95) and 1.87 (1.80–1.94).

11 Table 3. The effect of prolonged cumulative disadvantage in 2006–2010 on ambulatory care sensitive  
 12 conditions in Finland in 2011–2013 for the combination of living alone, poverty, and low level of education

The number of years of cumulative disadvantage	Men aged 45-64		Women aged 45-64	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
0	1.00	ref. <sup>1</sup>	1.00	ref. <sup>1</sup>
1	2.60	2.37–2.84	2.54	2.27–2.84
2	2.90	2.62–3.22	2.66	2.32–3.05
3	2.89	2.59–3.23	3.55	3.10–4.06
4	3.30	2.96–3.69	3.84	3.34–4.40
5	4.36	4.11–4.62	5.23	4.86–5.62
	Men aged ≥ 65		Women aged ≥ 65	
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% CI
0	1.00	ref. <sup>1</sup>	1.00	ref. <sup>1</sup>
1	1.77	1.65–1.90	1.64	1.55–1.74
2	1.73	1.59–1.89	1.70	1.58–1.81
3	1.78	1.65–1.92	1.80	1.69–1.91
4	1.59	1.48–1.70	1.79	1.69–1.89
5	1.88	1.81–1.95	1.87	1.80–1.94

13 <sup>1</sup> The reference category is those individuals who had none of the  
 14 risk factors during the period 2006–2010  
 15 Adjusted for age and region of residence

1  
2  
3 1 Among middle-aged men and women, the prolongation of the cumulative disadvantage increased gradually  
4  
5 2 the odds of being hospitalized due to ACSCs. The ORs for those who had experienced prolonged cumulative  
6  
7 3 disadvantage in one, two, three, or four years was statistically smaller than if an individual had experienced  
8  
9 4 cumulative disadvantage in each year. Among the middle-aged, the effect of prolongation of cumulative  
10  
11 5 disadvantage on hospitalisations due to ACSCs was statistically different between men and women (p-value  
12  
13 6 for interaction between gender and prolonged cumulative disadvantage 0.01).

14  
15  
16  
17 7 Among elderly men, the prolongation of the cumulative disadvantage did not increase the odds of being  
18  
19 8 hospitalized due to ACSC, i.e. experiencing one or more years of cumulative disadvantage did not change  
20  
21 9 the odds compared with those individuals who had experienced cumulative disadvantage in each of the five  
22  
23 10 years. Only the difference between four and five years of cumulative disadvantage was statistically  
24  
25 11 significant (pairwise comparison p-value < 0.001). Among elderly women, the differences experiencing one  
26  
27 12 or two years of cumulative disadvantage compared with five years were statistically significant (pairwise  
28  
29 13 comparison p-values < 0.002). Among the elderly, prolongation of cumulative disadvantage had also  
30  
31 14 statistically different effect on hospitalisations due to ACSCs among men and women (p-value for  
32  
33 15 interaction between gender and prolonged cumulative disadvantage 0.005).

34  
35  
36  
37  
38 16

### 39 17 ***Results concerning the sensitivity analyses***

40  
41  
42 18 The odds of being hospitalised due to ACSC for those with cumulative disadvantage compared with those  
43  
44 19 without any of the examined risk factors decreased when including only incident ACSC hospitalisations. For  
45  
46 20 the most hazardous combination of cumulative disadvantage (living alone, poverty, and low level of  
47  
48 21 education), the OR was 2.60 (2.46–2.76) among middle-aged men and 2.82 (2.62–3.02) among middle-aged  
49  
50 22 women when excluding all individuals who were hospitalised due to ACSC before 2011 from the analyses.  
51  
52 23 For the elderly, the OR was 1.65 (1.58–1.72) and 1.64 (1.57–1.71).

53  
54  
55  
56 24 We performed additional analyses using the number of hospital admissions due to ACSCs as an ordinal  
57  
58 25 outcome variable which yielded similar results among both genders and age groups. For the most  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1 hazardous combination of cumulative disadvantage (living alone, poverty, and low level of education), the  
4  
5 2 OR was 3.45 (3.30–3.60) among middle-aged men and 3.81 (3.61–4.02) among middle-aged women (other  
6  
7 3 results not shown).  
8  
9

#### 10 4 **Discussion**

11  
12  
13 5 This population-based register study found strong associations between preceding cumulative social  
14  
15 6 disadvantage and hospitalisations due to ambulatory care sensitive conditions. The study population  
16  
17 7 included all Finnish residents aged 45 years or older in 2011–2013 and for this population we utilised  
18  
19 8 comprehensive data from several administrative registers to examine their hospitalisations in 2011–2013  
20  
21 9 and preceding social and socioeconomic risk factors in 2006–2010. We defined cumulative social  
22  
23 10 disadvantage as combination of several simultaneous risk factors for disadvantage preceding the study  
24  
25 11 period: living alone, poverty, low level of education, and unemployment. The risk of being hospitalised due  
26  
27 12 to ACSCs was markedly elevated if an individual had lived alone and had experienced poverty during the  
28  
29 13 preceding years, and had also poor education. The same combination of the risk factors for social  
30  
31 14 disadvantage was the most hazardous for both age groups (45–64 and over 64) among both genders.  
32  
33 15 Additionally, we found that prolongation of cumulative disadvantage in time increased further the risk of  
34  
35 16 being hospitalized due to ACSCs among the middle-aged (aged 45–64). Among the middle-aged the  
36  
37 17 prolongation of accumulation of risks was even more hazardous for women than for men.  
38  
39  
40 18 The lack of nationwide comprehensive register data on the use of primary health care is a common  
41  
42 19 limitation in health services research. Hospitalisations due to ACSCs provide an indirect measure of the  
43  
44 20 effectiveness and quality of primary health care. Some studies have questioned the accuracy of this  
45  
46 21 indicator to reflect access to primary care. However, the studies concluding that hospitalisations due to  
47  
48 22 ACSCs are not associated with poor access to health care, have used area-level data and have not been able  
49  
50 23 to take into account need for care at individual-level.[42–44] Thus conclusive evidence that more efficient  
51  
52 24 or more accessible primary care could not prevent a notable proportion of hospitalisations due to ACSCs is  
53  
54 25 lacking.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1 A universal list of ACSCs does not exist since hospitalisation criteria vary between countries and health care  
4  
5 2 systems.[10] We applied the UK definition with some minor modifications to maintain international  
6  
7 3 comparability. However, the main purpose of this study was to examine social disadvantage as a risk factor  
8  
9 4 for hospitalisations due to ACSCs within Finland and not to compare countries. We expect there to be no  
10  
11 5 differences in coding practices between socioeconomic groups in administrative regions of Finland. Thus  
12  
13 6 we assume that there is no considerable inconsistency in using this ACSC definition list for our purposes.  
14  
15  
16  
17 7 In this study both emergency and elective hospital admissions were included while some earlier studies  
18  
19 8 have included only emergency admissions.[9, 23] In regard to social and socioeconomic differences, the use  
20  
21 9 of both emergency and elective hospitalisations is likely to somewhat diminish these differences since  
22  
23 10 social disadvantage might increase the risk of emergency hospitalisations while acting as a barrier to  
24  
25 11 elective care.[45] Additionally, the majority of the hospital admissions due to ACSCs in our data were  
26  
27 12 emergency admissions. Thus we presume our results of social inequity would be even greater, had we  
28  
29 13 studied only emergency hospital admissions.  
30  
31  
32  
33 14 With register data we were not able to measure social isolation directly and thus we used living alone as a  
34  
35 15 crude proxy. This measure excludes the individual's social networks outside their home. Living alone does  
36  
37 16 not always denote social isolation or loneliness, although they are interrelated and overlapping. Despite  
38  
39 17 these limitations we detected strong associations between living arrangements and hospitalisations due to  
40  
41 18 ACSCs and our results suggest that living arrangements reflect social support relatively accurately. Another  
42  
43 19 limitation is that we were not able to take into account for ill-health, morbidity or disease severity.  
44  
45  
46  
47 20 Our results of independent effects of the socioeconomic risk factors on hospitalisations due to ACSCs are in  
48  
49 21 line with the results found in several earlier studies reporting that disadvantaged socioeconomic position is  
50  
51 22 associated with increased risk of being hospitalised due to ACSCs.[15, 22, 25] These previous studies  
52  
53 23 examined only one socioeconomic factor or used small area based deprivation indices in assessing  
54  
55 24 socioeconomic position. Few studies have examined several socioeconomic factors at the same time.  
56  
57  
58 25 Blustein et al.[11] found that poorer and less-educated individuals were likely to be hospitalised due to  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1 ACSCs in the US in the early 1990's, but they modelled education and income separately. A study from  
4  
5 2 Sweden detected that individuals with lower income and those not gainfully employed had higher risk of  
6  
7 3 becoming hospitalised due to ACSCs in the mid 2000's.[24] Booth et al.[16] studied the effect of education  
8  
9 4 and income at the community-level on acute diabetes complications in Canada in the late 1990's and found  
10  
11 5 that only low neighbourhood income increased the risk of being hospitalised. However, these studies did  
12  
13 6 not examine how the accumulation of individual-level socioeconomic risk factors affects the risk of being  
14  
15 7 hospitalised due to ACSCs. Higher prevalence of morbidity among individuals with low socioeconomic  
16  
17 8 position is likely to partly explain inequalities in hospitalisation due to ACSCs. While primary health care  
18  
19 9 obviously cannot prevent all ACSC events leading to hospital admissions, an efficient health care system  
20  
21 10 should diminish differences between socioeconomic groups which may also be partly due to higher  
22  
23 11 morbidity among the lower socioeconomic groups.

24  
25  
26  
27  
28 12 We evaluated the effect of living alone as a proxy for social isolation on hospitalisations due to ACSCs. We  
29  
30 13 found that the independent effect of living alone was significant and increased the risk of being hospitalised  
31  
32 14 due to ACSCs and the effect was greater for middle-aged men than for middle-aged women. Living alone  
33  
34 15 was as hazardous as poverty and low level of education among middle-aged men. The strong association  
35  
36 16 between living alone and the risk of being hospitalized due to ACSC suggests that absence of adequate  
37  
38 17 social support might also play a role in seeking care especially among men with low socioeconomic  
39  
40 18 position. Using interview data Longman et al.[36] have reported a similar finding concerning social isolation  
41  
42 19 as a contributory factor in avoidable hospital admissions in Australia. Ennis et al.[37] studied the association  
43  
44 20 of living alone and hospitalisations due to ACSCs in the US and concluded that living alone in later life did  
45  
46 21 not increase hospitalisation risk. Their study cohort included about 2 600 selected participants who were  
47  
48 22 presumably healthier than the general population. Thus, the results might not be applicable to broader  
49  
50 23 population groups. Saxena et al.[27] found significant negative association between asthma, hypertension  
51  
52 24 and COPD hospitalisations and proportion of elderly living alone in London. Their interpretation of this  
53  
54 25 finding was that the support structures in the affluent areas prevent hospitalisations among the elderly.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1 We found the independent effect of unemployment and its effect as a co-factor in accumulation of risk  
4  
5 2 factors to be smaller than the effect of the other risk factors. This finding is likely to reflect at least to some  
6  
7 3 extent the fact that long-term unemployment is difficult to measure using register data. It is possible that  
8  
9  
10 4 our indicator does not properly capture all people suffering from long-term unemployment since it is based  
11  
12 5 on statistics that includes people registered as active job applicants. Further, the study took place during a  
13  
14 6 severe recession with high prevalence of unemployment resulting in the unemployed becoming more  
15  
16 7 heterogeneous and being unemployed less stigmatizing than in times when the economy is booming. Thus,  
17  
18 8 due to the recession, unemployment in our study may have represented less of a risk factor for social  
19  
20 9 deprivation and less severe health consequences. Alternatively, the finding of the small effect of  
21  
22 10 unemployment may derive from a homogenous unemployed population. Especially in the beginning of  
23  
24 11 unemployment the Finnish welfare state is relatively generous in buffering against the economic effect  
25  
26 12 resulting from the loss of a job. An unemployed is entitled to earning-related benefit for 14 to 23 months,  
27  
28 13 depending on the length of the employment history. Thus, it is only after a longer period of time that the  
29  
30 14 effects of unemployment regarding the loss of earnings will take place. Since we could not disentangle  
31  
32 15 those still enjoying the subsidies from those that no longer did, the effects among the latter "hard core"  
33  
34 16 unemployed group are potentially downplayed.

35  
36  
37  
38  
39 17 The higher risk of being hospitalised due to ACSCs among individuals with several simultaneous risk factors  
40  
41 18 for social disadvantage found in our study is probably due to multiple causes. The inequalities found in  
42  
43 19 hospitalisations due to ACSCs certainly partly reflect differences in access to and quality of primary health  
44  
45 20 care. Earlier studies have found that individuals with higher socioeconomic position have clearly more  
46  
47 21 annual visits to physicians than those with lower position after controlling for health status.[4, 46] There is  
48  
49 22 area-level evidence that low socioeconomic position and fewer physicians are associated with poorer  
50  
51 23 access to care in addition to higher hospitalisations due to ACSCs.[47] Moreover, earlier studies have  
52  
53 24 suggested that for instance continuity of primary care is associated with reduced risk of avoidable  
54  
55 25 hospitalisations.[48, 49] Especially a long-term relationship between a patient and a physician effectively  
56  
57 26 reduces the risk.[50] It is likely that there are differences between socioeconomic groups in the continuity  
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

1 of care in the treatment of many common chronic conditions. The increased risk of being hospitalised due  
2 to ACSCs among individuals with cumulative disadvantage may also be caused by inadequate resources in  
3 primary health care to recognise the needs of people with simultaneous social and physical health  
4 problems and inability to treat and prevent these diseases from worsening. Socioeconomic inequalities in  
5 the use of health care are likely to be explained at least partly also by differences in seeking the care  
6 needed.[13]

7 The finding that the prolongation of cumulative disadvantage increased further the risk of being  
8 hospitalized for ACSCs among the middle-aged is likely to reflect the interplay of social disadvantage and  
9 health problems over time. Prolongation of cumulative disadvantage worsens further social and physical  
10 health problems gradually. However, among the elderly (aged over 64), the prolongation of cumulative  
11 disadvantage did not increase the risk further. This may be due to the fact that chronic conditions  
12 potentially leading to ACSC are relatively common among older age groups. Additionally, selective mortality  
13 may play a role by diminishing differences between socioeconomic groups.

14 The sensitivity analyses included only those individuals who had no previous hospitalisations due to ACSCs.  
15 They detected that cumulative disadvantage increases the risk of being hospitalised due to ACSCs  
16 somewhat less than when including all individuals. This suggests that accumulation of social disadvantage  
17 can have worse effects for those who have chronic conditions and/or recurring hospitalisations. On the  
18 other hand this finding supports the conclusion that persons without previous avoidable hospitalisations  
19 have increased risk of being hospitalised due to ACSCs after experiencing social disadvantage.

20 To our knowledge, this is the first study to assess exhaustively the relationship between the accumulation  
21 of social disadvantage and hospitalisations due to ACSCs. The use of comprehensive individual-level register  
22 data enabled us to avoid ecological bias which is common in studies using area-level socioeconomic and  
23 social disadvantage variables. We were also able to study a rather long period of time and thus evaluate the  
24 effect of prolongation of accumulating social disadvantage; the retrospective follow-up time was eight  
25 years at longest. In our data avoidable hospitalisations were derived from the Care Register for Health Care,

1  
2  
3 1 which has been found to be of good quality and coverage in general.[51] The methodological approach of  
4  
5 2 the study allowed us to study simultaneously several risk factors that are to some extent dependent of  
6  
7 3 each other.  
8  
9

10 4 The results of our study underline the importance of improving coordination of care across the system  
11  
12 5 between social and health care, as well as primary and secondary care. Also primary prevention in the  
13  
14 6 management of care should be emphasized. Universalism is not enough; the recognition of patients with  
15  
16 7 chronic conditions and simultaneous particular combinations of cumulative disadvantage is important to  
17  
18 8 diminish these extensive differences between social groups to improve social equity in health care. The  
19  
20 9 identification of these vulnerable patients groups – who may be more susceptible – is also necessary to  
21  
22 10 reduce the use of more expensive treatment in specialised health care. Treating people with multiple  
23  
24 11 chronic conditions and social problems in primary care requires more attention and active means and for  
25  
26 12 instance strengthening continuity of care is even more significant for these vulnerable patients groups.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 14 **Author's contribution** SL participated in the conception and planning of the study, designed the study,  
35  
36 15 analysed and interpreted the data and was a major contributor in writing the manuscript. KM, MA, SK, and  
37  
38 16 IK participated in the conception and planning of the study and the interpretation of the results for  
39  
40 17 important intellectual content and writing the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final  
41  
42 18 manuscript.  
43  
44  
45

46 19 **Acknowledgements** We thank our colleague, MD Markku Satokangas for his valuable comments on the  
47  
48 20 manuscript.  
49  
50

51 21 **A funding statement** This work was supported by the Academy of Finland (project number 277939) and  
52  
53 22 NordForsk (project number 74637), but the Academy nor NordForsk had no involvement in its design, data  
54  
55 23 collection, analysis, findings or decision to publish.  
56  
57  
58

59 24 **A competing interests statement** The authors declare that they have no competing interests.  
60



1  
2  
3 1 **A patient consent form** Not applicable  
4  
5

6 2 **A data sharing statement** No additional data are available  
7  
8  
9

10 3 **References**  
11  
12

13 4 1. Whitehead M, Dahlgren G. Concepts and principles for tackling social inequities in health: Levelling up  
14 5 part 1. University of Liverpool: WHO Collaborating Centre for Policy Research on Social Determinants of  
15 6 Health; 2006.  
16  
17

18  
19 7 2. Starfield B, Shi L, Macinko J. Contribution of Primary Care to Health Systems and Health. *Milbank Q.*  
20 8 2005;83(3):457-502.  
21  
22

23 9 3. Keskimäki I, Tynkkynen LK, Reissell E, Koivusalo M, Syrjä V, Vuorenkoski L, et al. Finland: Health system  
24 10 review. *Health Systems in Transition.* 2019;21(2):1-166.  
25  
26

27  
28 11 4. van Doorslaer EE. Inequalities in access to medical care by income in developed countries. *CMAJ.*  
29 12 2006;174(2):177-183.  
30  
31

32 13 5. OECD/EU editor. *Health at a Glance: Europe 2018: State of Health in the EU Cycle.* Paris/EU, Brussels:  
33 14 OECD Publishing; 2018.  
34  
35

36  
37 15 6. Mölläri K, Kovanen L. *Hoitoonpääsy perusterveydenhuollossa maaliskuussa 2019.* Helsinki: THL; 2019.  
38  
39

40 16 7. Satokangas M, Lumme S, Arffman M, Keskimäki I. Trajectory modelling of ambulatory care sensitive  
41 17 conditions in Finland in 1996–2013: assessing the development of equity in primary health care through  
42 18 clustering of geographic areas – an observational retrospective study. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2019;19(629).  
43  
44  
45

46 19 8. Kringos D, Boerma W, Bourgueil Y, Cartier T, Dedeu T, Hasvold T, et al. The strength of primary care in  
47 20 Europe: an international comparative study. *Br J Gen Pract.* 2013;63(616):e742-750.  
48  
49

50 21 9. Tian Y, Dixon A, Gao H. Data briefing: Emergency hospital admissions for ambulatory care-sensitive  
51 22 conditions: Identifying the potential for reductions. London: The King's Fund; 2012.  
52  
53

54  
55 23 10. Purdy S, Griffin T, Salisbury C, Sharp D. Ambulatory care sensitive conditions: terminology and disease  
56 24 coding need to be more specific to aid policy makers and clinicians. *Public Health.* 2009;123(2):169-173.  
57  
58  
59  
60

11. Blustein J, Hanson K, Shea S. Preventable Hospitalizations And Socioeconomic Status. *Health Aff.* 1998;17(2):177-189.
12. Billings J, Anderson GM, Newman LS. Recent Findings On Preventable Hospitalizations. *Health Aff.* 1996;15(3):239-249.
13. Laditka JN, Laditka SB, Probst JC. More May Be Better: Evidence of a Negative Relationship between Physician Supply and Hospitalization for Ambulatory Care Sensitive Conditions. *Health Serv. Res.* 2005;40(4):1148-1166.
14. Roos LL, Walld R, Uhanova J, Bond R. Physician Visits, Hospitalizations, and Socioeconomic Status: Ambulatory Care Sensitive Conditions in a Canadian Setting. *Health Serv. Res.* 2005;40(4):1167-1185.
15. Trachtenberg AJ, Dik N, Chateau D, Katz A. Inequities in Ambulatory Care and the Relationship Between Socioeconomic Status and Respiratory Hospitalizations: A Population-Based Study of a Canadian City. *Ann. Fam. Med.* 2014; doi:10.1370/afm.1683.
16. Booth GL, Hux JE, Fang J, Chan BTB. Time Trends and Geographic Disparities in Acute Complications of Diabetes in Ontario, Canada. *Diabetes Care.* 2005; doi:10.2337/diacare.28.5.1045.
17. Falster K, Banks E, Lujic S, Falster M, Lynch J, Zwi K, et al. Inequalities in pediatric avoidable hospitalizations between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal children in Australia: a population data linkage study. *BMC pediatr.* 2016;16(1):169.
18. Butler DC, Thurecht L, Brown L, Konings P. Social exclusion, deprivation and child health: a spatial analysis of ambulatory care sensitive conditions in children aged 0–4 years in Victoria, Australia. *Soc Sci Med.* 2013; doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.06.029.
19. Ansari Z, Haider SI, Ansari H, de Gooyer T, Sindall C. Patient characteristics associated with hospitalisations for ambulatory care sensitive conditions in Victoria, Australia. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2012; doi:10.1186/1472-6963-12-475.
20. Jackson G, Tobias M. Potentially avoidable hospitalisations in New Zealand, 1989-98. *Aust. N. Z. J. Public Health.* 2001;25(3):212-221.
21. Magan P, Otero A, Alberquilla A, Ribera JM. Geographic variations in avoidable hospitalizations in the elderly, in a health system with universal coverage. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2008; doi:10.1186/1472-6963-8-42.

