

**Title:** Geographic variation in the treatment of spinal disorders: association with health care professional availability, and population socioeconomic status, race, and ethnicity. A retrospective cohort study

**Authors:**

David Elton, DC, Optum Labs, Minnetonka, Minnesota

Meng Zhang, PhD, Optum Labs, Minnetonka, Minnesota

Amy Okaya, MPH, MBA, Optum Labs, Minnetonka, Minnesota

**Corresponding author:**

David Elton, DC

Optum Labs

11000 Optum Circle, Eden Prairie, MN 55344

Phone: (952) 562-1349

[david.elton@optum.com](mailto:david.elton@optum.com)

## Abstract

**Importance:** Spinal disorders are common and associated with high rates of low value care. Efforts to improve guideline concordance and value benefit from understanding the influence of population and environmental factors.

**Objective:** Quantify geographic variation in population race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and health care professional (HCP) availability, and associated variation in service utilization and total cost for management of spinal disorders.

**Design, Setting, and Participants:** This retrospective cohort study examines a national sample of 1,534,280 complete episodes of a spinal disorder experienced in 2017-2019 using zip code and episode of care. Risk ratio (RR) and 95% confidence interval (CI), and ridge regression were used to examine associations between independent and dependent measures.

**Exposures:** Zip code level measures of population race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status were the primary independent measures.

**Main Outcomes and Measures:** Availability of and access to 17 types of HCPs, use of 14 types of health care services, and total cost were the primary dependent measures.

**Results:** 1,075,204 continuously insured individuals aged 18 years and older from 29,318 zip codes were associated with 1,534,280 episodes of a spinal disorder involving 531,115 HCPs generating \$2,022,124,695 in expenditures. Compared to those in primarily white, middle income zip codes, individuals in non-white, disadvantaged zip codes were more likely to initially contact an emergency medicine physician (RR 2.23, 95% CI 2.11-2.36) or primary care provider (RR 1.40, 95% CI 1.38-1.42) and less likely to contact a chiropractor (RR 0.36, 95% CI 0.34-0.37). These individuals had higher exposure to prescription NSAIDs (RR 1.99, 95% CI 1.95-2.02), skeletal muscle relaxants (RR 1.57, 95% CI 1.52-1.59), opioids (RR 1.18, 95% CI 1.15-1.20), and CT scans (RR 1.94, 95% CI 1.84-2.04).

**Conclusions and Relevance:** Individuals in affluent, primarily non-Hispanic white zip codes have an abundance of options for managing a spinal disorder. Use of first line non-pharmacological and non-interventional options should be reinforced before second- and third-line services are considered. Individuals in low-income, non-white zip codes have less availability of non-pharmacological options, leading to greater use of emergency department and primary care and resulting in pharmaceutical management of spinal disorders. Sustainable models that increase availability of non-pharmaceutical options warrant further study.

**Key Points:**

**Question** Compared to the middle-income zip codes with a primarily non-Hispanic white population, do individuals with a spinal disorder living in zip codes characterized by socioeconomic disadvantage and a primarily non-white population have different care experiences?

**Findings** Individuals with low back pain living in non-white, low-income zip codes have less availability of chiropractors, physical therapists and licensed acupuncturists and are more likely to seek initial treatment from an emergency department or primary care provider. These same individuals are more likely to receive pharmaceutical management, including prescription opioids, and less likely to receive guideline recommended non-pharmaceutical and non-interventional first line treatments.

**Meaning** These findings suggest the need to create economically sustainable models that ensure access to guideline concordant non-pharmaceutical treatment options in non-white, low-income communities.

**Key Words:** spinal disorders; back pain; neck pain; guideline; geographic variation; pathway; initial contact; cost; value; disparities; inequities; socioeconomic status; deprivation

## Background

Spinal disorders are prevalent<sup>1</sup>, costly<sup>2</sup>, and a common reason for visiting a primary care provider (PCP).<sup>3-5</sup> LBP clinical practice guidelines (CPGs)<sup>6,7</sup> describe a stepped approach to management<sup>3,8,9</sup> in which favorable natural history, self-care and non-pharmaceutical services are recommended as first-line approaches. Non-guideline concordant management of LBP is associated with a large percent of low-value care<sup>3,10-14</sup> and with the risk of LBP transitioning from an acute to chronic condition.<sup>15</sup> The likelihood of receiving CPG concordant management of LBP and neck pain (NP) has been associated with the type of initial health care professional (HCP) contacted.<sup>3,15-22</sup>

Geographic variation in health care quality, cost and outcomes is well established<sup>23-32</sup> for a range of conditions, which is determined in some measure by both supply and demand factors.<sup>33,34</sup>

Socioeconomic status (SES),<sup>35</sup> health care professional availability,<sup>34</sup> and population demographics<sup>27,36</sup> contribute to disparities in healthcare delivery and outcomes. A variety of geographic units of measurement are available to explore geographic variation,<sup>37-42</sup> with tradeoffs identified with each approach.<sup>43,44</sup>

Geographic variation in the management of LBP has been described. The availability of different types of HCPs managing LBP has been shown to have an impact on cost<sup>45,46</sup> and on use of health care services<sup>47-49</sup>. A variety of factors are associated with variation in the availability of, access to and utilization of first line non-pharmaceutical and non-interventional services<sup>50,51</sup>.

