Assessing Health Care Equity Through Administrative Data-Derived Qquity Indicators and Socio-Economic Determinants of Health in Emergency Care: A Systematic Review

Kevin Morisod (✉ kevin.morisod@unisanté.ch)

Centre for Primary Care and Public Health (Unisanté) <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2615-5428>

Xhylljeta Luta

Centre for Primary Care and Public Health (Unisanté)

Joachim Marti

Centre for Primary Care and Public Health (Unisanté)

Jacques Spycher

Centre for Primary Care and Public Health (Unisanté)

Mary Malebranche

University of Calgary Department of Medicine

Patrick Bodenmann

Centre for Primary Care and Public Health (Unisanté)

Research article

Keywords: equity, socioeconomic factors, emergency care

Posted Date: June 24th, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-36853/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background: Achieving equity in health care remains a challenge for health care systems worldwide and marked inequities in access and quality of care persist. The performance assessment of health care systems is often limited to quality and efficiency indicators. Identifying indicators of health care equity is an important first step in integrating the concept of equity into assessments of health care system performance. Because emergency care serves as the interface between ambulatory and inpatient care, it appears to be a key setting in which to begin this process.

Methods: We conducted a systematic review of administrative data-derived health care equity indicators and their association with socio-economic determinants of health (SEDH) in emergency care settings. Ovid MEDLINE, EMBASE, PUBMED and Web of Science were searched for relevant studies using administrative data following PRISMA-equity guidelines. The outcomes of interest were indicators of health care equity and the associated SEDH they examine.

Results: Among 29 studies identified, 14 equity indicators were identified and grouped into four categories that reflect the patient emergency care pathway. Total emergency department (ED) visits and ambulatory care sensitive condition-related ED visits were the two most frequently used indicators. The studies analysed equity based on seven SEDH: social deprivation, income, education level, social class, insurance coverage, health literacy and financial and non-financial barriers. Despite some conflicting results, all identified SEDH are associated with inequalities in access to and use of emergency care.

Conclusion: The use of administrative data-derived indicators in combination with identified SEDH could improve the measurement of health care equity in emergency care settings across health care systems worldwide. Using a combination of indicators is likely to lead to a more comprehensive, well-rounded analysis of health care equity than using any one indicator in isolation. Though studies analysed focused on emergency care settings, it seems possible to extrapolate these indicators to measure equity in other areas of the health care system. Further studies elucidating root causes of health inequities in and outside the health care system are needed.

I. Background

Achieving equity in health care remains a challenge for health care systems worldwide. The international literature has highlighted many potential challenges in achieving health care equity, including in developed countries.(1–4) Several recent studies raise the importance of addressing the concept of equity when making decisions about health care policies and practices.(5–7) However, the performance assessment of health care systems has traditionally been limited to quality and efficiency indicators and health care decision makers remain poorly informed about equity.(8) Measuring health care equity is therefore an emerging area of interest in assessing health care system performance around the world.(9–12) The accessibility of quality data on relevant variables, the identification of relevant health care

settings and the choice of equity indicators and SEDH, and how best to combine them, represent some of the key challenges facing researchers in this field.

The World Health Organization defines health equity as *"the absence of avoidable, unfair, or remediable differences among groups of people, whether those groups are defined socially, economically, demographically or geographically or by other means of stratification. "Health equity" or "equity in health" implies that ideally everyone should have a fair opportunity to attain their full health potential and that no one should be disadvantaged from achieving this potential".*(13) Several other definitions are used to define health equity,(14) but the principle of fairness is common across them all. Because of its fundamental link to the principle of justice, health equity is inherently normative and can vary according to cultural, geographical or temporal differences.(15) Traditionally, a distinction is made between horizontal and vertical social inequities. Vertical social inequities are associated to education level, professional status, income, etc. and horizontal social inequities to race/ethnicity, sexual orientation and gender identity, nationality, origin, place of residence, etc.(16)

Altogether these factors associated to vertical and horizontal inequities are named social determinants of health. For the purposes of this study, we focus on vertical social inequities and their associated factors that we call: socio-economic determinants of health (SEDH). They denote the economic and social conditions that influence the health of people and communities.

The rationale of this systematic review is based on two landmark World Health Organization (WHO) reports. The first is the WHO Report of the Commission of Social Determinants of Health published in 2008.(17, 18) It highlighted the importance of building health care system based on the principle of equity and the necessity of assessing social determinants of health to achieve this goal.(18) The second WHO report published in 2010 focused on the importance of guaranteeing access to health care for all independent of one's ability to pay and of raising sufficient resources for health.(19) Both landmark reports therefore emphasize the importance of SEDH in achieving health care equity.

In this review, we focus our analysis on inequities in the health care system, and more specifically on emergency care inequities (related to emergency department and emergency surgery). Emergency care is indeed situated at the interface of outpatient (ambulatory) care and inpatient (hospital-based) care. Identifying indicators of health care equity in this setting make it possible to both determine access to quality outpatient care and highlight differences in quality of care within hospital structures that provide inpatient care.(8, 20, 21) In addition, emergency department (ED) overcrowding remains a major issue for many health care systems and is frequently source of potential inequities.(22–24) In fact, it has been suggested that the ED is a good setting to assess inequities, particularly concerning frequent users of the ED.(25, 26)

An important step to improving health care equity is establishing effective means of measuring it. Several approaches and data sources might be used to do so, from primary qualitative or quantitative data collection to the use of routinely collected administrative data. The latter has two fundamental advantages in the analysis of health care equity: the achievement of near complete coverage of the target

population and the possibility of disaggregation in subpopulations.(27) Moreover, using administrative data minimizes cost and burden of response.(28) However, as they are not designed for the purpose of equity monitoring, administrative data also have some limitations, including lack of quality control of the collected data, a time lag in data availability, differences in concepts and definitions used between datasets limited comparability, and the possibility of missing records.