- 1  
2  
3 1 22. Agabiti N, Pirani M, Schifano P, Cesaroni G, Davoli M, Bisanti L, et al. Income level and chronic  
4 ambulatory care sensitive conditions in adults: a multicity population-based study in Italy. *BMC Public*  
5 2 *Health*. 2009; doi:10.1186/1471-2458-9-457.  
6 3  
7  
8  
9 4 23. Sexton E, Bedford D. GP supply, deprivation and emergency admission to hospital for COPD and  
10 5 diabetes complications in counties across Ireland: an exploratory analysis. *Ir J Med Sci*. 2016;  
11 6 doi:10.1007/s11845-015-1359-5.  
12  
13  
14  
15 7 24. Löfqvist T, Burström B, Walander A, Ljung R. Inequalities in avoidable hospitalisation by area income  
16 8 and the role of individual characteristics: a population-based register study in Stockholm County, Sweden.  
17 9 *BMJ Qual Saf*. 2014; doi:10.1136/bmjqs-2012-001715.  
18  
19  
20  
21 10 25. Conway R, O'Riordan D, Byrne D, Cournane S, Coveney S, Silke B. Deprivation influences the emergency  
22 11 admission rate of ambulatory care sensitive conditions. *Clinical Medicine*. 2016;  
23 12 doi:10.7861/clinmedicine.16-2-119.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 13 26. Orueta JF, García-Alvarez A, Grandes G, Nuño-Solinís R. Variability in potentially preventable  
29 14 hospitalisations: an observational study of clinical practice patterns of general practitioners and care  
30 15 outcomes in the Basque Country (Spain). *BMJ Open*. 2015; doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2014-007360.  
31  
32  
33  
34 16 27. Saxena S, George J, Barber J, Fitzpatrick J, Majeed A. Association of population and practice factors with  
35 17 potentially avoidable admission rates for chronic diseases in London: cross sectional analysis. *J R Soc Med*.  
36 18 2006; doi:10.1258/jrsm.99.2.81.  
37  
38  
39  
40 19 28. Galobardes B, Lynch J, Smith GD. Measuring socioeconomic position in health research. *British Medical*  
41 20 *Bulletin*. 2007;81-82(1):21-37.  
42  
43  
44  
45 21 29. Graham H editor. *Understanding health inequalities*. Berkshire and New York: Open University Press;  
46 22 2009.  
47  
48  
49 23 30. Ingold B, Yersin B, Wietlisbach V, Burckhardt P, Burnand B, Büla C. Characteristics associated with  
50 24 inappropriate hospital use in elderly patients admitted to a general internal medicine service. *Aging Clin*.  
51 25 *Exp. Res*. 2000;12:430-438.  
52  
53  
54  
55 26 31. Murphy BM, Elliott PC, Le Grande MR, Higgins RO, Ernest CS, Goble AJ, et al. Living alone predicts 30-  
56 27 day hospital readmission after coronary artery bypass graft surgery. *European Journal of Cardiovascular*  
57 28 *Prevention & Rehabilitation*. 2008; doi:10.1097/HJR.0b013e3282f2dc4e.  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 1 32. Finlay JM, Kobayashi LC. Social isolation and loneliness in later life: A parallel convergent mixed-  
4 methods case study of older adults and their residential contexts in the Minneapolis metropolitan area,  
5 2 USA. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2018 July 2018;208:25-33.  
6 3  
7  
8  
9 4 33. Dreyer K, Steventon A, Fisher R, Deeny SR. The association between living alone and health care  
10 utilisation in older adults: a retrospective cohort study of electronic health records from a London general  
11 5 practice. *BMC geriatrics*. 2018;18(1).  
12 6  
13  
14  
15 7 34. Mu C, Kecmanovic M, Hall J. Does Living Alone Confer a Higher Risk of Hospitalisation? *Econ Rec*.  
16 8 2015;91:124-138.  
17  
18  
19  
20 9 35. Shankar A, McMunn A, Banks J, Steptoe A. Loneliness, social isolation, and behavioral and biological  
21 health indicators in older adults. *Health Psychology*. 2011;30(4):377-385.  
22 10  
23  
24  
25 11 36. Longman J, Megan P, Judy S, Geoff M. The role of social isolation in frequent and/or avoidable  
26 12 hospitalisation: rural community-based service providers' perspectives. *Aust Health Rev*. 2013;  
27 doi:10.1071/AH12152.  
28 13  
29  
30  
31 14 37. Ennis S, Larson E, Grothaus L, Helfrich C, Balch S, Phelan E. Association of living alone and  
32 15 hospitalization among community-dwelling elders with and without dementia. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2014;  
33 doi:10.1007/s11606-014-2904-z.  
34 16  
35  
36  
37 17 38. Kuh D, Ben-Shlomo Y, Lynch J, Hallqvist J, Power C. Life course epidemiology. *J Epidemiol Community*  
38 18 *Health*. 2003; doi:10.1136/jech.57.10.778.  
39  
40  
41  
42 19 39. Noora Berg. Accumulation of disadvantage from adolescence to midlife : A 26-year follow-up study of  
43 20 16-year old adolescents. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto; 2017.  
44  
45  
46 21 40. Page A, Ambrose S, Glover J, Hetzel D. Atlas of Avoidable Hospitalisations in Australia: ambulatory  
47 22 care-sensitive conditions. Adelaide: PHIDU, University of Adelaide; 2007.  
48  
49  
50  
51 23 41. Eurostat. At risk of poverty rate. 2019; Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/tespm010)  
52 24 [datasets/-/tespm010](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/tespm010), 2019.  
53  
54  
55 25 42. Vuik S, Fontana G, Mayer E, Darzi A. Do hospitalisations for ambulatory care sensitive conditions reflect  
56 26 low access to primary care? An observational cohort study of primary care usage prior to hospitalisation.  
57 27 *BMJ Open*. 2017; doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-015704.  
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

- 1 43. Magan P, Alberquilla A, Otero A, Ribera JM. Hospitalizations for Ambulatory Care Sensitive Conditions  
2 and Quality of Primary Care: Their Relation With Socioeconomic and Health Care Variables in the Madrid  
3 Regional Health Service (Spain). *Med Care*. 2011; doi:10.1097/MLR.0b013e3181ef9d13.
- 4 44. Ricketts TC, Randolph R, Howard HA, Pathman D, Carey T. Hospitalization rates as indicators of access to  
5 primary care. *Health & Place*. 2001; doi:10.1016/S1353-8292(00)00035-6.
- 6 45. Sajjad MA, Holloway-Kew KL, Mohebbi M, Kotowicz MA, de Abreu LLF, Livingston PM, et al. Association  
7 between area-level socioeconomic status, accessibility and diabetes-related hospitalisations: a cross-  
8 sectional analysis of data from Western Victoria, Australia. *BMJ Open*. 2019;22(9):e026880.
- 9 46. Agerholm J, Bruce D, Ponce dL, Burström B. Socioeconomic differences in healthcare utilization, with  
10 and without adjustment for need: An example from Stockholm, Sweden. *Scand. J. Public Health*. 2013;  
11 doi:10.1177/1403494812473205.
- 12 47. Ansari Z, Laditka JN, Laditka SB. Access to Health Care and Hospitalization for Ambulatory Care Sensitive  
13 Conditions. *Med. Care Res. Rev*. 2006; doi:10.1177/1077558706293637.
- 14 48. Menec V, Sirski M, Attawar D, Katz A. Does continuity of care with a family physician reduce  
15 hospitalizations among older adults? *J. Health Serv. Res. Policy*. 2006; doi:10.1258/135581906778476562.
- 16 49. Barker I, Steventon A, Deeny SR. Association between continuity of care in general practice and hospital  
17 admissions for ambulatory care sensitive conditions: cross sectional study of routinely collected, person  
18 level data. *BMJ*. 2017; doi:10.1136/bmj.j84.
- 19 50. Lin I, Wu S. Effects of long-term high continuity of care on avoidable hospitalizations of chronic  
20 obstructive pulmonary disease patients. *Health Policy*. 2017; doi:10.1016/j.healthpol.2017.06.010.
- 21 51. Sund R. Quality of the Finnish Hospital Discharge Register: A systematic review. *Scand J Public Health*.  
22 2012; doi:10.1177/1403494812456637.

<i>ACSC conditions</i>	<i>ICD-10</i>	<i>Notes</i>
<b><i>Vaccine-preventable</i></b>		
Bacterial Pneumonia & Influenza	J09, J10, J11, J13, J14, J15.3, J15.4, J15.7, J15.9, J16.8, J18.1, J18.8, J18.9	In any diagnosis field, not included if D57 is as a secondary diagnose
Immunization-Related and Preventable Conditions	A35, A36, A37, A80, B05, B06, B16.1, B16.9, B18.0, B18.1, B26, G00.0, M01.4	In any diagnosis field
<b><i>Chronic</i></b>		
Acute Bronchitis	J20	Only when as a primary diagnose, and J41-J44 or J47 as a secondary diagnose
Angina	I20, I24.0, I24.8, I24.9	Only when as a primary diagnose, cases with surgical procedures (A) excluded
Asthma	J45, J46	Only when as a primary diagnose
Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD)	J41, J42, J43, J44, J47	Only when as a primary diagnose
Congestive Heart Failure	I11.0, I50, J81	Only when as a primary diagnose, cases with cardiac procedures (B) excluded
Diabetes Complications	E10.0-10.8, E11.0-E11.8, E12.0-E12.8, E13.0-E13.8, E14.0-E14.8	Only when as a primary diagnose
Hypertension	I10, I11.9	Only when as a primary diagnose, cases with cardiac procedures (B) excluded
Iron Deficiency Anaemia	D50.1-D50.9	Only when as a primary diagnose
Nutritional Deficiencies	E40, E41, E42, E43, E55.0, E64.3	Only when as a primary diagnose
<b><i>Acute</i></b>		
Cellulitis	L03, L04, L08.0, L08.8, L88, L98.0	Only when as a primary diagnose, cases with other surgical procedures than skin procedures (C) excluded
Convulsions and Epilepsy	G40, G41, O15, R56	Only when as a primary diagnose
Dehydration and Gastroenteritis	E86, K52.2, K52.8, K52.9	Only when as a primary diagnose
Dental Conditions	A69.0, K02-K06, K08, K09.8, K09.9, K12, K13	Only when as a primary diagnose
Gangrene	R02	In any diagnosis field
Kidney and Urinary Tract Infections	N10, N11, N12, N13.6	Only when as a primary diagnose
Pelvic Inflammatory Disease	N70, N73, N74	Only when as a primary diagnose
Perforated or Bleeding Ulcer	K25.0-K25.2, K25.4-K25.6, K26.0-K26.2, K26.4-K26.6, K27.0-K27.2, K27.4-K27.6, K28.0-K28.2, K28.4-K28.6	Only when as a primary diagnose
Severe ENT infection	H66, H67, J02, J03, J06, J31.2	Only when as a primary diagnose

**A) Angina**

procedure field contains none of the following (NCSP, Nordic Classification of Surgical Procedures):

AA4WT, AA400, AA5LT, AAA-AAW, AB4AT, AB4BT, AB4CT, AB4DT, AB4FT, AB5, AB6AT, AB6BT, AB6CT, AB6DT, ABA-ABW, ACA-ACW, AD-AW, AXX90, BA3AT, BA4KT, BAA, BB2AT, BB3AT, BB4WT, BBA, BC1LT, BC2-BC4, BCA, BD-BW, CAA-CAW, CB, CCA-CCW, CD-CJ, CKA-CKW, CW, DAA-DAW, DB, DCA-DCW, DD, DEA-DEW, DFA-DFE, DFW99, DG, DHA-DLW, DMA-DPW, DQ-DW, EA, EBA-EBW, EC, EDA-EDW, EEA-EW, EF, EGA-EGW, EHA-EHW, EJ-EK, EL3AT, EL3RT, EL3YT, EL4, ELA-ELW, EMA-EMW, EP1AT, EP1LT, EP2AT, EP3AT, ENA-ENW, EW, FA, FBA-FBW, FCA-FCE, FD, FE1AT, FE2, FEA-FEW, FF-FL, FMA-FMW, FN1ST, FN1XT, FNA-FNW, FP-FX, GA2-GA4, GAA-GAW, GBA-GBW, GCA, GD1AT, GD1BT, GD1CT, GD1LT, GD2AT, GD2BT, GD2CT, GD3, GDA-GDW, GE1AT, GE1CT, GE1DT, GE2, GEA-GEW, GW, HA0, HA1AT, HA1DT, HA1MT, HA1ST, HA2-HA5, HAA-HAF, HW, JA1LT, JA2-JA3, JAA-JAW, JB, JCA-JCW, JDA-JDW, JE, JF3, JFA-JFW, JGA-JGW, JHA-JHW, JJ1AT, JJ2-JJ8, JJA-JJW, JK1-JK2, J3KAT, JK3BT, JK3CT, JK3FT, JK3LT, JK3NT, JK3RT, JK4-JK5, JKA-JKW, JL1-JL3, JLA-JLW, JM1AT, JM1LT, JM2, JMA-JMW, JN4LT, JW, JX1LT, JX1RT, JXA, KA2AT, KA3AT, KA3CT, KA3DT, KA3LT, KA4-KA6, KAA-KAW, KBA-KBW, KC1AT, KC2AT, KC3AT, KCA-KCW, KDA-KDW, KE1AT, KE1CT, KE2, KEA-KEW, KF1-KF7, KF8AT, KF8KT, KFA-KFW, KGA-KGW, KH1AT, KH1BT, KH1CT, KH1CT, KH1DT, KH1FT, KH1YT, KKA-KKW, KW, KX, LA1, LAA-LAW, LB1AT, LB1YT, LBA-LBW, LCA-LCW, LDA-LDW, LEA-LEW, LF-LW, LX1LT, MAA-MAW, MBA-MBW, MC-MW, NA0, NA6CT, NA7BT, NA7FT, NA7KT, NA7LT, NA9KT, NAA-NAW, NB1AT, NB1BT, NB1ZT, NB2, NBA-NBW, NCA-NCW, NDA-NDW, NEA-NEW, NFA-NFW, NGA-NGW, NHA-NHW, NJ3LT, NK1AT, NK1CT, NK1DT, NK1LT, NK2-NK3, NK4AT, NK4BT, NK5, NK6AT, NK6BT, NK6CT, NK6DT, NK6KT, NK7AT, NX, PA2ZT, PA3-PA5, PA6AT, PA8KT, PA9KT, PAA-PAW, PB1AT, PB1BT, PB1ST, PB1YT, PBA-PBW, PC2DT, PC2ET, PC5AT, PC5BT, PC5DT, PC5ET, PC5GT, PC5HT, PC5JT, PC5NT, PC5PT, PC5YT, PC6DT, PC6ET, PC6FT, PC7NT, PCA-PCW, PD1AT, PD1YT, PD2DT, PD3, PD4ST, PD5YT, PD6YT, PD7YT, PDA-PDW, PE, PG1AT, PG1BT, PG1ET-PG1LT, PG1MT-PG1VT, PG1YT-PG3YT, PG5RT-PG6NT, PGA-PGW, PHIAT, PHI1FT, PHI1UT, PH2ST, PH3YT, PH4AT, PH5GT, PH6GT, PH7FT, PH7UT, PH9AT, PH9ST, PH900, PHA-PHW, PJ2AT, PJ2CT, PJ2HT, PJ3-PJ4, PJ5AN, PJA-PJW, PW, PXA-PXX, QAA-QAW, QBA-QBW, QCA-QCW, QDA-QDW, QW, QXA-QXW, QX2ZT, QX3AT, QX3CT, QX3LT, QX3YT, QX4, S, TAA-TAD, TAW99, TA100, TBA-TJF, TJG10, TJJ, TJL-TJW, TK-TL, TMA-TPX, TQ, U, WXQ, WW20, WW30-WW31, WW40, WW50, WX100-WX105, WX140-WX144, WX7-WX9, XCC00, XFE00, XFN96, XFX00, XFX10, XFX20, XFX97, XJW99, XPX00, XPX04, XPX08, XPX99, XW000, XW1-XW5, XX1AT, XX1BT, XX1CT, XX1DT, XX1XT, XX2AT-XX2DT, XX2XT, XX3AT-XX3DT, XX3XT, XX4-XX7, Y, ZC-ZP, ZS-ZX, ZZ

**B) Congestive heart failure and hypertension**

procedure field contains none of the following (NCSP, Nordic Classification of Surgical Procedures):

FEA-FEW, FFA00, FFA10-FFA30, FFA96, FFB-FFW, FG-FH, FJA00, FJA96, FJB-FJW, FKA-FKW, FK1BT, FLA00, FLA96, FLB-FLW, FMA-FMW, FN1AT, FN1BT, FN1ST, FN1XT, FN1YT, FNA-FNW, FPA-FPF, FPH-FPW, FQ, FXA00-FXN00, TFN10, TFN99, TFP00, TFP40-TFP59

**C) Cellulitis**

procedure field contains none of the following (NCSP, Nordic Classification of Surgical Procedures):

AA4WT, AA400, AA5LT, AAA-AAW, AB4AT, AB4BT, AB4CT, AB4DT, AB4FT, AB5, AB6AT, AB6BT, AB6CT, AB6DT, ABA-ABW, ACA-ACW, AD-AW, AXX90, BA3AT, BA4KT, BAA, BB2AT, BB3AT, BB4WT, BBA, BC1LT, BC2-BC4, BCA, BD-BW, CAA-CAW, CB, CCA-CCW, CD-CJ, CKA-CKW, CW, DAA-DAW, DB, DCA-DCW, DD, DEA-DEW, DFA-DFE, DFW99, DG, DHA-DLW, DMA-DPW, DQ-DW, EA, EBA-EBW, EC, EDA-EDW, EEA-EW, EF, EGA-EGW, EHA-EHW, EJ-EK, EL3AT, EL3RT, EL3YT, EL4, ELA-ELW, EMA-EMW, EP1AT, EP1LT, EP2AT, EP3AT, ENA-ENW, EW, FA, FBA-FBW, FCA-FCE, FD, FE1AT, FE2, FEA-FEW, FF-FL, FMA-FMW, FN1ST, FN1XT, FNA-FNW, FP-FX, GA2-GA4, GAA-GAW, GBA-GBW, GCA, GD1AT, GD1BT, GD1CT, GD1LT, GD2AT, GD2BT, GD2CT, GD3, GDA-GDW, GE1AT, GE1CT, GE1DT, GE2, GEA-GEW, GW, HA0, HA1AT, HA1DT, HA1MT, HA1ST, HA2-HA5, HAA-HAF, HW, JA1LT, JA2-JA3, JAA-JAW, JB, JCA-JCW, JDA-JDW, JE, JF3, JFA-JFW, JGA-JGW, JHA-JHW, JJ1AT, JJ2-JJ8, JJA-JJW, JK1-JK2, J3KAT, JK3BT, JK3CT, JK3FT, JK3LT, JK3NT, JK3RT, JK4-JK5, JKA-JKW, JL1-JL3, JLA-JLW, JM1AT, JM1LT, JM2, JMA-JMW, JN4LT, JW, JX1LT, JX1RT, JXA, KA2AT, KA3AT, KA3CT, KA3DT, KA3LT, KA4-KA6, KAA-KAW, KBA-KBW, KC1AT, KC2AT, KC3AT, KCA-KCW, KDA-KDW, KE1AT, KE1CT, KE2, KEA-KEW, KF1-KF7, KF8AT, KF8KT, KFA-KFW, KGA-KGW, KH1AT, KH1BT, KH1CT, KH1CT, KH1DT, KH1FT, KH1YT, KKA-KKW, KW, KX, LA1, LAA-LAW, LB1AT, LB1YT, LBA-LBW, LCA-LCW, LDA-LDW, LEA-LEW, LF-LW, LX1LT, MAA-MAW, MBA-MBW, MC-MW, NA0, NA6CT, NA7BT, NA7FT, NA7KT, NA7LT, NA9KT, NAA-NAW, NB1AT, NB1BT, NB1ZT, NB2, NBA-NBW, NCA-NCW, NDA-NDW, NEA-NEW, NFA-NFW, NGA-NGW, NHA-NHW, NJ3LT, NK1AT, NK1CT, NK1DT, NK1LT, NK2-NK3, NK4AT, NK4BT, NK5, NK6AT, NK6BT, NK6CT, NK6DT, NK6KT, NK7AT, NX, PA2ZT, PA3-PA5, PA6AT, PA8KT, PA9KT, PAA-PAW, PB1AT, PB1BT, PB1ST, PB1YT, PBA-PBW, PC2DT, PC2ET, PC5AT, PC5BT, PC5DT, PC5ET, PC5GT, PC5HT, PC5JT, PC5NT, PC5PT, PC5YT, PC6DT, PC6ET, PC6FT, PC7NT, PCA-PCW, PD1AT, PD1YT, PD2DT, PD3, PD4ST, PD5YT, PD6YT, PD7YT, PDA-PDW, PE, PG1AT, PG1BT, PG1ET-PG1LT, PG1MT-PG1VT, PG1YT-PG3YT, PG5RT-PG6NT, PGA-PGW, PHIAT, PHI1FT, PHI1UT, PH2ST, PH3YT, PH4AT, PH5GT, PH6GT, PH7FT, PH7UT, PH9AT, PH9ST, PH900, PHA-PHW, PJ2AT, PJ2CT, PJ2HT, PJ3-PJ4, PJ5AN, PJA-PJW, PW, PXA-PXX, QAA25, QAB00-QAB05, QAB99, QAC, QAD20, QAE-QAF, QAG10-QAG99, QAJ, QBA25, QBB00-QBB05, QBB99, QBC, QBD20, QBE, QBG10-QBG99, QBJ, QCA25, QCA30, QCB00-QCB05, QCB99, QCC, QCD20, QCE-QCG, QCJ, QDA25, QDB00-QDB05, QDB99, QDC, QDD20, QDE, QDG10-QDG99, QDJ, QXA25, QXB00-QXB05, QXB99, QXC, QXD20, QXE, QXG10-QXG99, QXJ, QX2ZT, QX3AT, QX3CT, QX3LT, QX3YT, QX4, S, TAA-TAD, TAW99, TA100, TBA-TJF, TJG10, TJJ, TJL-TJW, TK-TL, TMA-TPX, TQA-TQD, TQW00, TQW02, TQW30-40, TQW99, TQX00-TQX10, U, WW20, WW30-WW31, WW40, WW50, WX100-WX105, WX140-WX144, WX7-WX9, XCC00, XFE00, XFN96, XFX00, XFX10, XFX20, XFX97, XJW99, XPX00, XPX04, XPX08, XPX99, XW000, XW1-XW5, XX1AT, XX1BT, XX1CT, XX1DT, XX1XT, XX2AT-XX2DT, XX2XT, XX3AT-XX3DT, XX3XT, XX4-XX7, Y, ZC-ZP, ZS-ZX, ZZ

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

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	#1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	#2
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	#4-6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	#6
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	#7-8
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	#7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	#7
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	NA
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	#7-8
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	#7-8
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	#NA
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	#7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	#9-10
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	#9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	#10
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	NA
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	NA
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	#10
<b>Results</b>			



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	NA
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	-
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	#11
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	NA
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	NA
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	#11
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	#11-15
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	#10
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	-
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	#10
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	#16
<b>Limitations</b>			
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	#16-17
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	#19-21
<b>Other information</b>			
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	#21

\*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.