The aim of this study was to contribute to the understanding of geographic variation in the management of spinal disorders through analysis of a national sample of commercially insured adults in the US. The

hypothesis was that HCP availability, service utilization, and total cost would vary based on population SES, race, and ethnicity.

## **Methods**

### *Study design, population, setting and data sources*

This is a retrospective cohort study of individuals seen by one or more HCPs for a complete episode of a spinal disorder. An analytic database was created by linking multiple databases. An enrollee database included de-identified individual data, and administrative claims data for all inpatient, outpatient, and pharmacy services. An HCP database consisted of de-identified HCP demographic information and professional licensure status.

Because data was linked from various sources, a review was performed to assess compliance with de-identification requirements. With data being de-identified or a Limited Data Set in compliance with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, the UnitedHealth Group Office of Human Research Affairs determined that Institutional Review Board approval or waiver of authorization was not required. The study was conducted and reported based on the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines (Supplement – STROBE Checklist).<sup>52</sup>

### *Unit of analysis and cohort selection*

Episode of care and 5-digit zip code were the units of analysis. Episodes have been shown to be a valid way to organize administrative claims data.<sup>53</sup> The *Symmetry*® *Episode Treatment Groups*® (ETG®) and

*Episode Risk Groups*<sup>®</sup> (*ERG*<sup>®</sup>) version 9.5 methodologies and definitions were used to translate administrative claims data into discrete episodes.<sup>54</sup>

Complete episodes were defined as having at least 91-day pre- and 61-day post-episode clean periods during which no services were provided by any HCP for any LBP or NP diagnosis. Incomplete episodes were excluded. All non-musculoskeletal episodes and musculoskeletal episodes not categorized as LBP or NP were excluded. LBP and NP episodes associated with diagnoses of malignant and non-malignant neoplasms, fractures and other spinal trauma, infection, congenital deformities and scoliosis, autoimmune disorders, osteoporosis, and advanced arthritis were excluded.

The home address 5-digit zip code of the individual with LBP or NP was used as the crosswalk between study data sources. HCP location was based on the 5-digit zip code of the office location where a service was provided. HCP zip codes associated with a location without population data were transformed to the geographically closest zip code with material population. Population size, race, and ethnicity was obtained from the US Census Bureau<sup>55</sup> using the zip code tabulation area (ZCTA) code. Household adjusted gross income (AGI)<sup>56</sup> was obtained from the Internal Revenue Service using the 5-digit zip code of the filer home address. Area Deprivation Index (ADI)<sup>57</sup> was obtained from the University of Wisconsin Neighborhood Atlas at the zip+4 level and was transformed to a 5-digit zip code.

The cohort consisted of individuals aged 18 years and older with a complete episode of LBP or NP commencing and ending during the calendar years 2017-2019. This timeframe was selected as the 3-year period before the influence of the COVID-19 epidemic in early 2020. All individuals had continuous medical and pharmacy coverage from a single national insurer during the entire study period.

## *Variables*

Python (*Python Language Reference, Version 3.7.5.*, n.d.) was used for data preprocessing, table generation, and initial analyses. R (*version 3.6.1*) was used for Ridge regression analyses. A goodness-of-fit analysis was conducted using D'Agostino's K-squared test. Non-normally distributed data were reported using median and interquartile range (IQR).

The primary independent variables were zip code ADI and population percent non-Hispanic white (NHW) with each variable segmented into 4 categories, and 16 combined ADI/NHW segments. The reference for analyses of statistical significance was the highest episode volume 25-50 ADI and 75-100% NHW segment.

## *Measures*

The number of HCPs per 1,000 population was calculated for 17 types of HCP commonly contacted initially for LBP or NP. Doctors of Osteopathy (DO) with evidence of utilizing manipulative treatment were separately reported, and otherwise were included in the HCP type for which the DO was boarded. A Primary Care Provider (PCP) category consisted of Family Practice, Internal Medicine, General Medicine and OBGYN physician types. The Nurse category consisted primarily of nurse practitioners. Medical physician types not separately reported were reported as "MD-other".

The count of unique HCPs within a 5-digit zip code was based on all in- and out-of-network HCPs who provided at least one service of any type for any individual with a neuromusculoskeletal (NMS) condition during the 2017-2019 study period. The larger NMS cohort included a wide range of conditions in

addition to LBP and NP. The HCP zip code was based on the office location where a service was provided. Basing the HCP count on the larger NMS sample helped minimize the potential for misclassification bias associated with under-counting available HCPs.