The aim of this systematic review is to identify how health care equity is measured through the combination of administrative data-derived emergency care equity indicators and SEDH with the goal of creating a set of valuable and replicable indicators that can be used in the identification and analysis of health care equity in emergency care settings around the world.

II. Methods

The protocol of this systematic review was published in PROSPERO at the outset of the study. **(See Additional file 1)** The reporting of this systematic review was based on the PRISMA-equity guidelines.(29) **(See Additional file 2)**

1. Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria

We included studies reporting on health care equity indicators, and that were analysed as such, with a focus on studies conducted in emergency care in high-income countries using administrative data. We chose to focus on high-income countries, in order to limit bias of the health care equity assessment due to the global lack of resources that could affect the health care system of low and middle-income countries and that could impact the health care use upstream of equity issues. We included studies on adults (age 18 and over). If a study included both children and adults, we limited data extraction to data pertaining only to adults. We included studies regardless of whether or not a disease-specific focus was taken (for example cancer, chronic diseases or mental health). Searches were limited to articles in English, German, French, and Italian (due to the language skills of the authors) published between January 2010 and January 2019. We chose to focus on studies published after 2010 because of the significant evolution of health care equity-related literature that occurred following the two landmark WHO reports on health equity as already described.(18, 19)

We limited our analysis to studies looking at vertical social inequities and their associated socio-economic determinants of health (SEDH) as defined above, excluding studies looking at horizontal social inequities and their associated social determinants of health such as race/ethnicity, gender and place of residence, in order to ensure consistency between studies.

We excluded studies that did not focus on equity, as well as opinion papers, editorials, conference abstracts and study protocols.

1. Search Strategy

The search strategy was conducted with the assistance of a medical librarian using four 4 databases: Ovid MEDLINE, EMBASE, PubMed and Web of Science. We used keywords in the field of equity, socioeconomic factors and emergency care. We combined the Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms “Health Services Accessibility”, “Health Equity” or “Health care Disparities” with a combination of terms defining administrative data and with text words “emergency department” or “emergencies”. Initial searches were conducted in November 2018 to assess the scope of the literature. The final search was conducted in January 2019. The full search strategy can be found in supplementary file 3. **(See Additional file 3)**

Following the initial search, to identify any further relevant studies that were not initially captured or had not yet been published, we screened reference lists of all included studies and performed Google and Google Scholar searches using key search terms.

1. Study Selection

Two reviewers (KM, XL) conducted screening of articles independently and in duplicate. This was done in two stages. First by screening all titles and abstracts and second, by reviewing the full-text of all relevant articles to determine their eligibility in the final analysis. Two other reviewers (JM, PB) provided arbitration in the event of a disagreement at both stages of screening. Reasons for exclusion of articles at the full-text screening stage were documented.

1. Data Extraction

Two authors (KM, XL) extracted data independently and in duplicate from included studies using Rayyan® (free online systematic review management system) and any discrepancies were resolved by consulting the two other reviewers (JM, PB). Data on the key characteristics of the studies were extracted in a predefined data extraction form, into an Excel® spreadsheet, including information about the design of the study, population, type of data, indicators of health care equity, SDEH addressed, main findings and key conclusions.

1. Quality and Bias Assessment

In order to assess the risk of intrinsic bias inherent in this type of systematic review, we evaluated the quality of each study using an adapted Newcastle-Ottawa scale for cohort and cross-sectional studies. (30)

1. Conceptual framework for the analysis

To address equity, we based our analysis on a conceptual framework of access to health care, developed by Levesque and al.(31) This framework combines five dimensions of accessibility (approachability, acceptability, availability/accommodation, and affordability/appropriateness) with five corresponding abilities of the target population (ability to perceive, to seek, to reach, to pay and to engage). It provides a comprehensive approach to health care equity and the different factors that could impact it. (Fig. 1)

We will use this framework to structure data extraction.

Figure 1. **Framework of health care equity, adapted by Levesque et al.**

Adapted from the conceptual framework developed by Levesque et al. with the authors' permission. This figure represents the various potential barriers of access to care from the perspective of the health care system and of the patients.

iii. Results

The initial search yielded 354 papers of which 29 were included in the final analysis. (Fig. 2) Of these, 17 (59%) were conducted in the United States (US), 5 (17%) in the United Kingdom (UK), 3 (10%) in Canada, 2 (7%) in Australia, 1 (3%) in Sweden and 1 (3%) in Switzerland. Twenty-eight (97%) were written in English and one (3%) in French.

Due to the heterogeneity of study designs, indicators used and SDEH analysed, a quantitative meta-analysis of the data was not possible. Further, the significant heterogeneity precluded the creation of a funnel plot to assess publication bias. Quality assessment of the articles showed an overall good quality of studies with 24 (89%) considered to be good quality, two (7%) considered fair quality and one (3%) considered poor quality.

A summary description of each study is presented in **Additional file 4**.

Figure 2. **Flow diagram of literature research**

1. Equity indicators

The analysis of the 29 articles highlighted 14 different indicators used to assess health care equity. We categorized them into four groups according to the part of the patient care pathway they analysed, inspired by the “5 five dimensions of accessibility” defined in the framework of Levesque et al.(31):

1. Equity indicators of poor access to outpatient care (indicators “prior to emergency care”) (**Group 1**)
2. Equity indicators of quality of emergency care (indicators “during emergency care”) (**Group 2**)
3. Equity indicators of clinical outcomes (indicators “following emergency care”) (**Group 3**)
4. Global Equity indicators (**Group 4**)

Equity indicators of poor access to outpatient care (**Group 1**)

This group of indicators analysed access to outpatient care through differences in emergency care consumption (poor access to outpatient care leading to excess emergency care use). Therefore, they are indirect indicators of access to outpatient care. Five indicators belonged to this group.