# BMJ Open

## Cumulative social disadvantage and hospitalisations due to ambulatory care sensitive conditions in Finland in 2011–2013: a register study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-038338.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	08-May-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Lumme, Sonja; Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Department of Health and Social Care Systems; University of Helsinki, Department of Psychology and Logopedics Manderbacka, Kristiina; Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Department of Health and Social Care Systems Arffman, Martti; Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Department of Health and Social Care Systems Karvonen, Sakari; Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Department of Health and Social Care Systems Keskimäki, Ilmo; Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Department of Health and Social Care Systems; Tampere University, Faculty of Social Sciences
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Health services research
Secondary Subject Heading:	General practice / Family practice
Keywords:	Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, PRIMARY CARE, Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH, SOCIAL MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1  
2  
3 1 **Cumulative social disadvantage and hospitalisations due to ambulatory care sensitive conditions in**  
4  
5 2 **Finland in 2011–2013: a register study**  
6

7 3  
8  
9 4 **Corresponding author** Sonja Lumme<sup>1,2</sup>

10 5 <sup>1</sup>Social and Health Systems Research Unit, Department of Health and Social Care Systems, Finnish Institute  
11  
12 6 for Health and Welfare, P.O. Box 30, FI-00271 Helsinki, Finland

13 7 <sup>2</sup>Department Psychology and Logopedics, P.O. Box 21, FI-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland  
14  
15 8 email sonja.lumme@thl.fi, tel. +358 29 524 7218  
16  
17  
18

19 9  
20 10 **Co-authors** Kristiina Manderbacka,<sup>1</sup> Martti Arffman,<sup>1</sup> Sakari Karvonen,<sup>2</sup> Ilmo Keskimäki,<sup>1,3</sup>

21 11 <sup>1</sup> Social and Health Systems Research Unit, Department of Health and Social Care Systems, Finnish Institute  
22  
23 12 for Health and Welfare, P.O. Box 30, FI-00271 Helsinki, Finland

24 13 <sup>2</sup> Social Policy Research Unit, Department of Health and Social Care Systems, Finnish Institute for Health  
25  
26 14 and Welfare, P.O. Box 30, FI-00271 Helsinki

27 15 <sup>3</sup> Faculty of Social Sciences, Tampere University, 33014 Tampere University, Finland  
28  
29  
30  
31 16

32 17 **Word count** 5423  
33  
34 18  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **1 Abstract**  
4  
5

6 **2 Objectives** To study the interplay between several indicators of social disadvantage and hospitalisations  
7  
8 **3** due to ambulatory care sensitive conditions (ACSC) in 2011–2013. To evaluate whether the accumulation of  
9  
10 **4** preceding social disadvantage in one point of time or prolongation of social disadvantage had an effect on  
11  
12 **5** hospitalisations due to ACSCs. Four common indicators of disadvantage are examined: living alone, low  
13  
14 **6** level of education, poverty, and unemployment.  
15  
16

17  
18 **7 Design** A population-based register study  
19  
20

21 **8 Setting** Nationwide individual-level register data on hospitalisations due to ACSCs for the years 2011–2013  
22  
23 **9** and preceding data on social and socioeconomic factors for the years 2006–2010  
24  
25

26 **10 Participants** Finnish residents aged 45 or older in January 1<sup>st</sup> 2011  
27  
28

29 **11 Outcome measure** Hospitalisations due to ACSCs in 2011–2013. The effect of accumulation of preceding  
30  
31 **12** disadvantage in one point of time and its prolongation on ACSCs was studied using modified Poisson  
32  
33 **13** regression.  
34  
35

36  
37 **14 Results** People with preceding cumulative social disadvantage were more likely to be hospitalised due to  
38  
39 **15** ACSCs. The most hazardous combination was simultaneously living alone, low level of education, and  
40  
41 **16** poverty among the middle-aged (aged 45–64) and the elderly (over 64). Risk ratio (RR) of being hospitalized  
42  
43 **17** due to ACSC was 3.16 (95% confidence interval 3.03–3.29) among middle-aged men and 3.54 (3.36–3.73)  
44  
45 **18** among middle-aged women compared with individuals without any of these risk factors when controlling  
46  
47 **19** for age and residential area. For the elderly, the RR was 1.61 (1.57–1.66) among men and 1.69 (1.64–1.74)  
48  
49 **20** among women.  
50  
51

52  
53 **21 Conclusions** To improve social equity in health care, it is important to recognise not only patients with  
54  
55 **22** cumulative disadvantage, but – as this study shows – patients with particular combinations of disadvantage  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1 who may be more susceptible. The identification of these vulnerable patients groups is also necessary to  
4  
5 2 reduce the use of more expensive treatment in specialised health care.  
6  
7

8 3 Keywords: Socioeconomic disadvantage, social disadvantage, ambulatory care sensitive conditions,  
9  
10 4 inequities, health care, register data  
11  
12  
13

#### 14 5 15 16 6 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 17  
18  
19 7 • The individual-level register-based data allowed us to study simultaneously several indicators of  
20  
21 8 social and socioeconomic disadvantage  
22  
23  
24 9 • The nationwide register data covered all hospitalisations due to ambulatory care sensitive  
25  
26 10 conditions (ACSCs) in Finland  
27  
28  
29 11 • We were able to study social disadvantage of period preceding hospitalisations and its effect on  
30  
31 12 being hospitalised due to ACSCs  
32  
33  
34 13 • Hospitalisations due to ACSCs is an indirect indicator of the effectiveness and quality of primary  
35  
36 14 health care  
37  
38  
39 15 • While the study addressed associations between social disadvantage and hospitalisations due to  
40  
41 16 ACSCs, the causality between morbidity and social disadvantage could not be studied  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 1           2 3   1   **Background**

4  
5  
6   2   Inadequate access to health care is one of the important determinants of social inequities in health.[1] Well  
7  
8   3   organised primary care has repeatedly been shown to promote population health and prevent ill-health.  
9  
10   4   There is also evidence that primary care (in contrast to specialist care) is associated with a more equitable  
11  
12   5   distribution of health in populations through prevention and early management of health problems and  
13  
14   6   through facilitating entry to the rest of the health care system.[2] The Finnish health-care system provides a  
15  
16   7   good case for examining equity as the system operates on the principle of universality and therefore, in  
17  
18   8   general, supports equal access to health services according to need.[3] Simultaneously, studies from both  
19  
20   9   Finland and some other countries with universal health care systems show systematic and persistent  
21  
22   10   socioeconomic inequities in physician utilisation in relation to need.[2-5] Challenges in providing timely  
23  
24   11   access to primary care are encountered in some areas[6] and there are indications of differences in primary  
25  
26   12   health care quality between regions.[7] However, Finland has – compared to most other European  
27  
28   13   countries – a strong publicly funded primary health care.[8]  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33   14   Hospitalisations due to ambulatory care sensitive conditions (ACSC) are used to indirectly evaluate the  
34  
35   15   effectiveness and quality of primary care.[9, 10] They are defined as hospitalisations that could be  
36  
37   16   prevented by primary care interventions. Earlier studies have used slightly different lists of conditions, but  
38  
39   17   have usually examined three types of conditions: conditions that can be prevented by vaccination, acute  
40  
41   18   conditions in which hospitalisation can be prevented by adequate (acute) management of the condition,  
42  
43   19   and chronic conditions where good quality and timely primary care can prevent later admissions, e.g., due  
44  
45   20   to complications of diabetes. Several studies from the U.S.,[11-13] Canada,[14-18] Australia,[19-21] New  
46  
47   21   Zealand[22] and European countries[23-29] have examined socioeconomic differences in ACSC and  
48  
49   22   reported more ACSC hospitalisations among persons with lower socioeconomic background.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54   23   Most earlier studies examining socioeconomic differences in ACSC have used ecological data of single  
55  
56   24   socioeconomic indicators, mainly income[12, 14, 15, 24, 25, 28] or deprivation indices based on ecological  
57  
58   25   data,[19-23, 25, 27, 29] while few studies have focused on the individual-level socioeconomic indicators.  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1 Socioeconomic position is, however, a complex construct reflecting different dimensions of the individuals'  
4  
5 2 standing in the social hierarchy.[30] The persistence of health inequalities have led researchers to point out  
6  
7 3 that we need to analyse multiple social circumstances simultaneously in order to assess their impact on  
8  
9 4 health and health care.[31] We found few studies utilizing this approach with ACSCs. One study, which  
10  
11 5 examined elderly Medicare beneficiaries in the USA, and another study from Ontario, Canada, utilising  
12  
13 6 survey data linked to administrative databases, used multiple individual-level indicators of socioeconomic  
14  
15 7 position but they did not examine them simultaneously.[11, 17] A study from the Stockholm County in  
16  
17 8 Sweden[26] and a study from Canada[18] analysed several individual-level socioeconomic variables  
18  
19 9 simultaneously. Additionally, a study from Ontario, Canada, examined trends and regional differences in  
20  
21 10 acute diabetes complications and accounted for income and education at the community level.[16]  
22  
23 11 In addition to social position, social relationships may also contribute to outcomes of health care.[32, 33]  
24  
25 12 Social relationships can be measured using self-reported measures of social isolation or loneliness. Using  
26  
27 13 register data, it is possible to study living arrangements and to use living alone as a proxy measure for social  
28  
29 14 isolation. Although previous studies have found a strong association between living alone and social  
30  
31 15 isolation and loneliness,[34] these conditions are distinct. However, also living alone has been found to  
32  
33 16 increase the use of health services[35, 36] and living alone has been applied as a measure of social  
34  
35 17 isolation.[37] Social isolation has been identified as a risk factor for avoidable hospitalisation in one  
36  
37 18 interview study from rural Australia.[38] On the other hand, a study using area-level measures of social  
38  
39 19 deprivation detected lower admission rates for several chronic diseases in areas with higher proportions of  
40  
41 20 elderly individuals living alone in London.[29] A study in the US found no association between living alone  
42  
43 21 and hospitalisations due to ACSCs among retirement age (65+) individuals.[39] The population studied was,  
44  
45 22 however, a sample of participants having access to an integrated delivery system with a preventive  
46  
47 23 approach in the management of services and thus representing healthier residents than the general  
48  
49 24 population.  
50  
51 25 Cumulative disadvantage may refer to two distinct social processes. On the one hand, it may imply  
52  
53 26 accumulation of individual forms of disadvantage cross-sectionally. On the other hand, cumulative  
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

1 disadvantage may be observed with one or several forms of disadvantage persisting over time. The above-  
2 mentioned studies have not examined how these social risk factors cumulate at individual-level either in  
3 one point of time or during a longer time period and whether the accumulation is associated with the risk  
4 of being hospitalised due to ACSCs. In recent literature, researchers have suggested that the effects of risk  
5 factors accumulate over time and thus increase socioeconomic disparities in health outcomes.[40, 41] A  
6 large number of studies have found associations between cumulative disadvantage and health. However,  
7 the relationship between accumulation of social disadvantage and health care in terms of effectiveness and  
8 quality, has received relatively little attention.

9 Social risk factors may have different impacts on outcomes of health care. Accumulation of the risk factors  
10 may also increase the risk of poor outcomes. Additionally, the effect of accumulation may vary depending  
11 on the combination of the risk factors and the persistence of accumulation. The main aim of the current  
12 study is to examine whether the preceding accumulation of social disadvantage increases inequities in  
13 outcomes of health care. We study hospitalisations due to ACSCs as an outcome of health care and as a  
14 study population we examine Finns aged 45 and over. The more specific study questions are: 1) What is the  
15 univariate effect of each risk factor on the risk of being hospitalised due to ACSCs if an individual has no  
16 other risk factors? 2) What combination of social disadvantage in one point of time is the most hazardous in  
17 terms of hospitalisations due to ACSCs? 3) Does prolongation of cumulative disadvantage in time have  
18 effect on hospitalisations due to ACSCs? We examine four common indicators of social disadvantage: living  
19 alone, poverty, low level of education, and unemployment. We utilise comprehensive individual-level  
20 register data on sociodemographic and social factors and hospitalisations between 2006–2013.

## 1 **Materials**

2 As a study population we had non-institutionalised Finnish residents aged 45 years or older in January 1<sup>st</sup>  
3 2011. For this population, we utilised annual individual-level information on sociodemographic factors in  
4 2006–2010, obtained from different administrative registers maintained by Statistics Finland. These  
5 exposure factors included information on gender, age and region of residence as well as factors which were  
6 used to define risk factors for disadvantage: living arrangements, income, education, and annual number of  
7 unemployment months within a calendar year. Register data on hospitalisations due to ACSCs for the  
8 population at risk were individually linked to the sociodemographic data. Our outcome measure was  
9 hospitalisations due to ACSCs in 2011–2013. Information on hospitalisations was obtained from the Care  
10 Register for Health Care maintained by the Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare. We applied the UK  
11 definition of ACSCs with an addition of unspecified pneumonia (ICD-10 code J18.9) and influenza (J09)[10]  
12 (supplementary file 1). We categorised ACSCs as acute, chronic, or vaccine-preventable conditions as  
13 suggested by previous studies.[42] We included only inpatient hospital admissions, at least one night length  
14 of stay, both emergency and elective admissions.

15 We examined the data in two age groups: individuals aged 45–64 (the middle-aged) and 65 and older (the  
16 elderly) and studied them separately in all analyses. This allowed us to study whether there were  
17 differences between the middle-aged and the elderly in the association between ACSC hospitalisations and  
18 cumulative disadvantage and enabled us to include unemployment as a risk factor in the analysis in the  
19 younger age group. In addition, there are structural differences in access to ambulatory care services  
20 between the working aged population and others due to occupational health care.[3] We studied men and  
21 women mainly separately due to differing levels of hospitalisations due to ACSCs[7] and effects of risk  
22 factors. We used 20 hospital districts, based on an administrative division of the Finnish hospital care  
23 system, as an indicator of region of residence to adjust for the differences in the incidence of  
24 hospitalisations due to ACSCs between regions.

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

1 The situation of living arrangements on December 31<sup>st</sup> in each year was used to define a dichotomous  
2 variable indicating whether an individual had lived alone during the year. We studied disposable family net  
3 income as an indicator for income. The family income was adjusted for family size using the OECD modified  
4 equivalence scale. Poverty was defined as net family income lower than 60% of the median family  
5 income.[43] Data on level of education was used to categorize the risk factor related to education. Low  
6 level of education was defined as having no degrees after comprehensive school which is nine years of  
7 schooling. We defined the individual as being unemployed for that year if being unemployed for 6-12  
8 months during the year. For the older age group in this study we did not use unemployment as a risk factor  
9 as they are rarely in paid labour in Finland.

## 10 **Ethics**

11 Ethical approval for the study was received from the Research Ethics Committee of the Finnish Institute for  
12 Health and Welfare.

## 13 **Patient and Public Involvement**

14 Patients were not involved in the design or the implementation of the study.

15  
16

## 1 **Statistical methods**

2 We treated ACSC hospitalisations as a binary outcome variable, combining those with one and several ACSC  
3 hospitalisations into one category and we used modified Poisson regression method in analysing the  
4 data.[44] Our main interest was the effect of preceding social and socioeconomic factors on  
5 hospitalisations due to ACSCs in 2011–2013. The studied social and socioeconomic risk factors were living  
6 alone, poverty, and low level of education (and also unemployment for the younger age group) and these  
7 explanatory variables were also included in the model as binary variables. All analyses throughout the study  
8 were adjusted for region of residence and age, age treated as categorical variable by 5-year age groups. The  
9 modest correlations between the explanatory variables were taken into account by creating composite  
10 variables (Cramer's V was 0.06-0.34 among middle-aged men and 0.06-0.29 among middle-aged women.  
11 Among the elderly, the values were 0.09-0.37 and 0.08-0.45).

12 **Objective 1:** We aimed to study the univariate effect of each social risk factor on hospitalisations due to  
13 ACSCs by analysing separately each risk factor including only that variable as an explanatory variable in the  
14 model in addition to age and region. In these analyses we assessed the effect of each social risk factor  
15 separately for those who had experienced only that social disadvantage in 2006–2010 (at least in one year)  
16 compared with individuals who had none of the risk factors during the whole period. Additionally, the  
17 differences of the univariate effects of the risk factors were tested by creating a composite variable made  
18 up of all social risk factor variables.

19 **Objective 2:** We aimed to identify the most hazardous combination of social disadvantage in terms of  
20 hospitalisations due to ACSCs for the combinations of two, three (and four among the younger age group)  
21 risk factors. This was done by creating composite variables of different combinations of the risk factors in  
22 2006–2010 and these composite variables were modelled separately as the explanatory variables. If this  
23 risk factor was present at least in one year, it was considered as a risk factor and the prolongation was not  
24 taken into consideration in these analyses. Those who had none of the social risk factors during the years  
25 served as the reference group.

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

**Objective 3:** The effect of prolongation of cumulative disadvantage on hospitalisations due to ACSCs was studied for the most hazardous combination of the risk factors found in the analyses of the Objective 2. We studied how the prolongation of the cumulative disadvantage modified the risk by categorising the number of years (0 to 5 years) of cumulative disadvantage during the period and treating this categorical variable as an explanatory variable. For instance, if an individual had simultaneously all studied risk factors in each year between 2006–2010, he/she was categorised as having 5 years of prolonged cumulative disadvantage. Again, those who had none of the risk factors in 2006–2010 served as the reference group. Additionally, we performed pairwise comparison tests to study whether the number of years of prolongation of cumulative disadvantage had an effect on the RRs among those who had experienced cumulative disadvantage.

We analysed men and women separately but we performed additional analyses and tested gender differences in the associations of risk factors (as univariate, cumulative, and prolonged cumulative) and hospitalisations due to ACSCs. This was done by including an interaction term between gender and risk factors in analyses combining both genders.

#### ***Sensitivity analyses***

We conducted additional analyses for analyses concerning the Objective 2. In these additional analyses we included only incident hospitalisations due to ACSCs and excluded those patients who had preceding hospitalisation due to ACSCs in 1987–2010. Otherwise, the assumptions and definitions were similar to the main analyses.

We used SAS (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA) version 9.4 to analyse the data.

## 1 Results

2 In the study period 2011–2013, the population at risk comprised altogether 1 530 397 (50% men)  
3 individuals aged 45–64 and 927 152 (42% men) individuals aged 65 or over. In 2011–2013, 4% (29 275/760  
4 139) of middle-aged men and 3% (20 846/770 258) of middle-aged women had been hospitalised due to  
5 ACSCs. Among the elderly, the proportions were 16% (60 110/387 970) and 14% (73 231/539 182). Of those  
6 men, who had ACSC hospitalisations, 75% had only one ACSC hospitalisation during the study period among  
7 the middle-aged and 64% among the elderly. Among women, the corresponding proportions were 79% and  
8 67%.

9 Living alone was the most common risk factor of the studied social risk factors among the middle-aged. Of  
10 men 30% and 28% of women had lived alone at least in one year in 2006–2010 (Table 1). Among the  
11 elderly, low level of education was the most common risk factor, with 56% of the men and 62% of the  
12 women having low level of education. For each risk factor, the proportion of hospitalisation due to ACSCs in  
13 2011–2013 was clearly higher among those who had the risk factor compared with those who had not  
14 experienced the risk factor in any of the years 2006–2010.

1  
2  
3 1 Table 1. Characteristics of the study population by social and socioeconomic risk factors in 2006–2010 and  
4  
5 2 hospitalisations due to ambulatory care sensitive conditions (ACSCs) in 2011–2013 by age and gender in  
6  
7 3 Finland  
8  
9

Risk factor	Men aged 45-64 n = 760 139		Women aged 45-64 n = 770 258	
	% of having risk factor in 2006–2010	% of having hospitalisations due to ACSCs in 2011–2013	% of having risk factor in 2006–2010	% of having hospitalisations due to ACSCs in 2011–2013
Living alone				
YES	30	5.4	28	3.8
NO	70	3.2	72	2.3
Poverty				
YES	25	6.2	23	4.3
NO	75	3.1	77	2.2
Low level of education				
YES	27	5.3	22	4.1
NO	73	3.3	78	2.3
Unemployment				
YES	19	4.5	16	3.0
NO	81	3.7	84	2.7
Risk factor	Men aged ≥ 65 n = 387 970		Women aged ≥ 65 n = 539 182	
	% of having risk factor in 2006–2010	% of having hospitalisations due to ACSCs in 2011–2013	% of having risk factor in 2006–2010	% of having hospitalisations due to ACSCs in 2011–2013
Living alone				
YES	29	19.7	55	16.8
NO	71	13.8	45	9.7
Poverty				
YES	31	21.4	47	18.3
NO	69	12.9	53	9.4
Low level of education				
YES	56	18.3	62	16.1
NO	44	11.9	38	9.6

If an individual had the risk factor at least in one year in 2006–2010, he/she was categorised as having the risk factor.

If an individual had not had the risk factor in any of the years 2006–2010, he/she was categorised as not having the risk factor.

1

## 2 **Results concerning the Objective 1**

3 All the studied social and socioeconomic risk factors had a univariate effect on hospitalisations due to  
 4 ACSCs after controlling for area of residence and age (Table 2). Each of the risk factors increased  
 5 significantly the odds of being hospitalized due to ACSCs after adjustment for age and area of residence  
 6 compared to individuals who had none of the risk factors in 2006–2010. Poverty and low level of education  
 7 had the strongest univariate effect on ACSCs among both age groups and genders. The univariate effect of  
 8 unemployment was statistically significantly smaller than the effect of all the other studied risk factors  
 9 among middle-aged men (p-values < 0.0001). Among middle-aged women, the univariate effect of  
 10 unemployment was statistically smaller than the effect of poverty and low level of education (p-values <  
 11 0.0001). The univariate effect of living alone was statistically significantly smaller than the low level of  
 12 education among the elderly (p-values < 0.001). The effect of living alone was significantly larger for men  
 13 among the middle-aged (p-value for interaction between gender and living alone < 0.0001) and the effect  
 14 of poverty and low level of education was greater for women among the elderly (p-values for interaction <  
 15 0.01).

16 Table 2. Univariate effects of the risk factors in 2006–2010 on hospitalisations due to ambulatory care  
 17 sensitive conditions by age and gender in Finland in 2011–2013

	<b>Men aged 45-64</b>		<b>Women aged 45-64</b>	
	<b>RR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>RR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
Living alone	1.39	1.34–1.44	1.20	1.15–1.26
Poverty	1.53	1.46–1.61	1.54	1.46–1.62
Low level of education	1.42	1.37–1.47	1.55	1.49–1.62
Unemployment	1.18	1.12–1.24	1.15	1.08–1.23
	<b>Men aged ≥ 65</b>		<b>Women aged ≥ 65</b>	
	<b>RR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>RR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
Living alone	1.17	1.14–1.21	1.12	1.08–1.16
Poverty	1.27	1.21–1.32	1.31	1.24–1.38
Low level of education	1.26	1.23–1.29	1.30	1.27–1.34



1  
2  
3 The reference category is those individuals who had none of the risk factors  
4 during the period 2006–2010. RRs were estimated from separate models for  
5 each risk factor.

6 Adjusted for age and region of residence  
7

8 1

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14 2 **Results concerning the Objective 2**

15  
16 3 Next we studied the associations between different combinations of cumulative disadvantage and  
17 4 hospitalisations due to ACSCs (Table 3). All combinations of two, and three (and four among the middle-  
18 5 aged) risk factors increased significantly the odds of being hospitalized due to ACSC compared with the  
19 6 reference group who had none of the risk factors. The only exception was the combination of living alone  
20 7 and unemployment, which was not statistically significant among middle-aged women. Among the middle-  
21 8 aged, the most hazardous combination of two risk factors was living alone and poverty among both  
22 9 genders; the RR was 2.62 (95% confidence interval 2.52–2.73) among men and 2.53 (2.41–2.65) among  
23 10 women. Those risk combinations which included unemployment had the smallest RRs. The most hazardous  
24 11 combination of three risk factors was living alone, poverty, and low level of education with RR of 3.16  
25 12 (3.03–3.29) among men and 3.54 (3.36–3.73) among women. The effect of cumulative disadvantage on  
26 13 hospitalisations due to ACSCs was larger for women among the middle-aged (p-value for interaction  
27 14 between gender and cumulative disadvantage 0.02). When all the four risk factors were present, the RRs  
28 15 were 2.24 (2.10–2.39) and 1.98 (1.80–2.18), respectively and the effect was larger for men (p-value for  
29 16 interaction between gender and cumulative disadvantage 0.009). Among elderly men, the most hazardous  
30 17 combination of two risk factors was living alone and poverty: the RR was 1.49 (1.44–1.56). Among elderly  
31 18 women, the present of poverty and low level of education was the most hazardous combination of two risk  
32 19 factors: the RR was 1.48 (1.42–1.53). When all the three risk factors (living alone, poverty, and low level of  
33 20 education) were present, the RR was 1.61 (1.57–1.66) and 1.69 (1.64–1.74), respectively.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 Table 3. The effect of different combinations of the risk factors in 2006–2010 on hospitalisations due to  
 2 ambulatory care sensitive conditions in Finland in 2011–2013

Living alone	Poverty	Low level of education	Unemployment	Men aged 45-64		Women aged 45-64	
				RR	95% CI	RR	95% CI
<i>Combinations of two risk factors</i>							
X	X	–	–	2.62	2.52–2.73	2.53	2.41–2.65
X	–	X	–	1.70	1.62–1.79	1.57	1.47–1.68
X	–	–	X	1.39	1.28–1.51	1.08	0.94–1.23
–	X	X	–	2.02	1.92–2.13	2.52	2.38–2.66
–	X	–	X	1.61	1.49–1.74	1.52	1.39–1.65
–	–	X	X	1.24	1.16–1.33	1.27	1.17–1.37
<i>Combinations of three risk factors</i>							
X	X	X	–	3.16	3.03–3.29	3.54	3.36–3.73
X	X	–	X	2.11	2.00–2.23	1.75	1.62–1.90
X	–	X	X	1.40	1.23–1.59	1.39	1.17–1.67
–	X	X	X	1.78	1.63–1.95	1.83	1.66–2.02
<i>All four risk factors</i>							
X	X	X	X	2.24	2.10–2.39	1.98	1.80–2.18
				Men aged ≥ 65		Women aged ≥ 65	
Living alone	Poverty	Low level of education		RR	95% CI	RR	95% CI
<i>Combinations of two risk factors</i>							
X	X	–		1.49	1.44–1.56	1.43	1.38–1.48
X	–	X		1.40	1.36–1.44	1.36	1.32–1.41
–	X	X		1.31	1.28–1.35	1.48	1.42–1.53
<i>All three risk factors</i>							
X	X	X		1.61	1.57–1.66	1.69	1.64–1.74

The reference category is those individuals who had none of the risk factors during the period 2006–2010. RRs were estimated from separate models for each combination of risk factors.

Adjusted for age and region of residence

3

4 **Results concerning the Objective 3**

5 The effect of prolonged cumulative disadvantage between 2006–2010 on ACSCs in 2011–2013 was  
 6 examined for the most hazardous combination of the risk factors, i.e. simultaneously living alone,  
 7 experiencing poverty and low level of education. All RRs for being hospitalised due to ACSCs for those  
 8 experiencing one or more years of cumulative disadvantage were statistically significant compared with  
 9 those individuals who had none of the risk factors during the period 2006–2010 among both genders and

age groups (Table 4). The RR for being hospitalized was 3.91 (3.70–4.12) for those middle-aged men who had all the three risk factors in each year compared with those who had none of the risk factors between 2006–2010. Among middle-aged women, the corresponding RR was 4.75 (4.44–5.07). For the elderly, the RR was 1.66 (1.61–1.71) and 1.72 (1.67–1.78).

Table 4. The effect of prolonged cumulative disadvantage in 2006–2010 on ambulatory care sensitive conditions in Finland in 2011–2013 for the combination of living alone, poverty, and low level of education

The number of years of cumulative disadvantage <sup>1</sup>	Men aged 45-64			Women aged 45-64		
	RR	95% CI	n <sup>2</sup>	RR	95% CI	n <sup>2</sup>
0	1.00	ref. <sup>3</sup>	311 927	1.00	ref. <sup>3</sup>	339 402
1	2.47	2.28–2.69	9 304	2.45	2.20–2.74	7 031
2	2.74	2.49–3.01	6 088	2.57	2.25–2.92	4 368
3	2.72	2.46–3.01	4 767	3.35	2.95–3.80	3 434
4	3.06	2.77–3.39	4 163	3.60	3.16–4.09	2 999
5	3.91	3.70–4.12	12 432	4.75	4.44–5.07	9 189
	Men aged ≥ 65			Women aged ≥ 65		
	RR	95% CI	n <sup>2</sup>	RR	95% CI	n <sup>2</sup>
0	1.00	ref. <sup>3</sup>	116 197	1.00	ref. <sup>3</sup>	91 452
1	1.59	1.51–1.67	6 063	1.56	1.49–1.64	15 941
2	1.56	1.47–1.66	4 220	1.60	1.51–1.69	10 308
3	1.59	1.51–1.68	5 296	1.68	1.59–1.76	12 744
4	1.47	1.39–1.54	6 341	1.67	1.59–1.75	16 167
5	1.66	1.61–1.71	26 598	1.72	1.67–1.78	96 202

<sup>1</sup> In these analyses those individuals who had experienced disadvantage of one risk factor or cumulative disadvantage related to combination of two risk factors were excluded

<sup>2</sup> The total number of individuals in the category

<sup>3</sup> The reference category is those individuals who had none of the risk factors during the period 2006–2010

Adjusted for age and region of residence

Among middle-aged men and women, the prolongation of the cumulative disadvantage increased gradually the odds of being hospitalized due to ACSCs. The ORs for those who had experienced prolonged cumulative disadvantage in one, two, three, or four years was statistically smaller than if an individual had experienced cumulative disadvantage in each year. Among the middle-aged, the effect of prolongation of cumulative

1  
2  
3 1 disadvantage on hospitalisations due to ACSCs was statistically different between men and women only for  
4  
5 2 those who had experienced it for three or five years (p-values for interaction between gender and  
6  
7 3 prolonged cumulative disadvantage < 0.05).

9  
10 4 Among elderly men, the prolongation of the cumulative disadvantage did not increase the odds of being  
11  
12 5 hospitalized due to ACSC, i.e. experiencing one or more years of cumulative disadvantage did not change  
13  
14 6 the odds compared with those individuals who had experienced cumulative disadvantage in each of the five  
15  
16 7 years. Only the difference between four and five years of cumulative disadvantage was statistically  
17  
18 8 significant (pairwise comparison p-value < 0.001). Among elderly women, the differences experiencing one  
19  
20 9 or two years of cumulative disadvantage compared with five years were statistically significant (pairwise  
21  
22 10 comparison p-values < 0.003). Among the elderly, the prolongation of cumulative disadvantage had also  
23  
24 11 statistically different effect on hospitalisations due to ACSCs among men and women for those who had  
25  
26 12 experienced it for three or more years (p-values for interaction between gender and prolonged cumulative  
27  
28 13 disadvantage < 0.004).

### 32 33 14 34 35 15 **Results concerning the sensitivity analyses**

36  
37  
38 16 The odds of being hospitalised due to ACSC for those with cumulative disadvantage compared with those  
39  
40 17 without any of the examined risk factors decreased when including only incident ACSC hospitalisations. For  
41  
42 18 the most hazardous combination of cumulative disadvantage (living alone, poverty, and low level of  
43  
44 19 education), the RR was 2.50 (2.37–2.64) among middle-aged men and 2.72 (2.54–2.92) among middle-aged  
45  
46 20 women when excluding all individuals who were hospitalised due to ACSC before 2011 from the analyses.  
47  
48 21 For the elderly, the RR was 1.53 (1.48–1.59) and 1.57 (1.50–1.64).

49  
50  
51  
52 22  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 1 Discussion

2 This population-based register study found strong associations between preceding cumulative social  
3 disadvantage and hospitalisations due to ambulatory care sensitive conditions. The study population  
4 included all Finnish residents aged 45 years or older in 2011–2013 and for this population we utilised  
5 comprehensive data from several administrative registers to examine their hospitalisations in 2011–2013  
6 and preceding social and socioeconomic risk factors in 2006–2010. We defined cumulative social  
7 disadvantage as combination of several simultaneous risk factors for disadvantage preceding the study  
8 period: living alone, poverty, low level of education, and unemployment. The risk of being hospitalised due  
9 to ACSCs was markedly elevated if an individual had lived alone and had experienced poverty during the  
10 preceding years, and had also poor education. The same combination of the risk factors for social  
11 disadvantage was the most hazardous for both age groups (45–64 and over 64) among both genders.  
12 Additionally, we found that prolongation of cumulative disadvantage in time increased further the risk of  
13 being hospitalized due to ACSCs among the middle-aged (aged 45–64). Among the middle-aged the  
14 prolongation of accumulation of risks was even more hazardous for women than for men.

15 The lack of nationwide comprehensive register data on the use of primary health care is a common  
16 limitation in health services research. Hospitalisations due to ACSCs provide an indirect measure of the  
17 effectiveness and quality of primary health care. Some studies have questioned the accuracy of this  
18 indicator to reflect access to primary care. However, the studies concluding that hospitalisations due to  
19 ACSCs are not associated with poor access to health care, have used area-level data and have not been able  
20 to take into account need for care at individual-level.[45-47] Thus conclusive evidence that more efficient  
21 or more accessible primary care could not prevent a notable proportion of hospitalisations due to ACSCs is  
22 lacking.

23 A universal list of ACSCs does not exist since hospitalisation criteria vary between countries and health care  
24 systems.[10] We applied the UK definition with some minor modifications to maintain international  
25 comparability. However, the main purpose of this study was to examine social disadvantage as a risk factor

1  
2  
3 1 for hospitalisations due to ACSCs within Finland and not to compare countries. We expect there to be no  
4  
5 2 differences in coding practices between socioeconomic groups in administrative regions of Finland. Thus  
6  
7 3 we assume that there is no considerable inconsistency in using this ACSC definition list for our purposes.  
8  
9  
10 4 In this study both emergency and elective hospital admissions were included while some earlier studies  
11  
12 5 have included only emergency admissions.[9, 25] In regard to social and socioeconomic differences, the use  
13  
14 6 of both emergency and elective hospitalisations is likely to somewhat diminish these differences since  
15  
16 7 social disadvantage might increase the risk of emergency hospitalisations while acting as a barrier to  
17  
18 8 elective care.[48] Additionally, the majority of the hospital admissions due to ACSCs in our data were  
19  
20 9 emergency admissions. Thus we presume our results of social inequity would be even greater, had we  
21  
22 10 studied only emergency hospital admissions.  
23  
24

25  
26 11 With register data we were not able to measure social isolation directly and thus we used living alone as a  
27  
28 12 crude proxy. This measure excludes the individual's social networks outside their home. Living alone does  
29  
30 13 not always denote social isolation or loneliness, although they are interrelated and overlapping. Despite  
31  
32 14 these limitations we detected strong associations between living arrangements and hospitalisations due to  
33  
34 15 ACSCs and our results suggest that living arrangements reflect social support relatively accurately. Another  
35  
36 16 limitation is that we were not able to take into account for ill-health, morbidity or disease severity which is  
37  
38 17 an evident shortage when utilising merely register data on the use of hospital care. Thus, we cannot make  
39  
40 18 direct conclusions what part of differences between social groups in hospitalisations due to ACSCs would be  
41  
42 19 explained by the different health status of individuals.  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 20 Our results of univariate effects of the socioeconomic risk factors on hospitalisations due to ACSCs are in  
48  
49 21 line with the results found in several earlier studies reporting that disadvantaged socioeconomic position is  
50  
51 22 associated with increased risk of being hospitalised due to ACSCs.[15, 24, 27] These previous studies  
52  
53 23 examined only one socioeconomic factor or used small area based deprivation indices in assessing  
54  
55 24 socioeconomic position. Few studies have examined several socioeconomic factors at the same time.  
56  
57 25 Blustein et al.[11] found that poorer and less-educated individuals were likely to be hospitalised due to  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1 ACSCs in the US in the early 1990's, but they modelled education and income separately. A study from  
4  
5 2 Sweden detected that individuals with lower income and those not gainfully employed had higher risk of  
6  
7 3 becoming hospitalised due to ACSCs in the mid 2000's.[26] Booth et al.[16] studied the effect of education  
8  
9 4 and income at the community-level on acute diabetes complications in Canada in the late 1990's and found  
10  
11 5 that only low neighbourhood income increased the risk of being hospitalised. De Prophetis et al.[17]  
12  
13 6 detected that risk of being hospitalised due to ACSCs was highest for those who jointly had the lowest  
14  
15 7 levels of life satisfaction and low household income. The study by Wallar and Rosella[18], saw that  
16  
17 8 individuals among the two lowest income quintiles were at greatest risk of being hospitalised due to ACSCs  
18  
19 9 when adjusting for education and health behavioural factors. However, these studies did not examine how  
20  
21 10 the accumulation of individual-level socioeconomic risk factors affects the risk of being hospitalised due to  
22  
23 11 ACSCs. Higher prevalence of morbidity among individuals with low socioeconomic position is likely to partly  
24  
25 12 explain inequalities in hospitalisation due to ACSCs. While primary health care obviously cannot prevent all  
26  
27 13 ACSC events leading to hospital admissions, an efficient health care system should diminish differences  
28  
29 14 between socioeconomic groups which may also be partly due to higher morbidity among the lower  
30  
31 15 socioeconomic groups.

32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37 16 We evaluated the effect of living alone as a proxy for social isolation on hospitalisations due to ACSCs. We  
38  
39 17 found that the univariate effect of living alone was significant and increased the risk of being hospitalised  
40  
41 18 due to ACSCs and the effect was greater for middle-aged men than for middle-aged women. Living alone  
42  
43 19 was as hazardous as poverty and low level of education among middle-aged men. The strong association  
44  
45 20 between living alone and the risk of being hospitalized due to ACSC suggests that absence of adequate  
46  
47 21 social support might also play a role in seeking care especially among men with low socioeconomic  
48  
49 22 position. Using interview data Longman et al.[38] have reported a similar finding concerning social isolation  
50  
51 23 as a contributory factor in avoidable hospital admissions in Australia. Ennis et al.[39] studied the association  
52  
53 24 of living alone and hospitalisations due to ACSCs in the US and concluded that living alone in later life did  
54  
55 25 not increase hospitalisation risk. Their study cohort included about 2 600 selected participants who were  
56  
57 26 presumably healthier than the general population. Thus, the results might not be applicable to broader  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1 population groups. Saxena et al.[29] found significant negative association between asthma, hypertension  
4  
5 2 and COPD hospitalisations and proportion of elderly living alone in London. Their interpretation of this  
6  
7 3 finding was that the support structures in the affluent areas prevent hospitalisations among the elderly.  
8  
9  
10 4 We found the univariate effect of unemployment and its effect as a co-factor in accumulation of risk factors  
11  
12 5 to be smaller than the effect of the other risk factors. This finding is likely to reflect at least to some extent  
13  
14 6 the fact that long-term unemployment is difficult to measure using register data. It is possible that our  
15  
16 7 indicator does not properly capture all people suffering from long-term unemployment since it is based on  
17  
18 8 statistics that includes people registered as active job applicants. Further, the study took place during a  
19  
20 9 severe recession with high prevalence of unemployment resulting in the unemployed becoming more  
21  
22 10 heterogeneous and being unemployed less stigmatizing than in times when the economy is booming. Thus,  
23  
24 11 due to the recession, unemployment in our study may have represented less of a risk factor for social  
25  
26 12 deprivation and less severe health consequences. Alternatively, the finding of the small effect of  
27  
28 13 unemployment may derive from a homogenous unemployed population. Especially in the beginning of  
29  
30 14 unemployment the Finnish welfare state is relatively generous in buffering against the economic effect  
31  
32 15 resulting from the loss of a job. An unemployed is entitled to earning-related benefit for 14 to 23 months,  
33  
34 16 depending on the length of the employment history. Thus, it is only after a longer period of time that the  
35  
36 17 effects of unemployment regarding the loss of earnings will take place. Since we could not disentangle  
37  
38 18 those still enjoying the subsidies from those that no longer did, the effects among the latter "hard core"  
39  
40 19 unemployed group are potentially downplayed.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46 20 The higher risk of being hospitalised due to ACSCs among individuals with several simultaneous risk factors  
47  
48 21 for social disadvantage found in our study is probably due to multiple causes. The inequalities found in  
49  
50 22 hospitalisations due to ACSCs certainly partly reflect differences in access to and quality of primary health  
51  
52 23 care. Earlier studies have found that individuals with higher socioeconomic position have clearly more  
53  
54 24 annual visits to physicians than those with lower position after controlling for health status.[4, 49] There is  
55  
56 25 area-level evidence that low socioeconomic position and fewer physicians are associated with poorer  
57  
58 26 access to care in addition to higher hospitalisations due to ACSCs.[50] Moreover, earlier studies have



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

1 suggested that for instance continuity of primary care is associated with reduced risk of avoidable  
2 hospitalisations.[51, 52] Especially a long-term relationship between a patient and a physician effectively  
3 reduces the risk.[53] It is likely that there are differences between socioeconomic groups in the continuity  
4 of care in the treatment of many common chronic conditions. The increased risk of being hospitalised due  
5 to ACSCs among individuals with cumulative disadvantage may also be caused by inadequate resources in  
6 primary health care to recognise the needs of people with simultaneous social and physical health  
7 problems and inability to treat and prevent these diseases from worsening. Socioeconomic inequalities in  
8 the use of health care are likely to be explained at least partly also by differences in seeking the care  
9 needed.[13]

10 The finding that the prolongation of cumulative disadvantage increased further the risk of being  
11 hospitalized for ACSCs among the middle-aged is likely to reflect the interplay of social disadvantage and  
12 health problems over time. Prolongation of cumulative disadvantage worsens further social and physical  
13 health problems gradually. However, among the elderly (aged over 64), the prolongation of cumulative  
14 disadvantage did not increase the risk further. This may be due to the fact that chronic conditions  
15 potentially leading to ACSC are relatively common among older age groups. Additionally, selective mortality  
16 may play a role by diminishing differences between socioeconomic groups.

17 The sensitivity analyses included only those individuals who had no previous hospitalisations due to ACSCs.  
18 They detected that cumulative disadvantage increases the risk of being hospitalised due to ACSCs  
19 somewhat less than when including all individuals. This suggests that accumulation of social disadvantage  
20 can have worse effects for those who have chronic conditions and/or recurring hospitalisations. On the  
21 other hand this finding supports the conclusion that persons without previous avoidable hospitalisations  
22 have increased risk of being hospitalised due to ACSCs after experiencing social disadvantage.

23 To our knowledge, this is the first study to assess exhaustively the relationship between the accumulation  
24 of social disadvantage and hospitalisations due to ACSCs. The use of comprehensive individual-level register  
25 data enabled us to avoid ecological bias which is common in studies using area-level socioeconomic and

1  
2  
3 1 social disadvantage variables. We were also able to study a rather long period of time and thus evaluate the  
4  
5 2 effect of prolongation of accumulating social disadvantage; the retrospective follow-up time was eight  
6  
7 3 years at longest. In our data avoidable hospitalisations were derived from the Care Register for Health Care,  
8  
9  
10 4 which has been found to be of good quality and coverage in general.[54] The methodological approach of  
11  
12 5 the study allowed us to study simultaneously several risk factors that are to some extent dependent of  
13  
14 6 each other.

15  
16  
17 7 The results of our study underline the importance of improving coordination of care across the system  
18  
19 8 between social and health care, as well as primary and secondary care. Also primary prevention in the  
20  
21 9 management of care should be emphasized. Universalism is not enough; the recognition of patients with  
22  
23 10 chronic conditions and simultaneous particular combinations of cumulative disadvantage is important to  
24  
25 11 diminish these extensive differences between social groups to improve social equity in health care. The  
26  
27 12 identification of these vulnerable patients groups – who may be more susceptible – is also necessary to  
28  
29 13 reduce the use of more expensive treatment in specialised health care. Treating people with multiple  
30  
31 14 chronic conditions and social problems in primary care requires more attention and active means and for  
32  
33 15 instance strengthening continuity of care is even more significant for these vulnerable patients groups.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 17 **Author's contribution** SL participated in the conception and planning of the study, designed the study,  
42  
43 18 analysed and interpreted the data and was a major contributor in writing the manuscript. KM, MA, SK, and  
44  
45 19 IK participated in the conception and planning of the study and the interpretation of the results for  
46  
47 20 important intellectual content and writing the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final  
48  
49 21 manuscript.

50  
51  
52 22 **Acknowledgements** We thank our colleague, MD Markku Satokangas for his valuable comments on the  
53  
54 23 manuscript.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1 **A funding statement** This work was supported by the Academy of Finland (project number 277939) and  
4  
5 2 NordForsk (project number 74637), but the Academy nor NordForsk had no involvement in its design, data  
6  
7 3 collection, analysis, findings or decision to publish.  
8  
9

10 4 **A competing interests statement** The authors declare that they have no competing interests.  
11  
12

13 5 **A patient consent form** Not applicable  
14  
15

16 6 **A data sharing statement** No additional data are available  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 7  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 1 **References**

- 2 1. Whitehead M, Dahlgren G. Concepts and principles for tackling social inequities in health: Levelling up  
3 part 1. University of Liverpool: WHO Collaborating Centre for Policy Research on Social Determinants of  
4 Health; 2006.
- 5 2. Starfield B, Shi L, Macinko J. Contribution of Primary Care to Health Systems and Health. *Milbank Q.*  
6 2005;83(3):457-502.
- 7 3. Keskimäki I, Tynkkynen LK, Reissell E, Koivusalo M, Syrjä V, Vuorenkoski L, et al. Finland: Health system  
8 review. *Health Systems in Transition.* 2019;21(2):1-166.
- 9 4. van Doorslaer EE. Inequalities in access to medical care by income in developed countries. *CMAJ.*  
10 2006;174(2):177-183.
- 11 5. OECD/EU editor. *Health at a Glance: Europe 2018: State of Health in the EU Cycle.* Paris/EU, Brussels:  
12 OECD Publishing; 2018.
- 13 6. Mölläri K, Kovanen L. *Hoitoonpääsy perusterveydenhuollossa maaliskuussa 2019.* Helsinki: THL; 2019.
- 14 7. Satokangas M, Lumme S, Arffman M, Keskimäki I. Trajectory modelling of ambulatory care sensitive  
15 conditions in Finland in 1996–2013: assessing the development of equity in primary health care through  
16 clustering of geographic areas – an observational retrospective study. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2019;19(629).
- 17 8. Kringos D, Boerma W, Bourgueil Y, Cartier T, Dedeu T, Hasvold T, et al. The strength of primary care in  
18 Europe: an international comparative study. *Br J Gen Pract.* 2013;63(616):e742-750.
- 19 9. Tian Y, Dixon A, Gao H. Data briefing: Emergency hospital admissions for ambulatory care-sensitive  
20 conditions: Identifying the potential for reductions. London: The King's Fund; 2012.
- 21 10. Purdy S, Griffin T, Salisbury C, Sharp D. Ambulatory care sensitive conditions: terminology and disease  
22 coding need to be more specific to aid policy makers and clinicians. *Public Health.* 2009;123(2):169-173.