- (1) **ED visits/Emergency admissions rate**

With 26% (n = 7) of articles using this indicator, it was the most commonly reported indicator identified in this systematic review.(32–38) It was used to highlight disparities of access to outpatient care. Since both reflect poor access to quality primary care, we have grouped them under the same indicator.

- **(2) Ambulatory care sensitive conditions (ACSCs) ED visits/ACSCs emergency admissions rate**

Also called Preventable ED visits/Preventable emergency admissions, this indicator, used in seven articles, is used as often as the previous indicator “ED visits/Emergency admissions rate”.(8, 33, 35, 39–42) It is deemed a more specific indicator than “ED visits/Emergency admissions” alone to assess disparities in access to outpatient care.

- **(3) Frequent ED visits**

One study used this indicator considering frequent ED visits when 4 or more ED visits occurred by an individual per year.(43)

- **(4) ED-associated initial diagnosis rate**

This indicator compared the rate of initial diagnosis of cancer in the ED between different SEDH.(44)

1. Equity indicators of quality of emergency care **(Group 2)**

The second group of health care equity indicators identified was indicators of quality of emergency care. They characterize disparities of care in the ED among targeted SEDH.

- **(5) Emergency specific procedures rate**

Emergency specific procedures comprised a combination of different procedures performed during emergency care, highlighting disparities in the quality or access to care for specific emergency conditions such as a brain scan for the diagnosis of acute stroke,(45) reperfusion therapy in acute stroke,(46) and cardiac catheterization after myocardial infarction or cardiac arrest.(47, 48)

- **(6) Delay to diagnosis or treatment rate**

Two studies focused on disparities in time to a diagnostic procedure (CT scan for stroke)(45) and to definitive treatment (time to permanent pacemaker implementation for emergency cases).(49)

- **(7) Missed diagnoses in ED rate**

This indicator, used in one study, highlighted disparities of missed diagnoses of acute myocardial infarction according to insurance status or median household income.(50)

1. Equity indicators of outcome after emergency care **(Group 3)**

This third group of indicators includes indicators of outcome disparities. We identified six outcome indicators.

- **(8) Major adverse event rate**

This indicator was used in 2 studies that analysed emergency general surgery.(51, 52) It represented the rate of specific complications following an emergency general surgery including cerebrovascular accident, pneumonia, pulmonary embolus, acute respiratory distress syndrome, renal failure, urinary tract infection, myocardial infarction, sepsis, septic shock and cardiac arrest.

- **(9) In-hospital mortality and (10) failure to rescue rate**

In-hospital mortality was used to reflect the quality of care during emergency care or surgery as reported in three articles identified in our review.(48, 51, 52) One distinguishes in-hospital mortality from failure to rescue, which occurs when a patient dies as a result of a major adverse event and seems, therefore, to be more sensitive to assess differences in quality of emergency care or surgery.(51)

- **(11) Neurological recovery rate**

This specific indicator was used in one study analysing the neurological recovery over time of patients who presented to the ED with a cardiac arrest.(48)

- **(12) Length of stay/Bed days (after emergency admission)**

Although these are traditional indicators of hospital care quality, they are used in one study that analysed inequities following emergency admission according to social deprivation.(53)

1. Global Equity indicators

As they could reflect a lack of outpatient care following a discharge post-admission and/or poor quality of care during an emergency admission, these following indicators could apply to the three different groups of indicators.

- **(13) 30/90/365-day mortality rate**

One study analysed 30-/90-/365-day mortality following emergency admission for hip fracture, reflecting quality of ED- and hospital-based care, as well as access to and quality of ambulatory follow-up care post-discharge.(54)

- **(14) ED readmissions rate/Emergency reshospitalisation rate**

This indicator was used in three articles. Two of them analysed ED readmissions within 30 days post-discharge. (55, 56) One used this indicator to analyse the rate of hospital admissions through the ED in the year following a diagnosis of breast, colorectal, non-small cell lung or pancreatic cancer.(57)

Overall, indicators of access to outpatient care and particularly ED visits and emergency admission and ACSCs ED visits/ACSCs emergency admissions were the most frequent indicators used across studies.

The different emergency care equity indicators are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1
Emergency Care Equity indicators

GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3
Access to High Quality Outpatient Care (ie. Before ED care)	Quality of Emergency Care (ie. During ED care)	Outcome Following Emergency Care (ie. After ED care)
ED visits/Emergency admissions rate	Specific procedures rate (<i>Including management of ST-elevation myocardial infarction, ischemic stroke, out-of-hospital cardiac arrest</i>)	Major adverse events (MAE) rate (<i>Specifically following emergency surgery</i>)
Preventable ED visits/preventable emergency admissions rate (ACSCs)	ED missed diagnosis rate	In-Hospital Mortality rate/Failure to rescue rate (<i>After emergency admission</i>)
ED-associated initial diagnosis rate(<i>Of cancer, in "emergency presenters"</i>)	Delay to diagnosis or treatment rate (<i>For emergency conditions</i>)	Recovery rate (<i>After out-of-hospital cardiac arrest</i>)
Frequent ED visits rate (<i>4 or more a year</i>)		Length of stay/Bad days (<i>After emergency admission</i>)
ED readmissions rate/Emergency Rehospitalisation rate (<i>Within 30 days of discharge or during the year after diagnosis of cancer</i>)		
30/90/365-day mortality rate (<i>specifically following emergency hip fracture admission</i>)		

List of the different equity indicators divided in three categories. The first category represent indicators of access to high quality outpatient care. The second category represents the indicators of quality of emergency care. The last category represent the outcome indicators following emergency care. The two last indicators, because of their broadness are included in the 3 groups

1. Socio-Economic Determinants of Health (SEDH)

The articles included in this review analysed health care equity based on seven SEDH:

Insurance status, social deprivation, income, education level, social class, health literacy and financial and non-financial barriers. **(Additional file 4)** They covered the five abilities considered by Levesque et al. (Fig. 1), as mentioned in brackets and italics at the end of each paragraph.

Overall, the three main SEDH used to analyse health care equity across the 29 included studies were health insurance status, indices of social deprivation and income, and eight studies (28%) used more than one SEDH in their health care equity-focused analysis.

1. Insurance status

Insurance coverage as a relevant SEDH was approached in diverse ways amongst the 16 articles that used it including comparing outcomes between uninsured and insured individuals,(33, 39) between publicly and privately insured individuals,(42, 47–49, 55, 58) or between uninsured, publicly and privately insured individuals.(32, 34, 44, 50–52, 56, 57) Present in more than half (55%) of the studies analysed, it is the most widely used SEDH in analyses of health care equity identified in this review. *(It reflects the ability to pay in Levesque's framework).*

1. Social deprivation (indices of area deprivation)

This SEDH represents the diverse social and economic conditions in which people live. This group was composed of different socio-economic deprivation indices including the "Index of Multiple Deprivation", (8, 53, 54) "Carstairs Index", (40, 45) "Index of Marginalization area", (36) "INSPQ deprivation Index", (37, 43) "area-based socioeconomic status quintile index", (57) and "CT/10" (35) These various tools take into account information about income, education, access to services, community safety, and physical environment. These indices are not assessed at the individual-level, but are instead area-based indices at the level of neighbourhoods, communities or health care regions. **(Additional file 4 for details)** More than half of included studies (59%) analysed health care equity through this SEDH. *(It reflects abilities to reach and to pay).*

1. Income

To measure income differences, four studies that used this SEDH used median income household (divided into quartiles or thirds)(50, 52, 55, 56) and one used presence versus absence of a reportable income.(59) *(It reflects the ability to reach and to pay).*

1. Education level

Depending on the studies, the education level was divided into three or four categories ranging from never attended school to graduate degree.(46, 58) **(Additional file 4 for details)** *(It reflects the ability to perceive, to seek and to engage).*

1. Social class

This SDEH is defined hierarchically into six classes in descending order: professional, managerial, skilled non-manual, skilled manual, semi-skilled manual, non-skilled manual. This SEDH was used in one study to analyse health care equity.(40) *(It reflects the ability to reach and pay).*

1. Health literacy

In one study, health literacy was the SEDH used in the health equity-focused analysis, based on scores obtained through the Rapid Estimate of Adult Literacy in Medicine test, a reading recognition test comprised of 66 health-related words arranged in ascending order of difficulty.(41) *(It reflects the ability to perceive and engage).*

1. Financial and non-financial barriers

In one paper, these two types of barriers were used based on subjects' responses to 14 questions (7 questions each) relating to financial concerns and non-financial barriers.(38) *(It reflects the ability to reach and to pay).*

1. Addressing health care equity through the association of emergency care indicators and SEDH

Although the heterogeneity of included studies in this systematic review precluded a meta-analysis, the last two columns of **Additional file 4** present the statistical data and associated conclusions of the 29 reviewed studies. It can thus be seen that across all studies, all identified SEDH were found to be associated with statistically significant differences in emergency care indicators. Descriptive examples of associations between equity indicators and some of the main SEDH identified in this review are described below. The group of each indicator is indicated in bold and in brackets.

1. Health insurance

In a large retrospective study including over 2.2 million patients, Lines et al. demonstrated that patients with public insurance are 2.5 times more likely to have preventable ED visits (**Group 1**) than private patients (*Rate ratio 2.53, 95%CI 2.49–2.56*).(42) Similarly, in another large retrospective cohort of 1.3 millions patients, Metcalfe et al. highlighted a statistically significant association between in-hospital mortality (**Group 3**) and insurance status amongst patients presenting to hospital with acute surgical conditions requiring emergency surgery whereby uninsured patients were at significantly higher risk of death than privately insured patients (*Odds Ratio 1.28, 95%CI 1.16–1.41*).(51)

However, some studies do not show significant differences in access or quality of care based on insurance coverage.(47, 50) Further, among the studies comparing patients with and without insurance coverage, two have shown an increase in the use of ED (**Group 1**) after the introduction of public insurance coverage for previously uninsured patients. For example, DeLeire et al. found an increase in total ED visits (**Group 1**) of 46% (*p-value, $p < 0.01$*) and ACSCs ED visits (**Group 1**) of 38.7% (*p-value, $p < 0.01$*) after the introduction of a public insurance (Medicaid) among low-income childless adults.(33) Authors postulate that this may be due to insurance coverage increasing one's access to outpatient care, but also to ED-based care. Similarly, Kerr et al., who compared ED visits rate (**Group 1**) amongst a cohort of HIV-positive patients with varying health insurance coverage ($n = 4,947$), showed that uninsured patients used the ED significantly less than privately insured patients (*Incidence rate ratio (IRR) 0.65, 95%CI 0.61–0.70*), but that patients with Medicaid (public insurance program in the US) used the ED more frequently (*IRR 1.26, 95% CI 1.18–1.36*).(34)