- 1  
2  
3 1 11. Blustein J, Hanson K, Shea S. Preventable Hospitalizations And Socioeconomic Status. *Health Aff.*  
4  
5 2 1998;17(2):177-189.  
6  
7  
8 3 12. Billings J, Anderson GM, Newman LS. Recent Findings On Preventable Hospitalizations. *Health Aff.*  
9  
10 4 1996;15(3):239-249.  
11  
12  
13 5 13. Laditka JN, Laditka SB, Probst JC. More May Be Better: Evidence of a Negative Relationship between  
14  
15  
16 6 Physician Supply and Hospitalization for Ambulatory Care Sensitive Conditions. *Health Serv. Res.*  
17  
18 7 2005;40(4):1148-1166.  
19  
20  
21 8 14. Roos LL, Walld R, Uhanova J, Bond R. Physician Visits, Hospitalizations, and Socioeconomic Status:  
22  
23  
24 9 Ambulatory Care Sensitive Conditions in a Canadian Setting. *Health Serv. Res.* 2005;40(4):1167-1185.  
25  
26  
27 10 15. Trachtenberg AJ, Dik N, Chateau D, Katz A. Inequities in Ambulatory Care and the Relationship Between  
28  
29 11 Socioeconomic Status and Respiratory Hospitalizations: A Population-Based Study of a Canadian City. *Ann.*  
30  
31 12 *Fam. Med.* 2014; doi:10.1370/afm.1683.  
32  
33  
34 13 16. Booth GL, Hux JE, Fang J, Chan BTB. Time Trends and Geographic Disparities in Acute Complications of  
35  
36 14 Diabetes in Ontario, Canada. *Diabetes Care.* 2005; doi:10.2337/diacare.28.5.1045.  
37  
38  
39 15 17. De Prophetis E, Goel V, Watson T, Rosella LC. Relationship between life satisfaction and preventable  
40  
41 16 hospitalisations: a population-based cohort study in Ontario, Canada. *BMJ Open.* 2020;  
42  
43 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-032837.  
44 17  
45  
46  
47 18 18. Wallar LE, Rosella LC. Risk factors for avoidable hospitalizations in Canada using national linked data: A  
48  
49 19 retrospective cohort study. *PLoS ONE.* 2020; doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0229465.  
50  
51  
52 20 19. Falster K, Banks E, Lujic S, Falster M, Lynch J, Zwi K, et al. Inequalities in pediatric avoidable  
53  
54 21 hospitalizations between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal children in Australia: a population data linkage  
55  
56 22 study. *BMC pediatr.* 2016;16(1):169.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 1 20. Butler DC, Thurecht L, Brown L, Konings P. Social exclusion, deprivation and child health: a spatial  
4  
5 2 analysis of ambulatory care sensitive conditions in children aged 0–4 years in Victoria, Australia. *Soc Sci*  
6  
7 3 *Med.* 2013; doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.06.029.  
8  
9  
10 4 21. Ansari Z, Haider SI, Ansari H, de Gooyer T, Sindall C. Patient characteristics associated with  
11  
12 5 hospitalisations for ambulatory care sensitive conditions in Victoria, Australia. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2012;  
13  
14 6 doi:10.1186/1472-6963-12-475.  
15  
16  
17 7 22. Jackson G, Tobias M. Potentially avoidable hospitalisations in New Zealand, 1989-98. *Aust. N. Z. J. Public*  
18  
19 8 *Health.* 2001;25(3):212-221.  
20  
21  
22 9 23. Magan P, Otero A, Alberquilla A, Ribera JM. Geographic variations in avoidable hospitalizations in the  
23  
24 10 elderly, in a health system with universal coverage. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2008; doi:10.1186/1472-6963-8-  
25  
26 11 42.  
27  
28  
29 12 24. Agabiti N, Pirani M, Schifano P, Cesaroni G, Davoli M, Bisanti L, et al. Income level and chronic  
30  
31 13 ambulatory care sensitive conditions in adults: a multicity population-based study in Italy. *BMC Public*  
32  
33 14 *Health.* 2009; doi:10.1186/1471-2458-9-457.  
34  
35  
36 15 25. Sexton E, Bedford D. GP supply, deprivation and emergency admission to hospital for COPD and  
37  
38 16 diabetes complications in counties across Ireland: an exploratory analysis. *Ir J Med Sci.* 2016;  
39  
40 17 doi:10.1007/s11845-015-1359-5.  
41  
42  
43 18 26. Löfqvist T, Burström B, Walander A, Ljung R. Inequalities in avoidable hospitalisation by area income  
44  
45 19 and the role of individual characteristics: a population-based register study in Stockholm County, Sweden.  
46  
47 20 *BMJ Qual Saf.* 2014; doi:10.1136/bmjqs-2012-001715.  
48  
49  
50 21 27. Conway R, O’Riordan D, Byrne D, Cournane S, Coveney S, Silke B. Deprivation influences the emergency  
51  
52 22 admission rate of ambulatory care sensitive conditions. *Clinical Medicine.* 2016;  
53  
54 23 doi:10.7861/clinmedicine.16-2-119.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 1 28. Orueta JF, García-Alvarez A, Grandes G, Nuño-Solinís R. Variability in potentially preventable  
4  
5 2 hospitalisations: an observational study of clinical practice patterns of general practitioners and care  
6  
7 3 outcomes in the Basque Country (Spain). *BMJ Open*. 2015; doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2014-007360.  
8  
9  
10 4 29. Saxena S, George J, Barber J, Fitzpatrick J, Majeed A. Association of population and practice factors with  
11  
12 5 potentially avoidable admission rates for chronic diseases in London: cross sectional analysis. *J R Soc Med*.  
13  
14 6 2006; doi:10.1258/jrsm.99.2.81.  
15  
16  
17 7 30. Galobardes B, Lynch J, Smith GD. Measuring socioeconomic position in health research. *British Medical*  
18  
19 8 *Bulletin*. 2007;81-82(1):21-37.  
20  
21  
22 9 31. Graham H editor. *Understanding health inequalities*. Berkshire and New York: Open University Press;  
23  
24 10 2009.  
25  
26  
27 11 32. Ingold B, Yersin B, Wietlisbach V, Burckhardt P, Burnand B, Büla C. Characteristics associated with  
28  
29 12 inappropriate hospital use in elderly patients admitted to a general internal medicine service. *Aging Clin*.  
30  
31 13 *Exp. Res*. 2000;12:430-438.  
32  
33  
34 14 33. Murphy BM, Elliott PC, Le Grande MR, Higgins RO, Ernest CS, Goble AJ, et al. Living alone predicts 30-  
35  
36 15 day hospital readmission after coronary artery bypass graft surgery. *European Journal of Cardiovascular*  
37  
38 16 *Prevention & Rehabilitation*. 2008; doi:10.1097/HJR.0b013e3282f2dc4e.  
39  
40  
41 17 34. Finlay JM, Kobayashi LC. Social isolation and loneliness in later life: A parallel convergent mixed-  
42  
43 18 methods case study of older adults and their residential contexts in the Minneapolis metropolitan area,  
44  
45 19 USA. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2018 July 2018;208:25-33.  
46  
47  
48 20 35. Dreyer K, Steventon A, Fisher R, Deeny SR. The association between living alone and health care  
49  
50  
51 21 utilisation in older adults: a retrospective cohort study of electronic health records from a London general  
52  
53 22 practice. *BMC geriatrics*. 2018;18(1).  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 1 36. Mu C, Kecmanovic M, Hall J. Does Living Alone Confer a Higher Risk of Hospitalisation? *Econ Rec.*  
4  
5 2 2015;91:124-138.  
6  
7  
8 3 37. Shankar A, McMunn A, Banks J, Steptoe A. Loneliness, social isolation, and behavioral and biological  
9  
10 4 health indicators in older adults. *Health Psychology.* 2011;30(4):377-385.  
11  
12  
13 5 38. Longman J, Megan P, Judy S, Geoff M. The role of social isolation in frequent and/or avoidable  
14  
15 6 hospitalisation: rural community-based service providers' perspectives. *Aust Health Rev.* 2013;  
16  
17 7 doi:10.1071/AH12152.  
18  
19  
20 8 39. Ennis S, Larson E, Grothaus L, Helfrich C, Balch S, Phelan E. Association of living alone and  
21  
22 9 hospitalization among community-dwelling elders with and without dementia. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2014;  
23  
24 10 doi:10.1007/s11606-014-2904-z.  
25  
26  
27 11 40. Kuh D, Ben-Shlomo Y, Lynch J, Hallqvist J, Power C. Life course epidemiology. *J Epidemiol Community*  
28  
29 12 *Health.* 2003; doi:10.1136/jech.57.10.778.  
30  
31  
32 13 41. Noora Berg. Accumulation of disadvantage from adolescence to midlife : A 26-year follow-up study of  
33  
34 14 16-year old adolescents. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto; 2017.  
35  
36  
37 15 42. Page A, Ambrose S, Glover J, Hetzel D. Atlas of Avoidable Hospitalisations in Australia: ambulatory  
38  
39 16 care-sensitive conditions. Adelaide: PHIDU, University of Adelaide; 2007.  
40  
41  
42 17 43. Eurostat. At risk of poverty rate. 2019; Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/tespm010)  
43  
44 18 [datasets/-/tespm010](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/tespm010), 2019.  
45  
46  
47 19 44. Zou G. A Modified Poisson Regression Approach to Prospective Studies with Binary Data. *Am J*  
48  
49 20 *Epidemiol.* 2004; doi:10.1093/aje/kwh090.  
50  
51  
52 21 45. Vuik S, Fontana G, Mayer E, Darzi A. Do hospitalisations for ambulatory care sensitive conditions reflect  
53  
54 22 low access to primary care? An observational cohort study of primary care usage prior to hospitalisation.  
55  
56 23 *BMJ Open.* 2017; doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-015704.  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 1 46. Magan P, Alberquilla A, Otero A, Ribera JM. Hospitalizations for Ambulatory Care Sensitive Conditions  
4  
5 2 and Quality of Primary Care: Their Relation With Socioeconomic and Health Care Variables in the Madrid  
6  
7 3 Regional Health Service (Spain). *Med Care*. 2011; doi:10.1097/MLR.0b013e3181ef9d13.  
8  
9  
10 4 47. Ricketts TC, Randolph R, Howard HA, Pathman D, Carey T. Hospitalization rates as indicators of access to  
11  
12 5 primary care. *Health & Place*. 2001; doi:10.1016/S1353-8292(00)00035-6.  
13  
14  
15 6 48. Sajjad MA, Holloway-Kew KL, Mohebbi M, Kotowicz MA, de Abreu LLF, Livingston PM, et al. Association  
16  
17 7 between area-level socioeconomic status, accessibility and diabetes-related hospitalisations: a cross-  
18  
19 8 sectional analysis of data from Western Victoria, Australia. *BMJ Open*. 2019;22(9):e026880.  
20  
21  
22  
23 9 49. Agerholm J, Bruce D, Ponce dL, Burström B. Socioeconomic differences in healthcare utilization, with  
24  
25 10 and without adjustment for need: An example from Stockholm, Sweden. *Scand. J. Public Health*. 2013;  
26  
27 11 doi:10.1177/1403494812473205.  
28  
29  
30  
31 12 50. Ansari Z, Laditka JN, Laditka SB. Access to Health Care and Hospitalization for Ambulatory Care Sensitive  
32  
33 13 Conditions. *Med. Care Res. Rev*. 2006; doi:10.1177/1077558706293637.  
34  
35  
36 14 51. Menec V, Sirski M, Attawar D, Katz A. Does continuity of care with a family physician reduce  
37  
38 15 hospitalizations among older adults? *J. Health Serv. Res. Policy*. 2006; doi:10.1258/135581906778476562.  
39  
40  
41  
42 16 52. Barker I, Steventon A, Deeny SR. Association between continuity of care in general practice and hospital  
43  
44 17 admissions for ambulatory care sensitive conditions: cross sectional study of routinely collected, person  
45  
46 18 level data. *BMJ*. 2017; doi:10.1136/bmj.j84.  
47  
48  
49 19 53. Lin I, Wu S. Effects of long-term high continuity of care on avoidable hospitalizations of chronic  
50  
51 20 obstructive pulmonary disease patients. *Health Policy*. 2017; doi:10.1016/j.healthpol.2017.06.010.  
52  
53  
54 21 54. Sund R. Quality of the Finnish Hospital Discharge Register: A systematic review. *Scand J Public Health*.  
55  
56 22 2012; doi:10.1177/1403494812456637.  
57  
58  
59  
60 23

<i>ACSC conditions</i>	<i>ICD-10</i>	<i>Notes</i>
<b><i>Vaccine-preventable</i></b>		
Bacterial Pneumonia & Influenza	J09, J10, J11, J13, J14, J15.3, J15.4, J15.7, J15.9, J16.8, J18.1, J18.8, J18.9	In any diagnosis field, not included if D57 is as a secondary diagnose
Immunization-Related and Preventable Conditions	A35, A36, A37, A80, B05, B06, B16.1, B16.9, B18.0, B18.1, B26, G00.0, M01.4	In any diagnosis field
<b><i>Chronic</i></b>		
Acute Bronchitis	J20	Only when as a primary diagnose, and J41-J44 or J47 as a secondary diagnose
Angina	I20, I24.0, I24.8, I24.9	Only when as a primary diagnose, cases with surgical procedures (A) excluded
Asthma	J45, J46	Only when as a primary diagnose
Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD)	J41, J42, J43, J44, J47	Only when as a primary diagnose
Congestive Heart Failure	I11.0, I50, J81	Only when as a primary diagnose, cases with cardiac procedures (B) excluded
Diabetes Complications	E10.0-10.8, E11.0-E11.8, E12.0-E12.8, E13.0-E13.8, E14.0-E14.8	Only when as a primary diagnose
Hypertension	I10, I11.9	Only when as a primary diagnose, cases with cardiac procedures (B) excluded
Iron Deficiency Anaemia	D50.1-D50.9	Only when as a primary diagnose
Nutritional Deficiencies	E40, E41, E42, E43, E55.0, E64.3	Only when as a primary diagnose
<b><i>Acute</i></b>		
Cellulitis	L03, L04, L08.0, L08.8, L88, L98.0	Only when as a primary diagnose, cases with other surgical procedures than skin procedures (C) excluded
Convulsions and Epilepsy	G40, G41, O15, R56	Only when as a primary diagnose
Dehydration and Gastroenteritis	E86, K52.2, K52.8, K52.9	Only when as a primary diagnose
Dental Conditions	A69.0, K02-K06, K08, K09.8, K09.9, K12, K13	Only when as a primary diagnose
Gangrene	R02	In any diagnosis field
Kidney and Urinary Tract Infections	N10, N11, N12, N13.6	Only when as a primary diagnose
Pelvic Inflammatory Disease	N70, N73, N74	Only when as a primary diagnose
Perforated or Bleeding Ulcer	K25.0-K25.2, K25.4-K25.6, K26.0-K26.2, K26.4-K26.6, K27.0-K27.2, K27.4-K27.6, K28.0-K28.2, K28.4-K28.6	Only when as a primary diagnose
Severe ENT infection	H66, H67, J02, J03, J06, J31.2	Only when as a primary diagnose

**A) Angina**

procedure field contains none of the following (NCSP, Nordic Classification of Surgical Procedures):

AA4WT, AA400, AA5LT, AAA-AAW, AB4AT, AB4BT, AB4CT, AB4DT, AB4FT, AB5, AB6AT, AB6BT, AB6CT, AB6DT, ABA-ABW, ACA-ACW, AD-AW, AXX90, BA3AT, BA4KT, BAA, BB2AT, BB3AT, BB4WT, BBA, BC1LT, BC2-BC4, BCA, BD-BW, CAA-CAW, CB, CCA-CCW, CD-CJ, CKA-CKW, CW, DAA-DAW, DB, DCA-DCW, DD, DEA-DEW, DFA-DFE, DFW99, DG, DHA-DLW, DMA-DPW, DQ-DW, EA, EBA-EBW, EC, EDA-EDW, EEA-EW, EF, EGA-EGW, EHA-EHW, EJ-EK, EL3AT, EL3RT, EL3YT, EL4, ELA-ELW, EMA-EMW, EP1AT, EP1LT, EP2AT, EP3AT, ENA-ENW, EW, FA, FBA-FBW, FCA-FCE, FD, FE1AT, FE2, FEA-FEW, FF-FL, FMA-FMW, FN1ST, FN1XT, FNA-FNW, FP-FX, GA2-GA4, GAA-GAW, GBA-GBW, GCA, GD1AT, GD1BT, GD1CT, GD1LT, GD2AT, GD2BT, GD2CT, GD3, GDA-GDW, GE1AT, GE1CT, GE1DT, GE2, GEAGEW, GW, HA0, HA1AT, HA1DT, HA1MT, HA1ST, HA2-HA5, HAA-HAF, HW, JA1LT, JA2-JA3, JAA-JAW, JB, JCA-JCW, JDA-JDW, JE, JF3, JFA-JFW, JGA-JGW, JHA-JHW, JJ1AT, JJ2-JJ8, JJA-JJW, JK1-JK2, J3KAT, JK3BT, JK3CT, JK3FT, JK3LT, JK3NT, JK3RT, JK4-JK5, JKA-JKW, JL1-JL3, JLA-JLW, JM1AT, JM1LT, JM2, JMA-JMW, JN4LT, JW, JX1LT, JX1RT, JXA, KA2AT, KA3AT, KA3CT, KA3DT, KA3LT, KA4-KA6, KAA-KAW, KBA-KBW, KC1AT, KC2AT, KC3AT, KCA-KCW, KDA-KDW, KE1AT, KE1CT, KE2, KEA-KEW, KF1-KF7, KF8AT, KF8KT, KFA-KFW, KGA-KGW, KH1AT, KH1BT, KH1CT, KH1CT, KH1DT, KH1FT, KH1YT, KKA-KKW, KW, KX, LA1, LAA-LAW, LB1AT, LB1YT, LBA-LBW, LCA-LCW, LDA-LDW, LEA-LEW, LF-LW, LX1LT, MAA-MAW, MBA-MBW, MC-MW, NA0, NA6CT, NA7BT, NA7FT, NA7KT, NA7LT, NA9KT, NAA-NAW, NB1AT, NB1BT, NB1ZT, NB2, NBA-NBW, NCA-NCW, NDA-NDW, NEA-NEW, NFA-NFW, NGA-NGW, NHA-NHW, NJ3LT, NK1AT, NK1CT, NK1DT, NK1LT, NK2-NK3, NK4AT, NK4BT, NK5, NK6AT, NK6BT, NK6CT, NK6DT, NK6KT, NK7AT, NX, PA2ZT, PA3-PA5, PA6AT, PA8KT, PA9KT, PAA-PAW, PB1AT, PB1BT, PB1ST, PB1YT, PBA-PBW, PC2DT, PC2ET, PC5AT, PC5BT, PC5DT, PC5ET, PC5GT, PC5HT, PC5JT, PC5NT, PC5PT, PC5YT, PC6DT, PC6ET, PC6FT, PC7NT, PCA-PCW, PD1AT, PD1YT, PD2DT, PD3, PD4ST, PD5YT, PD6YT, PD7YT, PDA-PDW, PE, PG1AT, PG1BT, PG1ET-PG1LT, PG1MT-PG1VT, PG1YT-PG3YT, PG5RT-PG6NT, PGA-PGW, PHIAT, PHI1FT, PHI1UT, PH2ST, PH3YT, PH4AT, PH5GT, PH6GT, PH7FT, PH7UT, PH9AT, PH9ST, PH900, PHA-PHW, PJ2AT, PJ2CT, PJ2HT, PJ3-PJ4, PJ5AN, PJA-PJW, PW, PXA-PXX, QAA-QAW, QBA-QBW, QCA-QCW, QDA-QDW, QW, QXA-QXW, QX2ZT, QX3AT, QX3CT, QX3LT, QX3YT, QX4, S, TAA-TAD, TAW99, TA100, TBA-TJF, TJG10, TJJ, TJL-TJW, TK-TL, TMA-TPX, TQ, U, WXQ, WW20, WW30-WW31, WW40, WW50, WX100-WX105, WX140-WX144, WX7-WX9, XCC00, XFE00, XFN96, XFX00, XFX10, XFX20, XFX97, XJW99, XPX00, XPX04, XPX08, XPX99, XW000, XW1-XW5, XX1AT, XX1BT, XX1CT, XX1DT, XX1XT, XX2AT-XX2DT, XX2XT, XX3AT-XX3DT, XX3XT, XX4-XX7, Y, ZC-ZP, ZS-ZX, ZZ

**B) Congestive heart failure and hypertension**

procedure field contains none of the following (NCSP, Nordic Classification of Surgical Procedures):

FEA-FEW, FFA00, FFA10-FFA30, FFA96, FFB-FFW, FG-FH, FJA00, FJA96, FJB-FJW, FKA-FKW, FK1BT, FLA00, FLA96, FLB-FLW, FMA-FMW, FN1AT, FN1BT, FN1ST, FN1XT, FN1YT, FNA-FNW, FPA-FPF, FPH-FPW, FQ, FXA00-FXN00, TFN10, TFN99, TFP00, TFP40-TFP59

**C) Cellulitis**

procedure field contains none of the following (NCSP, Nordic Classification of Surgical Procedures):

AA4WT, AA400, AA5LT, AAA-AAW, AB4AT, AB4BT, AB4CT, AB4DT, AB4FT, AB5, AB6AT, AB6BT, AB6CT, AB6DT, ABA-ABW, ACA-ACW, AD-AW, AXX90, BA3AT, BA4KT, BAA, BB2AT, BB3AT, BB4WT, BBA, BC1LT, BC2-BC4, BCA, BD-BW, CAA-CAW, CB, CCA-CCW, CD-CJ, CKA-CKW, CW, DAA-DAW, DB, DCA-DCW, DD, DEA-DEW, DFA-DFE, DFW99, DG, DHA-DLW, DMA-DPW, DQ-DW, EA, EBA-EBW, EC, EDA-EDW, EEA-EW, EF, EGA-EGW, EHA-EHW, EJ-EK, EL3AT, EL3RT, EL3YT, EL4, ELA-ELW, EMA-EMW, EP1AT, EP1LT, EP2AT, EP3AT, ENA-ENW, EW, FA, FBA-FBW, FCA-FCE, FD, FE1AT, FE2, FEA-FEW, FF-FL, FMA-FMW, FN1ST, FN1XT, FNA-FNW, FP-FX, GA2-GA4, GAA-GAW, GBA-GBW, GCA, GD1AT, GD1BT, GD1CT, GD1LT, GD2AT, GD2BT, GD2CT, GD3, GDA-GDW, GE1AT, GE1CT, GE1DT, GE2, GEAGEW, GW, HA0, HA1AT, HA1DT, HA1MT, HA1ST, HA2-HA5, HAA-HAF, HW, JA1LT, JA2-JA3, JAA-JAW, JB, JCA-JCW, JDA-JDW, JE, JF3, JFA-JFW, JGA-JGW, JHA-JHW, JJ1AT, JJ2-JJ8, JJA-JJW, JK1-JK2, J3KAT, JK3BT, JK3CT, JK3FT, JK3LT, JK3NT, JK3RT, JK4-JK5, JKA-JKW, JL1-JL3, JLA-JLW, JM1AT, JM1LT, JM2, JMA-JMW, JN4LT, JW, JX1LT, JX1RT, JXA, KA2AT, KA3AT, KA3CT, KA3DT, KA3LT, KA4-KA6, KAA-KAW, KBA-KBW, KC1AT, KC2AT, KC3AT, KCA-KCW, KDA-KDW, KE1AT, KE1CT, KE2, KEA-KEW, KF1-KF7, KF8AT, KF8KT, KFA-KFW, KGA-KGW, KH1AT, KH1BT, KH1CT, KH1CT, KH1DT, KH1FT, KH1YT, KKA-KKW, KW, KX, LA1, LAA-LAW, LB1AT, LB1YT, LBA-LBW, LCA-LCW, LDA-LDW, LEA-LEW, LF-LW, LX1LT, MAA-MAW, MBA-MBW, MC-MW, NA0, NA6CT, NA7BT, NA7FT, NA7KT, NA7LT, NA9KT, NAA-NAW, NB1AT, NB1BT, NB1ZT, NB2, NBA-NBW, NCA-NCW, NDA-NDW, NEA-NEW, NFA-NFW, NGA-NGW, NHA-NHW, NJ3LT, NK1AT, NK1CT, NK1DT, NK1LT, NK2-NK3, NK4AT, NK4BT, NK5, NK6AT, NK6BT, NK6CT, NK6DT, NK6KT, NK7AT, NX, PA2ZT, PA3-PA5, PA6AT, PA8KT, PA9KT, PAA-PAW, PB1AT, PB1BT, PB1ST, PB1YT, PBA-PBW, PC2DT, PC2ET, PC5AT, PC5BT, PC5DT, PC5ET, PC5GT, PC5HT, PC5JT, PC5NT, PC5PT, PC5YT, PC6DT, PC6ET, PC6FT, PC7NT, PCA-PCW, PD1AT, PD1YT, PD2DT, PD3, PD4ST, PD5YT, PD6YT, PD7YT, PDA-PDW, PE, PG1AT, PG1BT, PG1ET-PG1LT, PG1MT-PG1VT, PG1YT-PG3YT, PG5RT-PG6NT, PGA-PGW, PHIAT, PHI1FT, PHI1UT, PH2ST, PH3YT, PH4AT, PH5GT, PH6GT, PH7FT, PH7UT, PH9AT, PH9ST, PH900, PHA-PHW, PJ2AT, PJ2CT, PJ2HT, PJ3-PJ4, PJ5AN, PJA-PJW, PW, PXA-PXX, QAA25, QAB00-QAB05, QAB99, QAC, QAD20, QAE-QAF, QAG10-QAG99, QAJ, QBA25, QBB00-QBB05, QBB99, QBC, QBD20, QBE, QBG10-QBG99, QBJ, QCA25, QCA30, QCB00-QCB05, QCB99, QCC, QCD20, QCE-QCG, QCJ, QDA25, QDB00-QDB05, QDB99, QDC, QDD20, QDE, QDG10-QDG99, QDJ, QXA25, QXB00-QXB05, QXB99, QXC, QXD20, QXE, QXG10-QXG99, QXJ, QX2ZT, QX3AT, QX3CT, QX3LT, QX3YT, QX4, S, TAA-TAD, TAW99, TA100, TBA-TJF, TJG10, TJJ, TJL-TJW, TK-TL, TMA-TPX, TQA-TQD, TQW00, TQW02, TQW30-40, TQW99, TQX00-TQX10, U, WW20, WW30-WW31, WW40, WW50, WX100-WX105, WX140-WX144, WX7-WX9, XCC00, XFE00, XFN96, XFX00, XFX10, XFX20, XFX97, XJW99, XPX00, XPX04, XPX08, XPX99, XW000, XW1-XW5, XX1AT, XX1BT, XX1CT, XX1DT, XX1XT, XX2AT-XX2DT, XX2XT, XX3AT-XX3DT, XX3XT, XX4-XX7, Y, ZC-ZP, ZS-ZX, ZZ

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

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	#1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	#2
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	#4-6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	#6
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	#7-8
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	#7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	#7
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	NA
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	#7-8
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	#7-8
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	#NA
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	#7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	#9-10
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	#9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	#10
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	NA
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	NA
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	#10
<b>Results</b>			

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	NA
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	-
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	#11
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	NA
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	NA
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	#11
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	#11-15
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	#10
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	-
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	#10
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	#16
<b>Limitations</b>			
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	#16-17
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	#19-21
<b>Other information</b>			
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	#21

\*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.

# BMJ Open

## Cumulative social disadvantage and hospitalisations due to ambulatory care sensitive conditions in Finland in 2011–2013: a register study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-038338.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	02-Jul-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Lumme, Sonja; Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Department of Health and Social Care Systems; University of Helsinki, Department of Psychology and Logopedics Manderbacka, Kristiina; Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Department of Health and Social Care Systems Arffman, Martti; Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Department of Health and Social Care Systems Karvonen, Sakari; Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Department of Health and Social Care Systems Keskimaki, Ilmo; Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Department of Health and Social Care Systems; Tampere University, Faculty of Social Sciences
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Health services research
Secondary Subject Heading:	General practice / Family practice
Keywords:	Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, PRIMARY CARE, Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH, SOCIAL MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1  
2  
3 1 **Cumulative social disadvantage and hospitalisations due to ambulatory care sensitive conditions in**  
4  
5 2 **Finland in 2011–2013: a register study**

6  
7 3  
8  
9  
10 4 **Corresponding author** Sonja Lumme<sup>1,2</sup>

11 5 <sup>1</sup>Social and Health Systems Research Unit, Department of Health and Social Care Systems, Finnish Institute  
12 for Health and Welfare, P.O. Box 30, FI-00271 Helsinki, Finland

13 6 <sup>2</sup>Department Psychology and Logopedics, P.O. Box 21, FI-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland  
14  
15 7 email sonja.lumme@thl.fi, tel. +358 29 524 7218  
16  
17 8

18  
19 9  
20  
21 10 **Co-authors** Kristiina Manderbacka,<sup>1</sup> Martti Arffman,<sup>1</sup> Sakari Karvonen,<sup>2</sup> Ilmo Keskimäki,<sup>1,3</sup>

22 11 <sup>1</sup> Social and Health Systems Research Unit, Department of Health and Social Care Systems, Finnish Institute  
23 for Health and Welfare, P.O. Box 30, FI-00271 Helsinki, Finland

24 12 <sup>2</sup> Social Policy Research Unit, Department of Health and Social Care Systems, Finnish Institute for Health  
25 and Welfare, P.O. Box 30, FI-00271 Helsinki

26 13 <sup>3</sup> Faculty of Social Sciences, Tampere University, 33014 Tampere University, Finland  
27  
28 14

29 15  
30  
31 16  
32 17 **Word count** 5423  
33  
34 18

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

ew only



1  
2  
3 **1 Abstract**  
4  
5

6 **2 Objectives** To study the interplay between several indicators of social disadvantage and hospitalisations  
7  
8 **3** due to ambulatory care sensitive conditions (ACSC) in 2011–2013. To evaluate whether the accumulation of  
9  
10 **4** preceding social disadvantage in one point of time or prolongation of social disadvantage had an effect on  
11  
12 **5** hospitalisations due to ACSCs. Four common indicators of disadvantage are examined: living alone, low  
13  
14 **6** level of education, poverty and unemployment.