1. Social deprivation

Although social deprivation is measured by many different area-level indices among studies, it appears to be significantly associated with the three categories of indicators of emergency care identified in this review. For example, Vanasse et al. show a relative risk of ED visits (**Group 1**) of 3.82 among women with mood disorders in Québec of the most deprived quintile in comparison with women of the least deprived quintile (based on an index combining social and material deprivation).(37) Then Lazzarino et al., who used the Carstairs Index, highlighted a significant difference in the likelihood of having a brain scan on the day of admission (**Group 2**) for patients presenting to the ED with an acute stroke between the least and the most deprived quartiles (*Odds ratio 0.94, 95%CI 0.89–0.99*).(45) Similarly, Thorne et al. demonstrate a significant association between 30-day mortality (**Group 4**) after ED admissions for hip fracture and social deprivation quintile with patients in the most deprived quintile at higher risk than those in the least deprived quintile, based on the Index of Multiple Deprivation (*Odds ratio 1.19, 95%CI 1.15–1.23*).(54)

1. Income

Findings regarding median household income were mixed across studies. Among the four studies using this SEDH, two demonstrated significant associations between median household income and emergency care indicators (52, 56) and the other two did not.(50, 55) (**See Additional file 4**)

1. Education level and Health Literacy

Contrary to expectations, only two studies assess this SEDH, including one with a small sample of patients (n = 647), which found that lower education level was potentially associated with an increased risk of being an “emergency presenters” (defined as presenting to ED around the time of a new cancer diagnosis) (**group 1**).(58) The other study, by Stecksen et al. highlighted that access to reperfusion therapy (**group 2**) for stroke is associated with higher patient education level (*Odds ratio 1.14, 95%CI 1.03–1.26*).(46) Only one study analysed the impact of health literacy on potentially preventable ED visits and found that patients with poor health literacy are approximately twice as likely to have preventable ED visits (**group 1**) than patients with adequate health literacy, even after adjustment for relevant confounding factors (*Rate Ratio 1.93, 95%CI 1.55–2.40*).(41)

IV. Discussion

In the context of emergency care settings, findings of this systematic review suggest that administrative data allows for a broad analysis of health care equity.

Figure 3 represents a conceptual framework for assessing health care equity, combining SEDH through different categories of emergency care indicators.

Figure 3. **Conceptual model of Assessment of Health care Equity**

Representation of a conceptual synthesis of the assessment of health care equity in an emergency setting, through the combination of socio-economic determinants of health with emergency care equity indicators.

1. Emergency care Equity indicators

Emergency care equity indicators were identified and categorized into three main groups. They allow the assessment of health care inequities based on selected SEDH. (Fig. 3)

The first group (indicators of poor access to outpatient care) use emergency care to reflect issues of access to ambulatory care. Interestingly this is the most widely used group of indicators. Among them, the most frequently used indicator is ED visits/Emergency admissions but due to its lack of specificity, it must be interpreted with caution as there are notably many factors that could explain differences in ED visits or emergency admissions beyond health care equity (ie. differences in general health status, prevalence of disease, care-seeking behaviours, etc.).(60) ACSC ED visits/ACSC emergency admissions, which is the second most frequently used indicator in this group, is arguably more specific from an equity perspective as it focuses on ED visits/admissions that are potentially preventable with good access to primary care.(22, 61)

The second group of indicators (indicators of quality of emergency care) directly analyse emergency care and are therefore more specific in their measurement of health care equity in emergency care settings than indicators in the first group. We found that they are used considerably less. This may reflect difficulty in obtaining relevant data to measure these indicators through administrative datasets. However, they might be useful indicators to use in future studies analysing health care equity.

Among outcome indicators, in-hospital mortality seems to be the most reproducible and available administrative data-derived indicator.

Finally, 30/90/326-day mortality and ED readmission, which are more global equity indicators assess the lack of access to outpatient care following an ED visit, but also potential issues during the emergency care leading to outcomes inequities.

Due to the inherent difficulties of measuring a complex concept like health care equity and the large number of potential confounding factors, using a combination of indicators instead of one sole indicator to measure health care equity in any given health care context is more likely to result in a well-rounded assessment. As such, we suggest combining indicators from different categories when assessing health care equity. The choice of specific indicators will depend on the context of the study, the study objectives and availability of administrative data (and relevant variables) in the health care setting of interest.

1. Socio-Economic Determinants of Health (SEDH)

In analysing equity in emergency care settings, seven SEDH were identified through this review.

Although median household income appears to be a common and reproducible measurement, many studies chose to use specific area-level indices that account for multiple domains of deprivation experienced by the target population. These indices combine different parameters to assess deprivation, such as income, employment status, living environment deprivation, and education. These indices are less reproducible than median household income since they require many more variables for their calculation (which may not be available in all health care administrative datasets), but they are arguably better at measuring inequities due to the broad domains of deprivation they assess.

To assess the accessibility of health care services, one particular SEDH emerged: insurance status. Most of the studies analysing this SEDH were published in the US. We assume that this is due to the specificities of the US health care system and the different health insurance reforms (most notably the Affordable Care Act),(62) which make this a very relevant SEDH in the US context. Despite most of the studies being US-based, this SEDH seems relevant to most health care systems in high-income countries, even those with universal health care coverage, where some individuals are able to access private insurance that covers additional benefits, therefore creating potential inequities.(63) As such, this SEDH could be used more widely than currently represented in the literature.

1. Perspectives and implications

An important implication of our research is the identification of three categories of indicators and a set of specific socio-economic determinants of health that can be used to analyse health care equity in high-income countries. As most of the indicators identified in this review are not specific to emergency care settings, it seems possible to study health care equity in other areas of the health care system of high-income countries with similar administrative data-derived indicators, as for example hospitalization,(64, 65) ACSCs during the total hospital admission,(66) and wait times.(61) Such information could be useful for policy makers or health equity researchers to fill the gap in data about health care equity within different health care settings, particularly in high-income countries, using available administrative data.

Our findings suggest that SEDH have a considerable impact on health care equity. The next step would also be to better characterize root causes for differences in emergency care utilization that lie outside the health care system. For example, in a recent study, McCormick et al. demonstrate that emergency admissions are primarily due to a higher prevalence of illness in disadvantaged areas,(60) while Pollack et al. who analysed the relationship between neighbourhood poverty and ED use in a 21-year randomized social experiment did not find a consistently significant connection between neighbourhood poverty and ED use.(67) More studies like these are needed to improve our understanding of the complex interconnectedness between SEDH, health care use and health care equity.

In conclusion, our focus has been solely on SEDH and their associated vertical inequities. It would also be important to analyse the horizontal components of health care equity through social determinants such as race/ethnicity, gender, or place of residence, in order to have a comprehensive picture of health care equity.

1. Limitations

Our review has some limitations that require consideration. First, the content and quality of administrative datasets are highly variable within countries (sometimes even within regions) and between countries. As such, many of the indicators identified in our review might not be available in many health care settings, reducing their generalizability and widespread applicability. However, important equity indicators such as preventable ED visits are frequently used and easily replicable between countries. Secondly, administrative data do not tend to capture detailed clinical information, such as patients' physical or biological data. To address this, further studies of health equity indicators and SEDH using different types of datasets would be helpful for the researchers. Third, in order to define the criteria relevant to this review, it was necessary to make many normative choices before data analysis (ie. when defining equity and SEDH, etc.). As such, these results must be interpreted in the context of the concept of health care equity and the definitions we used. Lastly, as more than the half of the studies was conducted in the US, the extrapolation of the results should be carefully interpreted.

V. Conclusion

Measuring health care equity should be an integral component of all comprehensive assessments of a health care system's performance. However, in order to measure health care equity, indicators for making such measurements need to be identified, as was the goal of this review. Such indicators can be used by researchers and policy makers interested in measuring health care equity through thoughtful selection of the most relevant indicators defined by the local context and stated objectives. Using a combination of indicators is likely to lead to a more comprehensive, well-rounded analysis of health care equity than using any one indicator in isolation. Though studies analysed focused on emergency care settings, it seems possible to extrapolate these indicators to measure equity in other areas of the health care system. Meta-analyses focusing on specific socio-economic determinants of health such as health insurance coverage, income or indices of social deprivation in combination with studies analysing factors that could influence the use of emergency care related to social inequalities would help to further characterize root causes of ongoing health care inequity in health care systems around the world.

Abbreviations

- ACSCs
- Ambulatory Care Sensitive Conditions
- ED
- Emergency Department
- SEDH
- Socio-Economic Determinants of Health
- US
- United States
- WHO

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Not applicable

Consent for publication: Not applicable

Availability of data and materials: All data generated or analysed during this study are included in the published article and its supplementary information files

Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interest

Funding: Federal Office of Public Health (Bundesamt für Gesundheit). The funding body play no role in the design of the study, in the collection, analysis and interpretation of the data and in the writing of the manuscript

Authors' contributions: KM and XJ extracted, selected and analysed data under co-supervision of PB and JM. KM drafted the work. JS and XJ participated to the design of the work and the revision of the manuscript. MM, PB and JM substantively revised the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript

Acknowledgment: The authors would like to thank warmly Mr. Thomas Brauchli for his important contribution to this review in the development of the search strategy.

References

1. Marmot M. The Health Gap: The Challenge of an Unequal World: the argument. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2017;46(4):1312–8.
2. Ostlin P, Braveman P, Dachs N, Health WHOTFoRPfEi, Team WHOE. Priorities for research to take forward the health equity policy agenda. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2005;83(12):948–53.
3. Braveman P, Gruskin S. Poverty, equity, human rights and health. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2003;81(7):539–45.
4. La Rosa-Salas V, Tricas-Sauras S. Equity in health care. *Cuad Bioet*. 2008;19(66):355–68.
5. Cookson R, Asaria M, Ali S, Ferguson B, Fleetcroft R, Goddard M, et al. Health Equity Indicators for the English NHS: a longitudinal whole-population study at the small-area level. Health Services and Delivery Research. Southampton (UK)2016.
6. Mery G, Majumder S, Brown A, Dobrow MJ. What do we mean when we talk about the Triple Aim? A systematic review of evolving definitions and adaptations of the framework at the health system level. *Health Policy*. 2017;121(6):629–36.

7. Marmot M, Allen J, Bell R, Bloomer E, Goldblatt P, Consortium for the European Review of Social Determinants of H, et al. WHO European review of social determinants of health and the health divide. *Lancet*. 2012;380(9846):1011-29.
8. Cookson R, Asaria M, Ali S, Shaw R, Doran T, Goldblatt P. Health equity monitoring for healthcare quality assurance. *Soc Sci Med*. 2018;198:148–56.
9. Lumme S, Manderbacka K, Keskimäki I. Trends of relative and absolute socioeconomic equity in access to coronary revascularisations in 1995–2010 in Finland: a register study. *Int J Equity Health*. 2017;16(1):37.
10. Manderbacka K, Arffman M, Leyland A, McCallum A, Keskimäki I. Change and persistence in healthcare inequities: access to elective surgery in Finland in 1992–2003. *Scand J Public Health*. 2009;37(2):131–8.
11. Carrieri V, Wuebker A. Assessing inequalities in preventive care use in Europe. *Health Policy*. 2013;113(3):247–57.
12. Forrest LF, Adams J, Wareham H, Rubin G, White M. Socioeconomic inequalities in lung cancer treatment: systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Med*. 2013;10(2):e1001376.
13. Organization WH. Equity. 2011 [Available from: <https://www.who.int/healthsystems/topics/equity/en/>].
14. Braveman P. Health disparities and health equity: concepts and measurement. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2006;27:167–94.
15. Marmot M, Bell R. Fair society, healthy lives. *Public Health*. 2012;126:4–10.
16. Oliver A, Mossialos E. Equity of access to health care: outlining the foundations for action. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2004;58(8):655–8.
17. Marmot M, Friel S, Bell R, Houweling TA, Taylor S. Commission on Social Determinants of H. Closing the gap in a generation: health equity through action on the social determinants of health. *Lancet*. 2008;372(9650):1661–9.
18. CSDH. Closing the gap in a generation: health equity through action on the social determinants of health. Final Report of the Commission on Social Determinants of Health.
19. Geneva. World Health Organization. 2008. Report No.: 978 92 4 156370 3.
20. WHO. The world health report: health systems financing: the path to universal coverage. 2010. Report No.: 1020–3311.
21. Dowd B, Karmarker M, Swenson T, Parashuram S, Kane R, Coulam R, et al. Emergency Department Utilization as a Measure of Physician Performance. *Am J Med Qual*. 2014;29(2):135–43.
22. Rosano A, Loha CA, Falvo R, van der Zee J, Ricciardi W, Guasticchi G, et al. The relationship between avoidable hospitalization and accessibility to primary care: a systematic review. *Eur J Public Health*. 2013;23(3):356–60.
23. Hoot NR, Aronsky D. Systematic review of emergency department crowding: causes, effects, and solutions. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2008;52(2):126–36.