15  
16  
17  
18 **7 Design** A population-based register study  
19

20  
21 **8 Setting** Nationwide individual-level register data on hospitalisations due to ACSCs for the years 2011–2013  
22  
23 **9** and preceding data on social and socioeconomic factors for the years 2006–2010  
24  
25

26 **10 Participants** Finnish residents aged 45 or older in January 1<sup>st</sup> 2011  
27  
28

29 **11 Outcome measure** Hospitalisations due to ACSCs in 2011–2013. The effect of accumulation of preceding  
30  
31 **12** disadvantage in one point of time and its prolongation on ACSCs was studied using modified Poisson  
32  
33 **13** regression.  
34  
35

36  
37 **14 Results** People with preceding cumulative social disadvantage were more likely to be hospitalised due to  
38  
39 **15** ACSCs. The most hazardous combination was simultaneously living alone, low level of education, and  
40  
41 **16** poverty among the middle-aged (aged 45-64) and the elderly (over 64). Risk ratio (RR) of being hospitalized  
42  
43 **17** due to ACSC was 3.16 (95% confidence interval 3.03-3.29) among middle-aged men and 3.54 (3.36-3.73)  
44  
45 **18** among middle-aged women compared with individuals without any of these risk factors when controlling  
46  
47 **19** for age and residential area. For the elderly, the RR was 1.61 (1.57-1.66) among men and 1.69 (1.64-1.74)  
48  
49 **20** among women.  
50  
51

52  
53 **21 Conclusions** To improve social equity in health care, it is important to recognise not only patients with  
54  
55 **22** cumulative disadvantage, but – as this study shows – patients with particular combinations of disadvantage  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1 who may be more susceptible. The identification of these vulnerable patients groups is also necessary to  
4  
5 2 reduce the use of more expensive treatment in specialised health care.  
6  
7

8 3 Keywords: Socioeconomic disadvantage, social disadvantage, ambulatory care sensitive conditions,  
9  
10 4 inequities, health care, register data  
11  
12  
13

#### 14 5 15 16 6 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 17  
18  
19 7 • The individual-level register-based data allowed us to study simultaneously several indicators of  
20 8 social and socioeconomic disadvantage
- 21  
22 9 • The nationwide register data covered all hospitalisations due to ambulatory care sensitive  
23 10 conditions (ACSCs) in Finland
- 24  
25 11 • We were able to study social disadvantage of period preceding hospitalisations and its effect on  
26 12 being hospitalised due to ACSCs
- 27  
28 13 • Hospitalisations due to ACSCs is an indirect indicator of the effectiveness and quality of primary  
29 14 health care
- 30  
31 15 • While the study addressed associations between social disadvantage and hospitalisations due to  
32 16 ACSCs, the causality between morbidity and social disadvantage could not be studied  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 1           2 3   1   **Background**

4  
5  
6   2   Inadequate access to health care is one of the important determinants of social inequities in health.[1] Well  
7  
8   3   organised primary care has repeatedly been shown to promote population health and prevent ill-health.  
9  
10   4   There is also evidence that primary care (in contrast to specialist care) is associated with a more equitable  
11  
12   5   distribution of health in populations through prevention and early management of health problems and  
13  
14   6   through facilitating entry to the rest of the health care system.[2] The Finnish health-care system provides a  
15  
16   7   good case for examining equity as the system operates on the principle of universality and therefore, in  
17  
18   8   general, supports equal access to health services according to need.[3] Simultaneously, studies from both  
19  
20   9   Finland and some other countries with universal health care systems show systematic and persistent  
21  
22   10   socioeconomic inequities in physician utilisation in relation to need.[2-5] Challenges in providing timely  
23  
24   11   access to primary care are encountered in some areas[6] and there are indications of differences in primary  
25  
26   12   health care quality between regions.[7] However, Finland has – compared to most other European  
27  
28   13   countries – a strong publicly funded primary health care.[8]  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33   14   Hospitalisations due to ambulatory care sensitive conditions (ACSC) are used to indirectly evaluate the  
34  
35   15   effectiveness and quality of primary care.[9, 10] They are defined as hospitalisations that could be  
36  
37   16   prevented by primary care interventions. Earlier studies have used slightly different lists of conditions, but  
38  
39   17   have usually examined three types of conditions: conditions that can be prevented by vaccination, acute  
40  
41   18   conditions in which hospitalisation can be prevented by adequate (acute) management of the condition,  
42  
43   19   and chronic conditions where good quality and timely primary care can prevent later admissions, e.g., due  
44  
45   20   to complications of diabetes. Several studies from the U.S.,[11-13] Canada,[14-18] Australia,[19-21] New  
46  
47   21   Zealand[22] and European countries[23-29] have examined socioeconomic differences in ACSC and  
48  
49   22   reported more ACSC hospitalisations among persons with lower socioeconomic background.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54   23   Most earlier studies examining socioeconomic differences in ACSC have used ecological data of single  
55  
56   24   socioeconomic indicators, mainly income[12, 14, 15, 24, 25, 28] or deprivation indices based on ecological  
57  
58   25   data,[19-23, 25, 27, 29] while few studies have focused on the individual-level socioeconomic indicators.  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1 Socioeconomic position is, however, a complex construct reflecting different dimensions of the individuals'  
4  
5 2 standing in the social hierarchy.[30] The persistence of health inequalities have led researchers to point out  
6  
7 3 that we need to analyse multiple social circumstances simultaneously in order to assess their impact on  
8  
9 4 health and health care.[31] We found few studies utilizing this approach with ACSCs. One study, which  
10  
11 5 examined elderly Medicare beneficiaries in the USA, and another study from Ontario, Canada, utilising  
12  
13 6 survey data linked to administrative databases, used multiple individual-level indicators of socioeconomic  
14  
15 7 position but they did not examine them simultaneously.[11, 17] A study from the Stockholm County in  
16  
17 8 Sweden[26] and a study from Canada[18] analysed several individual-level socioeconomic variables  
18  
19 9 simultaneously. Additionally, a study from Ontario, Canada, examined trends and regional differences in  
20  
21 10 acute diabetes complications and accounted for income and education at the community level.[16]  
22  
23 11 In addition to social position, social relationships may also contribute to outcomes of health care.[32, 33]  
24  
25 12 Social relationships can be measured using self-reported measures of social isolation or loneliness. Using  
26  
27 13 register data, it is possible to study living arrangements and to use living alone as a proxy measure for social  
28  
29 14 isolation. Although previous studies have found a strong association between living alone and social  
30  
31 15 isolation and loneliness,[34] these conditions are distinct. However, also living alone has been found to  
32  
33 16 increase the use of health services[35, 36] and living alone has been applied as a measure of social  
34  
35 17 isolation.[37] Social isolation has been identified as a risk factor for avoidable hospitalisation in one  
36  
37 18 interview study from rural Australia.[38] On the other hand, a study using area-level measures of social  
38  
39 19 deprivation detected lower admission rates for several chronic diseases in areas with higher proportions of  
40  
41 20 elderly individuals living alone in London.[29] A study in the US found no association between living alone  
42  
43 21 and hospitalisations due to ACSCs among retirement age (65+) individuals.[39] The population studied was,  
44  
45 22 however, a sample of participants having access to an integrated delivery system with a preventive  
46  
47 23 approach in the management of services and thus representing healthier residents than the general  
48  
49 24 population.  
50  
51 25 Cumulative disadvantage may refer to two distinct social processes. On the one hand, it may imply  
52  
53 26 accumulation of individual forms of disadvantage cross-sectionally. On the other hand, cumulative  
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

1 disadvantage may be observed with one or several forms of disadvantage persisting over time. The above-  
2 mentioned studies have not examined how these social risk factors cumulate at individual-level either in  
3 one point of time or during a longer time period and whether the accumulation is associated with the risk  
4 of being hospitalised due to ACSCs. In recent literature, researchers have suggested that the effects of risk  
5 factors accumulate over time and thus increase socioeconomic disparities in health outcomes.[40, 41] A  
6 large number of studies have found associations between cumulative disadvantage and health. However,  
7 the relationship between accumulation of social disadvantage and health care in terms of effectiveness and  
8 quality, has received relatively little attention.

9 Social risk factors may have different impacts on outcomes of health care. Accumulation of the risk factors  
10 may also increase the risk of poor outcomes. Additionally, the effect of accumulation may vary depending  
11 on the combination of the risk factors and the persistence of accumulation. The main aim of the current  
12 study is to examine whether the preceding accumulation of social disadvantage increases inequities in  
13 outcomes of health care. We study hospitalisations due to ACSCs as an outcome of health care and as a  
14 study population we examine Finns aged 45 and over. The more specific study questions are: 1) What is the  
15 univariate effect of each risk factor on the risk of being hospitalised due to ACSCs if an individual has no  
16 other risk factors? 2) What combination of social disadvantage in one point of time is the most hazardous in  
17 terms of hospitalisations due to ACSCs? 3) Does prolongation of cumulative disadvantage in time have  
18 effect on hospitalisations due to ACSCs? We examine four common indicators of social disadvantage: living  
19 alone, poverty, low level of education and unemployment. We utilise comprehensive individual-level  
20 register data on sociodemographic and social factors and hospitalisations between 2006–2013.

## 1 **Materials**

2 The study population included non-institutionalised Finnish residents aged 45 years or older in January 1<sup>st</sup>  
3 2011. For this population, annual individual-level information on sociodemographic factors in 2006–2010  
4 was obtained from different administrative registers maintained by Statistics Finland. These exposure  
5 factors included information on gender, age and region of residence as well as factors which were used to  
6 define risk factors for disadvantage: living arrangements, income, education and annual number of  
7 unemployment months within a calendar year. Register data on hospitalisations due to ACSCs for the  
8 population at risk were individually linked to the sociodemographic data. Hospitalisations due to ACSCs in  
9 2011–2013 was used as an outcome measure. Information on hospitalisations was obtained from the Care  
10 Register for Health Care maintained by the Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare. The UK definition of  
11 ACSCs was applied with an addition of unspecified pneumonia (ICD-10 code J18.9) and influenza (J09)[10]  
12 (supplementary file 1). ACSCs were categorised as acute, chronic or vaccine-preventable conditions as  
13 suggested by previous studies.[42] Both emergence and elective inpatient hospital admissions, at least one  
14 night length of stay, were included.

15 The data were divided into two age groups: individuals aged 45-64 (the middle-aged) and 65 and older (the  
16 elderly) and these age groups were studied separately in all analyses. This allowed us to study whether  
17 there were differences between the middle-aged and the elderly in the association between ACSC  
18 hospitalisations and cumulative disadvantage and enabled us to include unemployment as a risk factor in  
19 the analysis in the younger age group. In addition, there are structural differences in access to ambulatory  
20 care services between the working aged population and others due to occupational health care.[3] Men  
21 and women were studied mainly separately due to differing levels of hospitalisations due to ACSCs[7] and  
22 effects of risk factors. Hospital districts were used as an indicator of region of residence. This allowed us to  
23 adjust for the differences in the incidence of hospitalisations due to ACSCs between regions. The division of  
24 these 20 regions is based on an administrative division of the Finnish hospital care system.

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

1 The situation of living arrangements on December 31<sup>st</sup> in each year was used to define a dichotomous  
2 variable indicating whether an individual had lived alone during the year. We studied disposable family net  
3 income as an indicator for income. The family income was adjusted for family size using the OECD modified  
4 equivalence scale. Poverty was defined as net family income lower than 60% of the median family  
5 income.[43] Data on level of education was used to categorize the risk factor related to education. Low  
6 level of education was defined as having no degrees after comprehensive school which is nine years of  
7 schooling. We defined the individual as being unemployed for that year if being unemployed for 6-12  
8 months during the year. For the older age group in this study, we did not use unemployment as a risk factor  
9 as they are rarely in paid labour in Finland.

## 10 **Ethics**

11 Ethical approval for the study was received from the Research Ethics Committee of the Finnish Institute for  
12 Health and Welfare.

## 13 **Patient and Public Involvement**

14 Patients were not involved in the design or the implementation of the study.

15  
16

## 1 **Statistical methods**

2 ACSC hospitalisations was treated as a binary outcome variable, combining those with one and several  
3 ACSC hospitalisations into one category and modified Poisson regression method was used in analysing the  
4 data.[44] Our main interest was the effect of preceding social and socioeconomic factors on  
5 hospitalisations due to ACSCs in 2011–2013. The studied social and socioeconomic risk factors were living  
6 alone, poverty, and low level of education (and also unemployment for the younger age group) and these  
7 explanatory variables were also included in the model as binary variables. All analyses throughout the study  
8 were adjusted for region of residence and age, age treated as categorical variable by 5-year age groups. The  
9 modest correlations between the explanatory variables were taken into account by creating composite  
10 variables (Cramer's V was 0.06-0.34 among middle-aged men and 0.06-0.29 among middle-aged women.  
11 Among the elderly, the values were 0.09-0.37 and 0.08-0.45).

12 **Objective 1:** We aimed to study the univariate effect of each social risk factor on hospitalisations due to  
13 ACSCs by analysing separately each risk factor including only that variable as an explanatory variable in the  
14 model in addition to age and region. In these analyses we assessed the effect of each social risk factor  
15 separately for those who had experienced only that social disadvantage in 2006–2010 (at least in one year)  
16 compared with individuals who had none of the risk factors during the whole period. Additionally, the  
17 differences of the univariate effects of the risk factors were tested by creating a composite variable made  
18 up of all social risk factor variables.

19 **Objective 2:** We aimed to identify the most hazardous combination of social disadvantage in terms of  
20 hospitalisations due to ACSCs for the combinations of two, three (and four among the younger age group)  
21 risk factors. This was done by creating composite variables of different combinations of the risk factors in  
22 2006–2010 and these composite variables were modelled separately as the explanatory variables. If this  
23 risk factor was present at least in one year, it was considered as a risk factor and the prolongation was not  
24 taken into consideration in these analyses. Those who had none of the social risk factors during the years  
25 served as the reference group.



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

**Objective 3:** The effect of prolongation of cumulative disadvantage on hospitalisations due to ACSCs was studied for the most hazardous combination of the risk factors found in the analyses of the Objective 2. We studied how the prolongation of the cumulative disadvantage modified the risk by categorising the number of years (0 to 5 years) of cumulative disadvantage during the period and treating this categorical variable as an explanatory variable. For instance, if an individual had simultaneously all studied risk factors in each year between 2006–2010, he/she was categorised as having 5 years of prolonged cumulative disadvantage. Again, those who had none of the risk factors in 2006–2010 served as the reference group. Additionally, we performed pairwise comparison tests to study whether the number of years of prolongation of cumulative disadvantage had an effect on the RRs among those who had experienced cumulative disadvantage.

Men and women were studied separately but in the additional analyses gender differences in the associations of risk factors (as univariate, cumulative, and prolonged cumulative) and hospitalisations due to ACSCs were tested in the same model. This was done by including an interaction term between gender and risk factors.

#### ***Sensitivity analyses***

We conducted additional analyses for analyses concerning the Objective 2. In these additional analyses we included only incident hospitalisations due to ACSCs and excluded those patients who had preceding hospitalisation due to ACSCs in 1987–2010. Otherwise, the assumptions and definitions were similar to the main analyses.

We used SAS (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA) version 9.4 to analyse the data.

## 1 Results

2 In the study period 2011–2013, the population at risk comprised altogether 1 530 397 (50% men)  
3 individuals aged 45–64 and 927 152 (42% men) individuals aged 65 or over. In 2011–2013, 4% (29 275/760  
4 139) of middle-aged men and 3% (20 846/770 258) of middle-aged women had been hospitalised due to  
5 ACSCs. Among the elderly, the proportions were 16% (60 110/387 970) and 14% (73 231/539 182). Of those  
6 men, who had ACSC hospitalisations, 75% had only one ACSC hospitalisation during the study period among  
7 the middle-aged and 64% among the elderly. Among women, the corresponding proportions were 79% and  
8 67%.

9 Living alone was the most common risk factor of the studied social risk factors among the middle-aged. Of  
10 men 30% and 28% of women had lived alone at least in one year in 2006–2010 (Table 1). Among the  
11 elderly, low level of education was the most common risk factor, with 56% of the men and 62% of the  
12 women having low level of education. For each risk factor, the proportion of hospitalisation due to ACSCs in  
13 2011–2013 was clearly higher among those who had the risk factor compared with those who had not  
14 experienced the risk factor in any of the years 2006–2010.

1  
2  
3 1 Table 1. Characteristics of the study population by social and socioeconomic risk factors in 2006–2010 and  
4  
5 2 hospitalisations due to ambulatory care sensitive conditions (ACSCs) in 2011–2013 by age and gender in  
6  
7 3 Finland  
8  
9

Risk factor	Men aged 45–64 n = 760 139		Women aged 45–64 n = 770 258	
	% of having risk factor in 2006–2010	% of having hospitalisations due to ACSCs in 2011–2013	% of having risk factor in 2006–2010	% of having hospitalisations due to ACSCs in 2011–2013
Living alone				
YES	30	5.4	28	3.8
NO	70	3.2	72	2.3
Poverty				
YES	25	6.2	23	4.3
NO	75	3.1	77	2.2
Low level of education				
YES	27	5.3	22	4.1
NO	73	3.3	78	2.3
Unemployment				
YES	19	4.5	16	3.0
NO	81	3.7	84	2.7
Risk factor	Men aged ≥ 65 n = 387 970		Women aged ≥ 65 n = 539 182	
	% of having risk factor in 2006–2010	% of having hospitalisations due to ACSCs in 2011–2013	% of having risk factor in 2006–2010	% of having hospitalisations due to ACSCs in 2011–2013
Living alone				
YES	29	19.7	55	16.8
NO	71	13.8	45	9.7
Poverty				
YES	31	21.4	47	18.3
NO	69	12.9	53	9.4
Low level of education				
YES	56	18.3	62	16.1
NO	44	11.9	38	9.6

If an individual had the risk factor at least in one year in 2006–2010, he/she was categorised as having the risk factor.

If an individual had not had the risk factor in any of the years 2006–2010, he/she was categorised as not having the risk factor.

1

## 2 **Results concerning the Objective 1**

3 All the studied social and socioeconomic risk factors had a univariate effect on hospitalisations due to  
 4 ACSCs after controlling for area of residence and age (Table 2). Each of the risk factors increased  
 5 significantly the odds of being hospitalized due to ACSCs after adjustment for age and area of residence  
 6 compared to individuals who had none of the risk factors in 2006–2010. Poverty and low level of education  
 7 had the strongest univariate effect on ACSCs among both age groups and genders. The univariate effect of  
 8 unemployment was statistically significantly smaller than the effect of all the other studied risk factors  
 9 among middle-aged men (p-values < 0.0001). Among middle-aged women, the univariate effect of  
 10 unemployment was statistically smaller than the effect of poverty and low level of education (p-values <  
 11 0.0001). The univariate effect of living alone was statistically significantly smaller than the low level of  
 12 education among the elderly (p-values < 0.001). The effect of living alone was significantly larger for men  
 13 among the middle-aged (p-value for interaction between gender and living alone < 0.0001) and the effect  
 14 of poverty and low level of education was greater for women among the elderly (p-values for interaction <  
 15 0.01).

16 Table 2. Univariate effects of the risk factors in 2006–2010 on hospitalisations due to ambulatory care  
 17 sensitive conditions by age and gender in Finland in 2011–2013

	<b>Men aged 45-64</b>		<b>Women aged 45-64</b>	
	<b>RR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>RR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
Living alone	1.39	1.34–1.44	1.20	1.15–1.26
Poverty	1.53	1.46–1.61	1.54	1.46–1.62
Low level of education	1.42	1.37–1.47	1.55	1.49–1.62
Unemployment	1.18	1.12–1.24	1.15	1.08–1.23
	<b>Men aged ≥ 65</b>		<b>Women aged ≥ 65</b>	
	<b>RR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>RR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
Living alone	1.17	1.14–1.21	1.12	1.08–1.16
Poverty	1.27	1.21–1.32	1.31	1.24–1.38
Low level of education	1.26	1.23–1.29	1.30	1.27–1.34

1  
2  
3 The reference category is those individuals who had none of the risk factors  
4 during the period 2006–2010. RRs were estimated from separate models for  
5 each risk factor.

6 Adjusted for age and region of residence  
7

8 1

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14 2 **Results concerning the Objective 2**

15  
16 3 Next we studied the associations between different combinations of cumulative disadvantage and  
17 4 hospitalisations due to ACSCs (Table 3). All combinations of two, and three (and four among the middle-  
18 5 aged) risk factors increased significantly the odds of being hospitalized due to ACSC compared with the  
19 6 reference group who had none of the risk factors. The only exception was the combination of living alone  
20 7 and unemployment, which was not statistically significant among middle-aged women. Among the middle-  
21 8 aged, the most hazardous combination of two risk factors was living alone and poverty among both  
22 9 genders; the RR was 2.62 (95% confidence interval 2.52–2.73) among men and 2.53 (2.41–2.65) among  
23 10 women. Those risk combinations which included unemployment had the smallest RRs. The most hazardous  
24 11 combination of three risk factors was living alone, poverty, and low level of education with RR of 3.16  
25 12 (3.03–3.29) among men and 3.54 (3.36–3.73) among women. The effect of cumulative disadvantage on  
26 13 hospitalisations due to ACSCs was larger for women among the middle-aged (p-value for interaction  
27 14 between gender and cumulative disadvantage 0.02). When all the four risk factors were present, the RRs  
28 15 were 2.24 (2.10–2.39) and 1.98 (1.80–2.18), respectively and the effect was larger for men (p-value for  
29 16 interaction between gender and cumulative disadvantage 0.009). Among elderly men, the most hazardous  
30 17 combination of two risk factors was living alone and poverty: the RR was 1.49 (1.44–1.56). Among elderly  
31 18 women, the present of poverty and low level of education was the most hazardous combination of two risk  
32 19 factors: the RR was 1.48 (1.42–1.53). When all the three risk factors (living alone, poverty, and low level of  
33 20 education) were present, the RR was 1.61 (1.57–1.66) and 1.69 (1.64–1.74), respectively.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 Table 3. The effect of different combinations of the risk factors in 2006–2010 on hospitalisations due to  
 2 ambulatory care sensitive conditions in Finland in 2011–2013

Living alone	Poverty	Low level of education	Unemployment	Men aged 45-64		Women aged 45-64	
				RR	95% CI	RR	95% CI
<i>Combinations of two risk factors</i>							
X	X	–	–	2.62	2.52–2.73	2.53	2.41–2.65
X	–	X	–	1.70	1.62–1.79	1.57	1.47–1.68
X	–	–	X	1.39	1.28–1.51	1.08	0.94–1.23
–	X	X	–	2.02	1.92–2.13	2.52	2.38–2.66
–	X	–	X	1.61	1.49–1.74	1.52	1.39–1.65
–	–	X	X	1.24	1.16–1.33	1.27	1.17–1.37
<i>Combinations of three risk factors</i>							
X	X	X	–	3.16	3.03–3.29	3.54	3.36–3.73
X	X	–	X	2.11	2.00–2.23	1.75	1.62–1.90
X	–	X	X	1.40	1.23–1.59	1.39	1.17–1.67
–	X	X	X	1.78	1.63–1.95	1.83	1.66–2.02
<i>All four risk factors</i>							
X	X	X	X	2.24	2.10–2.39	1.98	1.80–2.18
				Men aged ≥ 65		Women aged ≥ 65	
Living alone	Poverty	Low level of education		RR	95% CI	RR	95% CI
<i>Combinations of two risk factors</i>							
X	X	–		1.49	1.44–1.56	1.43	1.38–1.48
X	–	X		1.40	1.36–1.44	1.36	1.32–1.41
–	X	X		1.31	1.28–1.35	1.48	1.42–1.53
<i>All three risk factors</i>							
X	X	X		1.61	1.57–1.66	1.69	1.64–1.74

The reference category is those individuals who had none of the risk factors during the period 2006–2010. RRs were estimated from separate models for each combination of risk factors.