24. Di Somma S, Paladino L, Vaughan L, Lalle I, Magrini L, Magnanti M. Overcrowding in emergency department: an international issue. *Intern Emerg Med*. 2015;10(2):171–5.
25. Yarmohammadian MH, Rezaei F, Haghshenas A, Tavakoli N. Overcrowding in emergency departments: A review of strategies to decrease future challenges. *J Res Med Sci*. 2017;22:23.
26. Bodenmann P, Baggio S, Iglesias K, Althaus F, Velonaki VS, Stucki S, et al. Characterizing the vulnerability of frequent emergency department users by applying a conceptual framework: a controlled, cross-sectional study. *Int J Equity Health*. 2015;14:146.
27. Bieler G, Paroz S, Faouzi M, Trueb L, Vaucher P, Althaus F, et al. Social and medical vulnerability factors of emergency department frequent users in a universal health insurance system. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2012;19(1):63–8.
28. Penneck S, editor *The future of using administrative data sources for statistical purposes. Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Establishment Surveys, Survey Methods for Businesses, Farms, and Institutions*; 2007.
29. Wallgren A, Wallgren B. *Register-based statistics: administrative data for statistical purposes*: John Wiley & Sons; 2007.
30. Burford BJ, Welch V, Waters E, Tugwell P, Moher D, O'Neill J, et al. Testing the PRISMA-Equity 2012 reporting guideline: the perspectives of systematic review authors. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(10):e75122.
31. Wells GA SB, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality if nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses. 2009 [Available from: http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.htm.
32. Levesque JF, Harris MF, Russell G. Patient-centred access to health care: conceptualising access at the interface of health systems and populations. *Int J Equity Health*. 2013;12:18.
33. Davis EE, Deinard AS, Maiga EW. Doctor, my tooth hurts: the costs of incomplete dental care in the emergency room. *J Public Health Dent*. 2010;70(3):205–10.
34. DeLeire T, Dague L, Leininger L, Voskuil K, Friedsam D. Wisconsin Experience Indicates That Expanding Public Insurance To Low-Income Childless Adults Has Health Care Impacts. *Health Affair*. 2013;32(6):1037–45.
35. Kerr J, Duffus WA, Stephens T. Relationship of HIV care engagement to emergency department utilization. *AIDS Care*. 2014;26(5):547–53.
36. Lines LM, Rosen AB, Ash AS. Enhancing Administrative Data to Predict Emergency Department Utilization: The Role of Neighborhood Sociodemographics. *J Health Care Poor Underserved*. 2017;28(4):1487–508.
37. Shulman R, Luo J, Shah BR. Mental health visits and low socio-economic status in adolescence are associated with complications of Type 1 diabetes in early adulthood: a population-based cohort study. *Diabet Med*. 2018;35(7):920–8.
38. Vanasse A, Courteau J, Lesage A, Fleury MJ, Gregoire JP, Moisan J, et al. [Health inequities in mood disorders based on material and social deprivation in dwelling sectors]. *Can J Psychiatry*. 2012;57(12):772–81.