Adjusted for age and region of residence

3

4 **Results concerning the Objective 3**

5 The effect of prolonged cumulative disadvantage between 2006–2010 on ACSCs in 2011–2013 was  
 6 examined for the most hazardous combination of the risk factors, i.e. simultaneously living alone,  
 7 experiencing poverty and low level of education. All RRs for being hospitalised due to ACSCs for those  
 8 experiencing one or more years of cumulative disadvantage were statistically significant compared with  
 9 those individuals who had none of the risk factors during the period 2006–2010 among both genders and

age groups (Table 4). The RR for being hospitalized was 3.91 (3.70–4.12) for those middle-aged men who had all the three risk factors in each year compared with those who had none of the risk factors between 2006–2010. Among middle-aged women, the corresponding RR was 4.75 (4.44–5.07). For the elderly, the RR was 1.66 (1.61–1.71) and 1.72 (1.67–1.78).

Table 4. The effect of prolonged cumulative disadvantage in 2006–2010 on ambulatory care sensitive conditions in Finland in 2011–2013 for the combination of living alone, poverty, and low level of education

The number of years of cumulative disadvantage <sup>1</sup>	Men aged 45-64			Women aged 45-64		
	RR	95% CI	n <sup>2</sup>	RR	95% CI	n <sup>2</sup>
0	1.00	ref. <sup>3</sup>	311 927	1.00	ref. <sup>3</sup>	339 402
1	2.47	2.28–2.69	9 304	2.45	2.20–2.74	7 031
2	2.74	2.49–3.01	6 088	2.57	2.25–2.92	4 368
3	2.72	2.46–3.01	4 767	3.35	2.95–3.80	3 434
4	3.06	2.77–3.39	4 163	3.60	3.16–4.09	2 999
5	3.91	3.70–4.12	12 432	4.75	4.44–5.07	9 189
	Men aged ≥ 65			Women aged ≥ 65		
	RR	95% CI	n <sup>2</sup>	RR	95% CI	n <sup>2</sup>
0	1.00	ref. <sup>3</sup>	116 197	1.00	ref. <sup>3</sup>	91 452
1	1.59	1.51–1.67	6 063	1.56	1.49–1.64	15 941
2	1.56	1.47–1.66	4 220	1.60	1.51–1.69	10 308
3	1.59	1.51–1.68	5 296	1.68	1.59–1.76	12 744
4	1.47	1.39–1.54	6 341	1.67	1.59–1.75	16 167
5	1.66	1.61–1.71	26 598	1.72	1.67–1.78	96 202

<sup>1</sup> In these analyses those individuals who had experienced disadvantage of one risk factor or cumulative disadvantage related to combination of two risk factors were excluded

<sup>2</sup> The total number of individuals in the category

<sup>3</sup> The reference category is those individuals who had none of the risk factors during the period 2006–2010

Adjusted for age and region of residence

Among middle-aged men and women, the prolongation of the cumulative disadvantage increased gradually the odds of being hospitalized due to ACSCs. The ORs for those who had experienced prolonged cumulative disadvantage in one, two, three or four years was statistically smaller than if an individual had experienced cumulative disadvantage in each year. Among the middle-aged, the effect of prolongation of cumulative

1  
2  
3 1 disadvantage on hospitalisations due to ACSCs was statistically different between men and women only for  
4  
5 2 those who had experienced it for three or five years (p-values for interaction between gender and  
6  
7 3 prolonged cumulative disadvantage < 0.05).

9  
10 4 Among elderly men, the prolongation of the cumulative disadvantage did not increase the odds of being  
11  
12 5 hospitalized due to ACSC, i.e. experiencing one or more years of cumulative disadvantage did not change  
13  
14 6 the odds compared with those individuals who had experienced cumulative disadvantage in each of the five  
15  
16 7 years. Only the difference between four and five years of cumulative disadvantage was statistically  
17  
18 8 significant (pairwise comparison p-value < 0.001). Among elderly women, the differences experiencing one  
19  
20 9 or two years of cumulative disadvantage compared with five years were statistically significant (pairwise  
21  
22 10 comparison p-values < 0.003). Among the elderly, the prolongation of cumulative disadvantage had also  
23  
24 11 statistically different effect on hospitalisations due to ACSCs among men and women for those who had  
25  
26 12 experienced it for three or more years (p-values for interaction between gender and prolonged cumulative  
27  
28 13 disadvantage < 0.004).

### 14 15 **Results concerning the sensitivity analyses**

16 The odds of being hospitalised due to ACSC for those with cumulative disadvantage compared with those  
17 without any of the examined risk factors decreased when including only incident ACSC hospitalisations. For  
18 the most hazardous combination of cumulative disadvantage (living alone, poverty and low level of  
19 education), the RR was 2.50 (2.37–2.64) among middle-aged men and 2.72 (2.54–2.92) among middle-aged  
20 women when excluding all individuals who were hospitalised due to ACSC before 2011 from the analyses.  
21 For the elderly, the RR was 1.53 (1.48–1.59) and 1.57 (1.50–1.64).



## 1 Discussion

2 This population-based register study found strong associations between preceding cumulative social  
3 disadvantage and hospitalisations due to ambulatory care sensitive conditions. The study population  
4 included all Finnish residents aged 45 years or older in 2011–2013 and for this population we utilised  
5 comprehensive data from several administrative registers to examine their hospitalisations in 2011–2013  
6 and preceding social and socioeconomic risk factors in 2006–2010. We defined cumulative social  
7 disadvantage as combination of several simultaneous risk factors for disadvantage preceding the study  
8 period: living alone, poverty, low level of education and unemployment. The risk of being hospitalised due  
9 to ACSCs was markedly elevated if an individual had lived alone and had experienced poverty during the  
10 preceding years, and had also poor education. The same combination of the risk factors for social  
11 disadvantage was the most hazardous for both age groups (45–64 and over 64) among both genders.  
12 Additionally, we found that prolongation of cumulative disadvantage in time increased further the risk of  
13 being hospitalized due to ACSCs among the middle-aged (aged 45–64). Among the middle-aged the  
14 prolongation of accumulation of risks was even more hazardous for women than for men.

## 15 Strengths and limitations

16 The lack of nationwide comprehensive register data on the use of primary health care is a common  
17 limitation in health services research. Hospitalisations due to ACSCs provide an indirect measure of the  
18 effectiveness and quality of primary health care. Some studies have questioned the accuracy of this  
19 indicator to reflect access to primary care. However, the studies concluding that hospitalisations due to  
20 ACSCs are not associated with poor access to health care, have used area-level data and have not been able  
21 to take into account need for care at individual-level.[45-47] Thus conclusive evidence that more efficient  
22 or more accessible primary care could not prevent a notable proportion of hospitalisations due to ACSCs is  
23 lacking.

24 A universal list of ACSCs does not exist since hospitalisation criteria vary between countries and health care  
25 systems.[10] We applied the UK definition with some minor modifications to maintain international

1 comparability. However, the main purpose of this study was to examine social disadvantage as a risk factor  
2 for hospitalisations due to ACSCs within Finland and not to compare countries. We expect there to be no  
3 differences in coding practices between socioeconomic groups in administrative regions of Finland. Thus  
4 we assume that there is no considerable inconsistency in using this ACSC definition list for our purposes.

5 In this study both emergency and elective hospital admissions were included while some earlier studies  
6 have included only emergency admissions.[9, 25] In regard to social and socioeconomic differences, the use  
7 of both emergency and elective hospitalisations is likely to somewhat diminish these differences since  
8 social disadvantage might increase the risk of emergency hospitalisations while acting as a barrier to  
9 elective care.[48] Additionally, the majority of the hospital admissions due to ACSCs in our data were  
10 emergency admissions. Thus we presume our results of social inequity would be even greater, had we  
11 studied only emergency hospital admissions.

12 With register data we were not able to measure social isolation directly and thus we used living alone as a  
13 crude proxy. This measure excludes the individual's social networks outside their home. Living alone does  
14 not always denote social isolation or loneliness, although they are interrelated and overlapping. Despite  
15 these limitations we detected strong associations between living arrangements and hospitalisations due to  
16 ACSCs and our results suggest that living arrangements reflect social support relatively accurately. Another  
17 limitation is that we were not able to take into account for ill-health, morbidity or disease severity which is  
18 an evident shortage when utilising merely register data on the use of hospital care. Thus, we cannot make  
19 direct conclusions what part of the differences between social groups in hospitalisations due to ACSCs  
20 would be explained by the different health status of individuals.

21 Our results of univariate effects of the socioeconomic risk factors on hospitalisations due to ACSCs are in  
22 line with the results found in several earlier studies reporting that disadvantaged socioeconomic position is  
23 associated with increased risk of being hospitalised due to ACSCs.[15, 24, 27] These previous studies  
24 examined only one socioeconomic factor or used small area based deprivation indices in assessing  
25 socioeconomic position. Few studies have examined several socioeconomic factors at the same time.

1  
2  
3 1 Blustein et al.[11] found that poorer and less-educated individuals were likely to be hospitalised due to  
4  
5 2 ACSCs in the US in the early 1990's, but they modelled education and income separately. A study from  
6  
7 3 Sweden detected that individuals with lower income and those not gainfully employed had higher risk of  
8  
9 4 becoming hospitalised due to ACSCs in the mid 2000's.[26] Booth et al.[16] studied the effect of education  
10  
11 5 and income at the community-level on acute diabetes complications in Canada in the late 1990's and found  
12  
13 6 that only low neighbourhood income increased the risk of being hospitalised. De Prophetis et al.[17]  
14  
15 7 detected that risk of being hospitalised due to ACSCs was highest for those who jointly had the lowest  
16  
17 8 levels of life satisfaction and low household income. The study by Wallar and Rosella[18], saw that  
18  
19 9 individuals among the two lowest income quintiles were at greatest risk of being hospitalised due to ACSCs  
20  
21 10 when adjusting for education and health behavioural factors. However, these studies did not examine how  
22  
23 11 the accumulation of individual-level socioeconomic risk factors affects the risk of being hospitalised due to  
24  
25 12 ACSCs. Higher prevalence of morbidity among individuals with low socioeconomic position is likely to partly  
26  
27 13 explain inequalities in hospitalisation due to ACSCs. While primary health care obviously cannot prevent all  
28  
29 14 ACSC events leading to hospital admissions, an efficient health care system should diminish differences  
30  
31 15 between socioeconomic groups which may also be partly due to higher morbidity among the lower  
32  
33 16 socioeconomic groups.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39 17 We evaluated the effect of living alone as a proxy for social isolation on hospitalisations due to ACSCs. We  
40  
41 18 found that the univariate effect of living alone was significant and increased the risk of being hospitalised  
42  
43 19 due to ACSCs and the effect was greater for middle-aged men than for middle-aged women. Living alone  
44  
45 20 was as hazardous as poverty and low level of education among middle-aged men. The strong association  
46  
47 21 between living alone and the risk of being hospitalized due to ACSC suggests that absence of adequate  
48  
49 22 social support might also play a role in seeking care especially among men with low socioeconomic  
50  
51 23 position. Using interview data Longman et al.[38] have reported a similar finding concerning social isolation  
52  
53 24 as a contributory factor in avoidable hospital admissions in Australia. Ennis et al.[39] studied the association  
54  
55 25 of living alone and hospitalisations due to ACSCs in the US and concluded that living alone in later life did  
56  
57 26 not increase hospitalisation risk. Their study cohort included about 2 600 selected participants who were  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1 presumably healthier than the general population. Thus, the results might not be applicable to broader  
4  
5 2 population groups. Saxena et al.[29] found significant negative association between asthma, hypertension  
6  
7 3 and COPD hospitalisations and proportion of elderly living alone in London. Their interpretation of this  
8  
9 4 finding was that the support structures in the affluent areas prevent hospitalisations among the elderly.  
10  
11  
12 5 We found the univariate effect of unemployment and its effect as a co-factor in accumulation of risk factors  
13  
14 6 to be smaller than the effect of the other risk factors. This finding is likely to reflect at least to some extent  
15  
16 7 the fact that long-term unemployment is difficult to measure using register data. It is possible that our  
17  
18 8 indicator does not properly capture all people suffering from long-term unemployment since it is based on  
19  
20 9 statistics that includes people registered as active job applicants. Further, the study took place during a  
21  
22 10 severe recession with high prevalence of unemployment resulting in the unemployed becoming more  
23  
24 11 heterogeneous and being unemployed less stigmatizing than in times when the economy is booming. Thus,  
25  
26 12 due to the recession, unemployment in our study may have represented less of a risk factor for social  
27  
28 13 deprivation and less severe health consequences. Alternatively, the finding of the small effect of  
29  
30 14 unemployment may derive from a homogenous unemployed population. Especially in the beginning of  
31  
32 15 unemployment the Finnish welfare state is relatively generous in buffering against the economic effect  
33  
34 16 resulting from the loss of a job. An unemployed is entitled to earning-related benefit for 14 to 23 months,  
35  
36 17 depending on the length of the employment history. Thus, it is only after a longer period of time that the  
37  
38 18 effects of unemployment regarding the loss of earnings will take place. Since we could not disentangle  
39  
40 19 those still enjoying the subsidies from those that no longer did, the effects among the latter "hard core"  
41  
42 20 unemployed group are potentially downplayed.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 21 The higher risk of being hospitalised due to ACSCs among individuals with several simultaneous risk factors  
50  
51 22 for social disadvantage found in our study is probably due to multiple causes. The inequalities found in  
52  
53 23 hospitalisations due to ACSCs certainly partly reflect differences in access to and quality of primary health  
54  
55 24 care. Earlier studies have found that individuals with higher socioeconomic position have clearly more  
56  
57 25 annual visits to physicians than those with lower position after controlling for health status.[4, 49] There is  
58  
59 26 area-level evidence that low socioeconomic position and fewer physicians are associated with poorer

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

1 access to care in addition to higher hospitalisations due to ACSCs.[50] Moreover, earlier studies have  
2 suggested that for instance continuity of primary care is associated with reduced risk of avoidable  
3 hospitalisations.[51, 52] Especially a long-term relationship between a patient and a physician effectively  
4 reduces the risk.[53] It is likely that there are differences between socioeconomic groups in the continuity  
5 of care in the treatment of many common chronic conditions. The increased risk of being hospitalised due  
6 to ACSCs among individuals with cumulative disadvantage may also be caused by inadequate resources in  
7 primary health care to recognise the needs of people with simultaneous social and physical health  
8 problems and inability to treat and prevent these diseases from worsening. Socioeconomic inequalities in  
9 the use of health care are likely to be explained at least partly also by differences in seeking the care  
10 needed.[13]

11 The finding that the prolongation of cumulative disadvantage increased further the risk of being  
12 hospitalized for ACSCs among the middle-aged is likely to reflect the interplay of social disadvantage and  
13 health problems over time. Prolongation of cumulative disadvantage worsens further social and physical  
14 health problems gradually. However, among the elderly (aged over 64), the prolongation of cumulative  
15 disadvantage did not increase the risk further. This may be due to the fact that chronic conditions  
16 potentially leading to ACSC are relatively common among older age groups. Additionally, selective mortality  
17 may play a role by diminishing differences between socioeconomic groups.

18 The sensitivity analyses included only those individuals who had no previous hospitalisations due to ACSCs.  
19 They detected that cumulative disadvantage increases the risk of being hospitalised due to ACSCs  
20 somewhat less than when including all individuals. This suggests that accumulation of social disadvantage  
21 can have worse effects for those who have chronic conditions and/or recurring hospitalisations. On the  
22 other hand this finding supports the conclusion that persons without previous avoidable hospitalisations  
23 have increased risk of being hospitalised due to ACSCs after experiencing social disadvantage.

24 To our knowledge, this is the first study to assess exhaustively the relationship between the accumulation  
25 of social disadvantage and hospitalisations due to ACSCs. The use of comprehensive individual-level register

1  
2  
3 1 data enabled us to avoid ecological bias which is common in studies using area-level socioeconomic and  
4  
5 2 social disadvantage variables. We were also able to study a rather long period of time and thus evaluate the  
6  
7 3 effect of prolongation of accumulating social disadvantage; the retrospective follow-up time was eight  
8  
9 4 years at longest. In our data avoidable hospitalisations were derived from the Care Register for Health Care,  
10  
11 5 which has been found to be of good quality and coverage in general.[54] The methodological approach of  
12  
13 6 the study allowed us to study simultaneously several risk factors that are to some extent dependent of  
14  
15 7 each other.  
16  
17  
18

## 19 8 **Conclusions**

20  
21  
22 9 The results of our study underline the importance of improving coordination of care across the system  
23  
24 10 between social and health care, as well as primary and secondary care. Also primary prevention in the  
25  
26 11 management of care should be emphasized. Universalism is not enough; the recognition of patients with  
27  
28 12 chronic conditions and simultaneous particular combinations of cumulative disadvantage is important to  
29  
30 13 diminish these extensive differences between social groups to improve social equity in health care. The  
31  
32 14 identification of these vulnerable patients groups – who may be more susceptible – is also necessary to  
33  
34 15 reduce the use of more expensive treatment in specialised health care. Treating people with multiple  
35  
36 16 chronic conditions and social problems in primary care requires more attention and active means and for  
37  
38 17 instance strengthening continuity of care is even more significant for these vulnerable patients groups.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 19 **Author's contribution** SL participated in the conception and planning of the study, designed the study,  
46  
47 20 analysed and interpreted the data and was a major contributor in writing the manuscript. KM, MA, SK, and  
48  
49 21 IK participated in the conception and planning of the study and the interpretation of the results for  
50  
51 22 important intellectual content and writing the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final  
52  
53 23 manuscript.  
54  
55  
56

57 24 **Acknowledgements** We thank our colleague, MD Markku Satokangas for his valuable comments on the  
58  
59 25 manuscript.  
60

1  
2  
3 1 **A funding statement** This work was supported by the Academy of Finland (project number 277939) and  
4  
5 2 NordForsk (project number 74637), but the Academy nor NordForsk had no involvement in its design, data  
6  
7 3 collection, analysis, findings or decision to publish.  
8  
9

10 4 **A competing interests statement** The authors declare that they have no competing interests.  
11  
12

13 5 **A patient consent form** Not applicable  
14  
15

16  
17 6 **A data sharing statement** Data may be obtained from a third party and are not publicly available  
18  
19  
20  
21 7  
22  
23  
24 8  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 1           2 3           **References** 4 5

- 6           2       1. Whitehead M, Dahlgren G. Concepts and principles for tackling social inequities in health: Levelling up  
7  
8           3       part 1. University of Liverpool: WHO Collaborating Centre for Policy Research on Social Determinants of  
9  
10          4       Health; 2006.  
11  
12  
13          5       2. Starfield B, Shi L, Macinko J. Contribution of Primary Care to Health Systems and Health. *Milbank Q.*  
14          6       2005;83(3):457-502.  
15  
16          7       3. Keskimäki I, Tynkkynen LK, Reissell E, Koivusalo M, Syrjä V, Vuorenkoski L, et al. Finland: Health system  
17  
18          8       review. *Health Systems in Transition.* 2019;21(2):1-166.  
19  
20  
21          9       4. van Doorslaer EE. Inequalities in access to medical care by income in developed countries. *CMAJ.*  
22          10       2006;174(2):177-183.  
23  
24          11       5. OECD/EU editor. *Health at a Glance: Europe 2018: State of Health in the EU Cycle.* Paris/EU, Brussels:  
25          12       OECD Publishing; 2018.  
26  
27          13       6. Mölläri K, Kovanen L. *Hoitoonpääsy perusterveydenhuollossa maaliskuussa 2019.* Helsinki: THL; 2019.  
28  
29          14       7. Satokangas M, Lumme S, Arffman M, Keskimäki I. Trajectory modelling of ambulatory care sensitive  
30          15       conditions in Finland in 1996–2013: assessing the development of equity in primary health care through  
31          16       clustering of geographic areas – an observational retrospective study. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2019;19(629).  
32  
33          17       8. Kringos D, Boerma W, Bourgueil Y, Cartier T, Dedeu T, Hasvold T, et al. The strength of primary care in  
34          18       Europe: an international comparative study. *Br J Gen Pract.* 2013;63(616):e742-750.  
35  
36          19       9. Tian Y, Dixon A, Gao H. Data briefing: Emergency hospital admissions for ambulatory care-sensitive  
37          20       conditions: Identifying the potential for reductions. London: The King's Fund; 2012.  
38  
39          21       10. Purdy S, Griffin T, Salisbury C, Sharp D. Ambulatory care sensitive conditions: terminology and disease  
40          22       coding need to be more specific to aid policy makers and clinicians. *Public Health.* 2009;123(2):169-173.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 1 11. Blustein J, Hanson K, Shea S. Preventable Hospitalizations And Socioeconomic Status. *Health Aff.*  
4  
5 2 1998;17(2):177-189.  
6  
7  
8 3 12. Billings J, Anderson GM, Newman LS. Recent Findings On Preventable Hospitalizations. *Health Aff.*  
9  
10 4 1996;15(3):239-249.  
11  
12  
13 5 13. Laditka JN, Laditka SB, Probst JC. More May Be Better: Evidence of a Negative Relationship between  
14  
15  
16 6 Physician Supply and Hospitalization for Ambulatory Care Sensitive Conditions. *Health Serv. Res.*  
17  
18 7 2005;40(4):1148-1166.  
19  
20  
21 8 14. Roos LL, Walld R, Uhanova J, Bond R. Physician Visits, Hospitalizations, and Socioeconomic Status:  
22  
23  
24 9 Ambulatory Care Sensitive Conditions in a Canadian Setting. *Health Serv. Res.* 2005;40(4):1167-1185.  
25  
26  
27 10 15. Trachtenberg AJ, Dik N, Chateau D, Katz A. Inequities in Ambulatory Care and the Relationship Between  
28  
29 11 Socioeconomic Status and Respiratory Hospitalizations: A Population-Based Study of a Canadian City. *Ann.*  
30  
31 12 *Fam. Med.* 2014; doi:10.1370/afm.1683.  
32  
33  
34 13 16. Booth GL, Hux JE, Fang J, Chan BTB. Time Trends and Geographic Disparities in Acute Complications of  
35  
36 14 Diabetes in Ontario, Canada. *Diabetes Care.* 2005; doi:10.2337/diacare.28.5.1045.  
37  
38  
39 15 17. De Prophetis E, Goel V, Watson T, Rosella LC. Relationship between life satisfaction and preventable  
40  
41 16 hospitalisations: a population-based cohort study in Ontario, Canada. *BMJ Open.* 2020;  
42  
43 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-032837.  
44  
45  
46  
47 18 18. Wallar LE, Rosella LC. Risk factors for avoidable hospitalizations in Canada using national linked data: A  
48  
49 19 retrospective cohort study. *PLoS ONE.* 2020; doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0229465.  
50  
51  
52 20 19. Falster K, Banks E, Lujic S, Falster M, Lynch J, Zwi K, et al. Inequalities in pediatric avoidable  
53  
54 21 hospitalizations between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal children in Australia: a population data linkage  
55  
56 22 study. *BMC pediatr.* 2016;16(1):169.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 1 20. Butler DC, Thurecht L, Brown L, Konings P. Social exclusion, deprivation and child health: a spatial  
4  
5 2 analysis of ambulatory care sensitive conditions in children aged 0–4 years in Victoria, Australia. *Soc Sci*  
6  
7 3 *Med.* 2013; doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.06.029.  
8  
9  
10 4 21. Ansari Z, Haider SI, Ansari H, de Gooyer T, Sindall C. Patient characteristics associated with  
11  
12 5 hospitalisations for ambulatory care sensitive conditions in Victoria, Australia. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2012;  
13  
14 6 doi:10.1186/1472-6963-12-475.  
15  
16  
17 7 22. Jackson G, Tobias M. Potentially avoidable hospitalisations in New Zealand, 1989-98. *Aust. N. Z. J. Public*  
18  
19 8 *Health.* 2001;25(3):212-221.  
20  
21  
22 9 23. Magan P, Otero A, Alberquilla A, Ribera JM. Geographic variations in avoidable hospitalizations in the  
23  
24 10 elderly, in a health system with universal coverage. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2008; doi:10.1186/1472-6963-8-  
25  
26 11 42.  
27  
28  
29 12 24. Agabiti N, Pirani M, Schifano P, Cesaroni G, Davoli M, Bisanti L, et al. Income level and chronic  
30  
31 13 ambulatory care sensitive conditions in adults: a multicity population-based study in Italy. *BMC Public*  
32  
33 14 *Health.* 2009; doi:10.1186/1471-2458-9-457.  
34  
35  
36 15 25. Sexton E, Bedford D. GP supply, deprivation and emergency admission to hospital for COPD and  
37  
38 16 diabetes complications in counties across Ireland: an exploratory analysis. *Ir J Med Sci.* 2016;  
39  
40 17 doi:10.1007/s11845-015-1359-5.  
41  
42  
43 18 26. Löfqvist T, Burström B, Walander A, Ljung R. Inequalities in avoidable hospitalisation by area income  
44  
45 19 and the role of individual characteristics: a population-based register study in Stockholm County, Sweden.  
46  
47 20 *BMJ Qual Saf.* 2014; doi:10.1136/bmjqs-2012-001715.  
48  
49  
50 21 27. Conway R, O’Riordan D, Byrne D, Cournane S, Coveney S, Silke B. Deprivation influences the emergency  
51  
52 22 admission rate of ambulatory care sensitive conditions. *Clinical Medicine.* 2016;  
53  
54 23 doi:10.7861/clinmedicine.16-2-119.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 1 28. Orueta JF, García-Alvarez A, Grandes G, Nuño-Solinís R. Variability in potentially preventable  
4  
5 2 hospitalisations: an observational study of clinical practice patterns of general practitioners and care  
6  
7 3 outcomes in the Basque Country (Spain). *BMJ Open*. 2015; doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2014-007360.  
8  
9  
10 4 29. Saxena S, George J, Barber J, Fitzpatrick J, Majeed A. Association of population and practice factors with  
11  
12 5 potentially avoidable admission rates for chronic diseases in London: cross sectional analysis. *J R Soc Med*.  
13  
14 6 2006; doi:10.1258/jrsm.99.2.81.  
15  
16  
17  
18 7 30. Galobardes B, Lynch J, Smith GD. Measuring socioeconomic position in health research. *British Medical*  
19  
20 8 *Bulletin*. 2007;81-82(1):21-37.  
21  
22  
23 9 31. Graham H editor. *Understanding health inequalities*. Berkshire and New York: Open University Press;  
24  
25 10 2009.  
26  
27  
28  
29 11 32. Ingold B, Yersin B, Wietlisbach V, Burckhardt P, Burnand B, Büla C. Characteristics associated with  
30  
31 12 inappropriate hospital use in elderly patients admitted to a general internal medicine service. *Aging Clin*.  
32  
33 13 *Exp. Res*. 2000;12:430-438.  
34  
35  
36 14 33. Murphy BM, Elliott PC, Le Grande MR, Higgins RO, Ernest CS, Goble AJ, et al. Living alone predicts 30-  
37  
38 15 day hospital readmission after coronary artery bypass graft surgery. *European Journal of Cardiovascular*  
39  
40 16 *Prevention & Rehabilitation*. 2008; doi:10.1097/HJR.0b013e3282f2dc4e.  
41  
42  
43  
44 17 34. Finlay JM, Kobayashi LC. Social isolation and loneliness in later life: A parallel convergent mixed-  
45  
46 18 methods case study of older adults and their residential contexts in the Minneapolis metropolitan area,  
47  
48 19 USA. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2018 July 2018;208:25-33.  
49  
50  
51 20 35. Dreyer K, Steventon A, Fisher R, Deeny SR. The association between living alone and health care  
52  
53 21 utilisation in older adults: a retrospective cohort study of electronic health records from a London general  
54  
55 22 practice. . *BMC geriatrics*. 2018;18(1).  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 1 36. Mu C, Kecmanovic M, Hall J. Does Living Alone Confer a Higher Risk of Hospitalisation? *Econ Rec.*  
4  
5 2 2015;91:124-138.  
6  
7  
8 3 37. Shankar A, McMunn A, Banks J, Steptoe A. Loneliness, social isolation, and behavioral and biological  
9  
10 4 health indicators in older adults. *Health Psychology.* 2011;30(4):377-385.  
11  
12  
13 5 38. Longman J, Megan P, Judy S, Geoff M. The role of social isolation in frequent and/or avoidable  
14  
15 6 hospitalisation: rural community-based service providers' perspectives. *Aust Health Rev.* 2013;  
16  
17 7 doi:10.1071/AH12152.  
18  
19  
20 8 39. Ennis S, Larson E, Grothaus L, Helfrich C, Balch S, Phelan E. Association of living alone and  
21  
22 9 hospitalization among community-dwelling elders with and without dementia. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2014;  
23  
24 10 doi:10.1007/s11606-014-2904-z.  
25  
26  
27 11 40. Kuh D, Ben-Shlomo Y, Lynch J, Hallqvist J, Power C. Life course epidemiology. *J Epidemiol Community*  
28  
29 12 *Health.* 2003; doi:10.1136/jech.57.10.778.  
30  
31  
32 13 41. Noora Berg. Accumulation of disadvantage from adolescence to midlife : A 26-year follow-up study of  
33  
34 14 16-year old adolescents. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto; 2017.  
35  
36  
37 15 42. Page A, Ambrose S, Glover J, Hetzel D. Atlas of Avoidable Hospitalisations in Australia: ambulatory  
38  
39 16 care-sensitive conditions. Adelaide: PHIDU, University of Adelaide; 2007.  
40  
41  
42 17 43. Eurostat. At risk of poverty rate. 2019; Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/tespm010)  
43  
44 18 [datasets/-/tespm010](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/tespm010), 2019.  
45  
46  
47 19 44. Zou G. A Modified Poisson Regression Approach to Prospective Studies with Binary Data. *Am J*  
48  
49 20 *Epidemiol.* 2004; doi:10.1093/aje/kwh090.  
50  
51  
52 21 45. Vuik S, Fontana G, Mayer E, Darzi A. Do hospitalisations for ambulatory care sensitive conditions reflect  
53  
54 22 low access to primary care? An observational cohort study of primary care usage prior to hospitalisation.  
55  
56 23 *BMJ Open.* 2017; doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-015704.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 1 46. Magan P, Alberquilla A, Otero A, Ribera JM. Hospitalizations for Ambulatory Care Sensitive Conditions  
4  
5 2 and Quality of Primary Care: Their Relation With Socioeconomic and Health Care Variables in the Madrid  
6  
7 3 Regional Health Service (Spain). *Med Care*. 2011; doi:10.1097/MLR.0b013e3181ef9d13.  
8  
9  
10 4 47. Ricketts TC, Randolph R, Howard HA, Pathman D, Carey T. Hospitalization rates as indicators of access to  
11  
12 5 primary care. *Health & Place*. 2001; doi:10.1016/S1353-8292(00)00035-6.  
13  
14  
15 6 48. Sajjad MA, Holloway-Kew KL, Mohebbi M, Kotowicz MA, de Abreu LLF, Livingston PM, et al. Association  
16  
17 7 between area-level socioeconomic status, accessibility and diabetes-related hospitalisations: a cross-  
18  
19 8 sectional analysis of data from Western Victoria, Australia. *BMJ Open*. 2019;22(9):e026880.  
20  
21  
22  
23 9 49. Agerholm J, Bruce D, Ponce dL, Burström B. Socioeconomic differences in healthcare utilization, with  
24  
25 10 and without adjustment for need: An example from Stockholm, Sweden. *Scand. J. Public Health*. 2013;  
26  
27 11 doi:10.1177/1403494812473205.  
28  
29  
30  
31 12 50. Ansari Z, Laditka JN, Laditka SB. Access to Health Care and Hospitalization for Ambulatory Care Sensitive  
32  
33 13 Conditions. *Med. Care Res. Rev*. 2006; doi:10.1177/1077558706293637.  
34  
35  
36 14 51. Menec V, Sirski M, Attawar D, Katz A. Does continuity of care with a family physician reduce  
37  
38 15 hospitalizations among older adults? *J. Health Serv. Res. Policy*. 2006; doi:10.1258/135581906778476562.  
39  
40  
41  
42 16 52. Barker I, Steventon A, Deeny SR. Association between continuity of care in general practice and hospital  
43  
44 17 admissions for ambulatory care sensitive conditions: cross sectional study of routinely collected, person  
45  
46 18 level data. *BMJ*. 2017; doi:10.1136/bmj.j84.  
47  
48  
49 19 53. Lin I, Wu S. Effects of long-term high continuity of care on avoidable hospitalizations of chronic  
50  
51 20 obstructive pulmonary disease patients. *Health Policy*. 2017; doi:10.1016/j.healthpol.2017.06.010.  
52  
53  
54 21 54. Sund R. Quality of the Finnish Hospital Discharge Register: A systematic review. *Scand J Public Health*.  
55  
56 22 2012; doi:10.1177/1403494812456637.  
57  
58  
59  
60 23

<i>ACSC conditions</i>	<i>ICD-10</i>	<i>Notes</i>
<b><i>Vaccine-preventable</i></b>		
Bacterial Pneumonia & Influenza	J09, J10, J11, J13, J14, J15.3, J15.4, J15.7, J15.9, J16.8, J18.1, J18.8, J18.9	In any diagnosis field, not included if D57 is as a secondary diagnose
Immunization-Related and Preventable Conditions	A35, A36, A37, A80, B05, B06, B16.1, B16.9, B18.0, B18.1, B26, G00.0, M01.4	In any diagnosis field
<b><i>Chronic</i></b>		
Acute Bronchitis	J20	Only when as a primary diagnose, and J41-J44 or J47 as a secondary diagnose
Angina	I20, I24.0, I24.8, I24.9	Only when as a primary diagnose, cases with surgical procedures (A) excluded
Asthma	J45, J46	Only when as a primary diagnose
Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD)	J41, J42, J43, J44, J47	Only when as a primary diagnose
Congestive Heart Failure	I11.0, I50, J81	Only when as a primary diagnose, cases with cardiac procedures (B) excluded
Diabetes Complications	E10.0-10.8, E11.0-E11.8, E12.0-E12.8, E13.0-E13.8, E14.0-E14.8	Only when as a primary diagnose
Hypertension	I10, I11.9	Only when as a primary diagnose, cases with cardiac procedures (B) excluded
Iron Deficiency Anaemia	D50.1-D50.9	Only when as a primary diagnose
Nutritional Deficiencies	E40, E41, E42, E43, E55.0, E64.3	Only when as a primary diagnose
<b><i>Acute</i></b>		
Cellulitis	L03, L04, L08.0, L08.8, L88, L98.0	Only when as a primary diagnose, cases with other surgical procedures than skin procedures (C) excluded
Convulsions and Epilepsy	G40, G41, O15, R56	Only when as a primary diagnose
Dehydration and Gastroenteritis	E86, K52.2, K52.8, K52.9	Only when as a primary diagnose
Dental Conditions	A69.0, K02-K06, K08, K09.8, K09.9, K12, K13	Only when as a primary diagnose
Gangrene	R02	In any diagnosis field
Kidney and Urinary Tract Infections	N10, N11, N12, N13.6	Only when as a primary diagnose
Pelvic Inflammatory Disease	N70, N73, N74	Only when as a primary diagnose
Perforated or Bleeding Ulcer	K25.0-K25.2, K25.4-K25.6, K26.0-K26.2, K26.4-K26.6, K27.0-K27.2, K27.4-K27.6, K28.0-K28.2, K28.4-K28.6	Only when as a primary diagnose
Severe ENT infection	H66, H67, J02, J03, J06, J31.2	Only when as a primary diagnose

**A) Angina**

procedure field contains none of the following (NCSP, Nordic Classification of Surgical Procedures):

AA4WT, AA400, AA5LT, AAA-AAW, AB4AT, AB4BT, AB4CT, AB4DT, AB4FT, AB5, AB6AT, AB6BT, AB6CT, AB6DT, ABA-ABW, ACA-ACW, AD-AW, AXX90, BA3AT, BA4KT, BAA, BB2AT, BB3AT, BB4WT, BBA, BC1LT, BC2-BC4, BCA, BD-BW, CAA-CAW, CB, CCA-CCW, CD-CJ, CKA-CKW, CW, DAA-DAW, DB, DCA-DCW, DD, DEA-DEW, DFA-DFE, DFW99, DG, DHA-DLW, DMA-DPW, DQ-DW, EA, EBA-EBW, EC, EDA-EDW, EEA-EW, EF, EGA-EGW, EHA-EHW, EJ-EK, EL3AT, EL3RT, EL3YT, EL4, ELA-ELW, EMA-EMW, EP1AT, EP1LT, EP2AT, EP3AT, ENA-ENW, EW, FA, FBA-FBW, FCA-FCE, FD, FE1AT, FE2, FEA-FEW, FF-FL, FMA-FMW, FN1ST, FN1XT, FNA-FNW, FP-FX, GA2-GA4, GAA-GAW, GBA-GBW, GCA, GD1AT, GD1BT, GD1CT, GD1LT, GD2AT, GD2BT, GD2CT, GD3, GDA-GDW, GE1AT, GE1CT, GE1DT, GE2, GEA-GEW, GW, HA0, HA1AT, HA1DT, HA1MT, HA1ST, HA2-HA5, HAA-HAF, HW, JA1LT, JA2-JA3, JAA-JAW, JB, JCA-JCW, JDA-JDW, JE, JF3, JFA-JFW, JGA-JGW, JHA-JHW, JJ1AT, JJ2-JJ8, JJA-JJW, JK1-JK2, J3KAT, JK3BT, JK3CT, JK3FT, JK3LT, JK3NT, JK3RT, JK4-JK5, JKA-JKW, JL1-JL3, JLA-JLW, JM1AT, JM1LT, JM2, JMA-JMW, JN4LT, JW, JX1LT, JX1RT, JXA, KA2AT, KA3AT, KA3CT, KA3DT, KA3LT, KA4-KA6, KAA-KAW, KBA-KBW, KC1AT, KC2AT, KC3AT, KCA-KCW, KDA-KDW, KE1AT, KE1CT, KE2, KEA-KEW, KF1-KF7, KF8AT, KF8KT, KFA-KFW, KGA-KGW, KH1AT, KH1BT, KH1CT, KH1CT, KH1DT, KH1FT, KH1YT, KKA-KKW, KW, KX, LA1, LAA-LAW, LB1AT, LB1YT, LBA-LBW, LCA-LCW, LDA-LDW, LEA-LEW, LF-LW, LX1LT, MAA-MAW, MBA-MBW, MC-MW, NA0, NA6CT, NA7BT, NA7FT, NA7KT, NA7LT, NA9KT, NAA-NAW, NB1AT, NB1BT, NB1ZT, NB2, NBA-NBW, NCA-NCW, NDA-NDW, NEA-NEW, NFA-NFW, NGA-NGW, NHA-NHW, NJ3LT, NK1AT, NK1CT, NK1DT, NK1LT, NK2-NK3, NK4AT, NK4BT, NK5, NK6AT, NK6BT, NK6CT, NK6DT, NK6KT, NK7AT, NX, PA2ZT, PA3-PA5, PA6AT, PA8KT, PA9KT, PAA-PAW, PB1AT, PB1BT, PB1ST, PB1YT, PBA-PBW, PC2DT, PC2ET, PC5AT, PC5BT, PC5DT, PC5ET, PC5GT, PC5HT, PC5JT, PC5NT, PC5PT, PC5YT, PC6DT, PC6ET, PC6FT, PC7NT, PCA-PCW, PD1AT, PD1YT, PD2DT, PD3, PD4ST, PD5YT, PD6YT, PD7YT, PDA-PDW, PE, PG1AT, PG1BT, PG1ET-PG1LT, PG1MT-PG1VT, PG1YT-PG3YT, PG5RT-PG6NT, PGA-PGW, PHIAT, PHI1FT, PHI1UT, PH2ST, PH3YT, PH4AT, PH5GT, PH6GT, PH7FT, PH7UT, PH9AT, PH9ST, PH900, PHA-PHW, PJ2AT, PJ2CT, PJ2HT, PJ3-PJ4, PJ5AN, PJA-PJW, PW, PXA-PXX, QAA-QAW, QBA-QBW, QCA-QCW, QDA-QDW, QW, QXA-QXW, QX2ZT, QX3AT, QX3CT, QX3LT, QX3YT, QX4, S, TAA-TAD, TAW99, TA100, TBA-TJF, TJG10, TJJ, TJL-TJW, TK-TL, TMA-TPX, TQ, U, WXQ, WW20, WW30-WW31, WW40, WW50, WX100-WX105, WX140-WX144, WX7-WX9, XCC00, XFE00, XFN96, XFX00, XFX10, XFX20, XFX97, XJW99, XPX00, XPX04, XPX08, XPX99, XW000, XW1-XW5, XX1AT, XX1BT, XX1CT, XX1DT, XX1XT, XX2AT-XX2DT, XX2XT, XX3AT-XX3DT, XX3XT, XX4-XX7, Y, ZC-ZP, ZS-ZX, ZZ

**B) Congestive heart failure and hypertension**

procedure field contains none of the following (NCSP, Nordic Classification of Surgical Procedures):

FEA-FEW, FFA00, FFA10-FFA30, FFA96, FFB-FFW, FG-FH, FJA00, FJA96, FJB-FJW, FKA-FKW, FK1BT, FLA00, FLA96, FLB-FLW, FMA-FMW, FN1AT, FN1BT, FN1ST, FN1XT, FN1YT, FNA-FNW, FPA-FPF, FPH-FPW, FQ, FXA00-FXN00, TFN10, TFN99, TFP00, TFP40-TFP59

**C) Cellulitis**

procedure field contains none of the following (NCSP, Nordic Classification of Surgical Procedures):

AA4WT, AA400, AA5LT, AAA-AAW, AB4AT, AB4BT, AB4CT, AB4DT, AB4FT, AB5, AB6AT, AB6BT, AB6CT, AB6DT, ABA-ABW, ACA-ACW, AD-AW, AXX90, BA3AT, BA4KT, BAA, BB2AT, BB3AT, BB4WT, BBA, BC1LT, BC2-BC4, BCA, BD-BW, CAA-CAW, CB, CCA-CCW, CD-CJ, CKA-CKW, CW, DAA-DAW, DB, DCA-DCW, DD, DEA-DEW, DFA-DFE, DFW99, DG, DHA-DLW, DMA-DPW, DQ-DW, EA, EBA-EBW, EC, EDA-EDW, EEA-EW, EF, EGA-EGW, EHA-EHW, EJ-EK, EL3AT, EL3RT, EL3YT, EL4, ELA-ELW, EMA-EMW, EP1AT, EP1LT, EP2AT, EP3AT, ENA-ENW, EW, FA, FBA-FBW, FCA-FCE, FD, FE1AT, FE2, FEA-FEW, FF-FL, FMA-FMW, FN1ST, FN1XT, FNA-FNW, FP-FX, GA2-GA4, GAA-GAW, GBA-GBW, GCA, GD1AT, GD1BT, GD1CT, GD1LT, GD2AT, GD2BT, GD2CT, GD3, GDA-GDW, GE1AT, GE1CT, GE1DT, GE2, GEA-GEW, GW, HA0, HA1AT, HA1DT, HA1MT, HA1ST, HA2-HA5, HAA-HAF, HW, JA1LT, JA2-JA3, JAA-JAW, JB, JCA-JCW, JDA-JDW, JE, JF3, JFA-JFW, JGA-JGW, JHA-JHW, JJ1AT, JJ2-JJ8, JJA-JJW, JK1-JK2, J3KAT, JK3BT, JK3CT, JK3FT, JK3LT, JK3NT, JK3RT, JK4-JK5, JKA-JKW, JL1-JL3, JLA-JLW, JM1AT, JM1LT, JM2, JMA-JMW, JN4LT, JW, JX1LT, JX1RT, JXA, KA2AT, KA3AT, KA3CT, KA3DT, KA3LT, KA4-KA6, KAA-KAW, KBA-KBW, KC1AT, KC2AT, KC3AT, KCA-KCW, KDA-KDW, KE1AT, KE1CT, KE2, KEA-KEW, KF1-KF7, KF8AT, KF8KT, KFA-KFW, KGA-KGW, KH1AT, KH1BT, KH1CT, KH1CT, KH1DT, KH1FT, KH1YT, KKA-KKW, KW, KX, LA1, LAA-LAW, LB1AT, LB1YT, LBA-LBW, LCA-LCW, LDA-LDW, LEA-LEW, LF-LW, LX1LT, MAA-MAW, MBA-MBW, MC-MW, NA0, NA6CT, NA7BT, NA7FT, NA7KT, NA7LT, NA9KT, NAA-NAW, NB1AT, NB1BT, NB1ZT, NB2, NBA-NBW, NCA-NCW, NDA-NDW, NEA-NEW, NFA-NFW, NGA-NGW, NHA-NHW, NJ3LT, NK1AT, NK1CT, NK1DT, NK1LT, NK2-NK3, NK4AT, NK4BT, NK5, NK6AT, NK6BT, NK6CT, NK6DT, NK6KT, NK7AT, NX, PA2ZT, PA3-PA5, PA6AT, PA8KT, PA9KT, PAA-PAW, PB1AT, PB1BT, PB1ST, PB1YT, PBA-PBW, PC2DT, PC2ET, PC5AT, PC5BT, PC5DT, PC5ET, PC5GT, PC5HT, PC5JT, PC5NT, PC5PT, PC5YT, PC6DT, PC6ET, PC6FT, PC7NT, PCA-PCW, PD1AT, PD1YT, PD2DT, PD3, PD4ST, PD5YT, PD6YT, PD7YT, PDA-PDW, PE, PG1AT, PG1BT, PG1ET-PG1LT, PG1MT-PG1VT, PG1YT-PG3YT, PG5RT-PG6NT, PGA-PGW, PHIAT, PHI1FT, PHI1UT, PH2ST, PH3YT, PH4AT, PH5GT, PH6GT, PH7FT, PH7UT, PH9AT, PH9ST, PH900, PHA-PHW, PJ2AT, PJ2CT, PJ2HT, PJ3-PJ4, PJ5AN, PJA-PJW, PW, PXA-PXX, QAA25, QAB00-QAB05, QAB99, QAC, QAD20, QAE-QAF, QAG10-QAG99, QAJ, QBA25, QBB00-QBB05, QBB99, QBC, QBD20, QBE, QBG10-QBG99, QBJ, QCA25, QCA30, QCB00-QCB05, QCB99, QCC, QCD20, QCE-QCG, QCJ, QDA25, QDB00-QDB05, QDB99, QDC, QDD20, QDE, QDG10-QDG99, QDJ, QXA25, QXB00-QXB05, QXB99, QXC, QXD20, QXE, QXG10-QXG99, QXJ, QX2ZT, QX3AT, QX3CT, QX3LT, QX3YT, QX4, S, TAA-TAD, TAW99, TA100, TBA-TJF, TJG10, TJJ, TJL-TJW, TK-TL, TMA-TPX, TQA-TQD, TQW00, TQW02, TQW30-40, TQW99, TQX00-TQX10, U, WW20, WW30-WW31, WW40, WW50, WX100-WX105, WX140-WX144, WX7-WX9, XCC00, XFE00, XFN96, XFX00, XFX10, XFX20, XFX97, XJW99, XPX00, XPX04, XPX08, XPX99, XW000, XW1-XW5, XX1AT, XX1BT, XX1CT, XX1DT, XX1XT, XX2AT-XX2DT, XX2XT, XX3AT-XX3DT, XX3XT, XX4-XX7, Y, ZC-ZP, ZS-ZX, ZZ

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

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	#1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	#2
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	#4-6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	#6
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	#7-8
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	#7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	#7
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	NA
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	#7-8
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	#7-8
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	#NA
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	#7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	#9-10
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	#9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	#10
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	NA
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	NA
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	#10
<b>Results</b>			



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	NA
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	-
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	#11
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	NA
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	NA
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	#11
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	#11-15
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	#10
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	-
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	#10
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	#16
<b>Limitations</b>			
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	#16-17
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	#19-21
<b>Other information</b>			
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	#21

\*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.