39. Shippee ND, Shippee TP, Hess EP, Beebe TJ. An observational study of emergency department utilization among enrollees of Minnesota Health Care Programs: financial and non-financial barriers have different associations. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2014;14:62.
40. Mazurenko O, Shen J, Shan G, Greenway J. Nevada's Medicaid expansion and admissions for ambulatory care-sensitive conditions. *Am J Manag Care.* 2018;24(5):e157-e63.
41. Fairley L, Dundas R, Leyland AH. The influence of both individual and area based socioeconomic status on temporal trends in Caesarean sections in Scotland 1980–2000. *BMC Public Health.* 2011;11:330.
42. Balakrishnan MP, Herndon JB, Zhang J, Payton T, Shuster J, Carden DL. The Association of Health Literacy With Preventable Emergency Department Visits: A Cross-sectional Study. *Acad Emerg Med.* 2017;24(9):1042–50.
43. Lines LM, Li NC, Mick EO, Ash AS. Emergency Department and Primary Care Use in Massachusetts 5 Years After Health Reform. *Med Care.* 2019;57(2):101–8.
44. Vanasse A, Courteau J, Asghari S, Leroux D, Cloutier L. Health inequalities associated with neighbourhood deprivation in the Quebec population with hypertension in primary prevention of cardiovascular disease. *Chronic Dis Inj Can.* 2014;34(4):181–94.
45. Livingood WC, Smotherman C, Lukens-Bull K, Aldridge P, Kraemer DF, Wood DL, et al. An Elephant in the Emergency Department: Symptom of Disparities in Cancer Care. *Popul Health Manag.* 2016;19(2):95–101.
46. Lazzarino AI, Palmer W, Bottle A, Aylin P. Inequalities in stroke patients' management in English public hospitals: a survey on 200,000 patients. *PLoS One.* 2011;6(3):e17219.
47. Stecksen A, Glader EL, Asplund K, Norrving B, Eriksson M. Education level and inequalities in stroke reperfusion therapy: observations in the Swedish stroke register. *Stroke.* 2014;45(9):2762–8.
48. Berlin C, Juni P, Endrich O, Zwahlen M. Revascularization Treatment of Emergency Patients with Acute ST-Segment Elevation Myocardial Infarction in Switzerland: Results from a Nationwide, Cross-Sectional Study in Switzerland for 2010–2011. *PLoS One.* 2016;11(4):e0153326.
49. Casey SD, Mumma BE. Sex, race, and insurance status differences in hospital treatment and outcomes following out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *Resuscitation.* 2018;126:125–9.
50. Bradshaw PJ, Stobie P, Einarsdottir K, Briffa TG, Hobbs MS. Using quality indicators to compare outcomes of permanent cardiac pacemaker implantation among publicly and privately funded patients. *Intern Med J.* 2015;45(8):813–20.
51. Moy E, Barrett M, Coffey R, Hines AL, Newman-Toker DE. Missed diagnoses of acute myocardial infarction in the emergency department: variation by patient and facility characteristics. *Diagnosis (Berl).* 2015;2(1):29–40.
52. Metcalfe D, Castillo-Angeles M, Olufajo OA, Rios-Diaz AJ, Salim A, Haider AH, et al. Failure to rescue and disparities in emergency general surgery. *J Surg Res.* 2018;231:62–8.
53. Shah AA, Haider AH, Zogg CK, Schwartz DA, Haut ER, Zafar SN, et al. National estimates of predictors of outcomes for emergency general surgery. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg.* 2015;78(3):482–

90. discussion 90 – 1.

54. Levin KA, Crighton EM. The Reshaping Care for Older People programme and changes in unscheduled hospital care: Analysis of routinely collected hospital data. *Maturitas*. 2017;103:23–31.
55. Thorne K, Johansen A, Akbari A, Williams JG, Roberts SE. The impact of social deprivation on mortality following hip fracture in England and Wales: a record linkage study. *Osteoporos Int*. 2016;27(9):2727–37.
56. Finnegan MA, Shaffer R, Remington A, Kwong J, Curtin C, Hernandez-Boussard T. Emergency Department Visits Following Elective Total Hip and Knee Replacement Surgery: Identifying Gaps in Continuity of Care. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2017;99(12):1005–12.
57. Ladha KS, Young JH, Ng DK, Efron DT, Haider AH. Factors affecting the likelihood of presentation to the emergency department of trauma patients after discharge. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2011;58(5):431–7.
58. Whitney RL, Bell JF, Tancredi DJ, Romano PS, Bold RJ, Joseph JG. Hospitalization Rates and Predictors of Rehospitalization Among Individuals With Advanced Cancer in the Year After Diagnosis. *J Clin Oncol*. 2017;35(31):3610–7.
59. Yap S, Goldsbury D, Yap ML, Yuill S, Rankin N, Weber M, et al. Patterns of care and emergency presentations for people with non-small cell lung cancer in New South Wales, Australia: A population-based study. *Lung Cancer*. 2018;122:171–9.
60. Singhal A, Momany ET, Jones MP, Caplan DJ, Kuthy RA, Buresh CT, et al. Dental care after an emergency department visit for dental problems among adults enrolled in Medicaid. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 2016;147(2):111–9.
61. McCormick B, Hill PS, Redding S. Comparative morbidities and the share of emergencies in hospital admissions in deprived areas: a method and evidence from English administrative data. *Bmj Open*. 2018;8(8):e022573.
62. Langford KM, Bottle A, Aylin PP, Ward H. Using routine data to monitor inequalities in an acute trust: a retrospective study. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2012;12:104.
63. McIntyre A, Song Z. The US Affordable Care Act: Reflections and directions at the close of a decade. *PLoS Med*. 2019;16(2):e1002752.
64. Nay O, Béjean S, Benamouzig D, Bergeron H, Castel P, Ventelou BJTL. Achieving universal health coverage in France: policy reforms the challenge of inequalities. 2016;387(10034):2236–49.
65. Newman KL, Lynch RJ, Adams AB, Zhang R, Pastan SO, Patzer REJT. Hospitalization Among Individuals Waitlisted For Kidney Transplant. 2017;101(12):2913–23.
66. Lama G, Alcala E, Capitman JA. Poor People Are Hospitalized Three Times More for Mental Health Services than the Non-Poor in Central Valley California. *Healthcare-Basel*. 2018;6(1).
67. McCormick D, Hanchate AD, Lasser KE, Manze MG, Lin M, Chu C, et al. Effect of Massachusetts healthcare reform on racial and ethnic disparities in admissions to hospital for ambulatory care sensitive conditions: retrospective analysis of hospital episode statistics. *BMJ*. 2015;350:h1480.

68. Pollack CE, Du S, Blackford AL, Herring B. Experiment To Decrease Neighborhood Poverty Had Limited Effects On Emergency Department Use. Health Aff (Millwood). 2019;38(9):1442–50.

69. Materials.

Figures

Figure 1

Framework of health care equity, adapted by Levesque et al.

Figure 2

Flow diagram of literature research

Figure 3

Conceptual model of Assessment of Health care Equity

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [Additionalfile1.pdf](#)
- [Additionalfile2.doc](#)
- [Additionalfile3.docx](#)
- [Additionalfile4.docx](#)