The percent of episodes where an individual initially contacted each HCP type was calculated. All HCP types could be accessed directly without a referral and the HCP office location could be within or outside the individual's home address zip code. The rate and timing of use of 14 types of health care services was calculated.<sup>3,4</sup> Service utilization reflects services provided at any time by any type of HCP. Services were grouped into first-, second-, and third-line categories. First-line services include chiropractic and osteopathic manipulation, active care, manual therapy, and acupuncture. Second-line services include prescription NSAIDs and skeletal muscle relaxants, radiography, and MRI studies. Third-line services include prescription opioids, spinal injection and surgery, and CT scans. Odds (OR) and risk (RR) ratios, along with associated 95% confidence intervals (CI), were calculated for both the initial contact HCP and utilization of each service type. As a measure more widely understood in associational analyses, RR were reported.<sup>58</sup>

The total cost, number of different HCPs seen during an episode, and episode duration were calculated. Total cost included costs associated with all services provided by any HCP for a LBP or NP episode, including those not specifically identified in the 14 categories used in the analyses. Costs for services for which an insurance claim was not submitted were not available. Episode duration was the number of days between the first and last date of service for each episode.

Due to potential collinearity among HCPs per 1000 and initial contact HCP measures, ridge regression was used to better identify significant predictors among zip code population factors, HCP availability,



and dependent measures. Variables were scaled to create similar ranges. ADI was transformed from a 0-100 scale to 0-1, and HCP type per 1000 was transformed to per 100. Log transformed, and non-transformed total cost results were produced in addition to opioid and NSAID prescribing rates using a 0-1 scale.

## Results

The sample included 1,075,204 individuals, with a median age of 44.0 (Q1 34.0, Q3 54.0) and 54.9% females. These individuals were from all 50 States, 29,318 5-digit zip codes, and were associated with 1,534,280 complete episodes of a spinal disorder involving 531,115 unique HCPs and \$2,022,124,695 in reimbursed health care expenditures. The median pre-episode clean period was 621 days (Q1 409, Q3 853). For individuals with multiple episodes the median number of days between sequential episodes was 202 (Q1 120, Q3 336). The median post-episode clean period was 435 days (Q1 266, Q3 690).

(Supplement 1) Among the ADI and percent NHW segments, the distribution of LBP and NP episodes, individual age, % female, ERG<sup>®</sup> risk score, and number of different HCP seen was highly uniform.

(Supplement 2)

### *Availability of HCPs*

Primary care HCP types were available across ADI segments median 1.06 per 1000 population (Q1 0.42, Q3 2.38), with the lowest availability observed in zip codes with 0-25% NHW population (median 0.59, Q1 0.25, Q3 1.34). Availability of non-prescribing (median 0.45, Q1 0.18, Q3 0.88), specialist (median 0.25, Q1 0.03, Q3 1.01) and emergency/radiology/urgent care (EM/UC) (median 0.10, Q1 0.00, Q3 0.31) HCP types was lower than primary care, with availability of non-prescribing and specialist types

increasing as ADI decreased. Like primary care, availability of non-prescribing (median 0.14, Q1 0.04, Q3 0.30) and specialist (median 0.11, Q1 0.01, Q3 0.49) HCP types were generally lowest in zip codes with 0-25% NHW population. (Supplements 3 and 3a)

#### *Initial Contact HCP*

Zip codes with 75-100 ADI and 0-25% NHW population were associated with a higher percent of individuals initially contacting a primary care HCP (59.3%), and lower percent of individuals initially contacting a non-prescriber (16.9%) or specialist HCP (13.1%). As ADI decreased and NHW% increased the percent of individuals initially contacting a non-prescriber or specialist increased. [Figure 1] (Supplement 4)

Compared to the reference segment, individuals with a spinal disorder in the 75-100 ADI and 0-25% NHW segment were more likely to contact an EM/UC HCP (RR 1.73, 95% CI 1.66-1.80), or primary care HCP (RR 1.34, 95% CI 1.32-1.35), and less likely to contact a non-prescribing HCP (RR 0.36, 95% CI 0.35-0.37). Individuals with a spinal disorder in the 0-25 ADI and 75-100% NHW segment were more likely to contact a specialist HCP (RR 1.42, 95% CI 1.39-1.44). [Figure 2] (Supplement 4a)

#### *Services Provided for Spinal Disorders*

As ADI decreased and the NHW% increased, second-line services decreased, and first-line services increased. Third-line service use had a stronger association with ADI than NHW%, decreasing as ADI decreased. The 75-100 ADI and 0-25% NHW segment was associated with second-line services (66.6% of episodes) and third-line services (24.0%) provided more frequently than first-line services (23.4%). The

0-25 ADI and 75-100% NHW segment was associated with first-line services provided more frequently (52.2%) than second-line services (47.8%), or third-line services (19.0%). [Figure 3] (Supplement 5)

Compared to the reference segment, individuals in the 75-100 ADI and 0-25% NHW segment were more likely to receive a second-line service (RR 1.41, 95% CI 1.40-1.42) or a third-line service (RR 1.19, 95% CI 1.16-1.21), and less likely to receive a first-line service (RR 0.45, 95% CI 0.44-0.45). [Figure 4] Compared to the reference segment, individuals in the 75-100 ADI and 0-25% NHW segment were more likely to receive a prescription NSAID (RR 1.99, 95% CI 1.95-2.02) and less likely to receive chiropractic manipulation therapy (CMT) (RR 0.34, 95% CI 0.33-0.35) or active care (RR 0.68, 95% CI 0.66-0.70).

Compared to the reference segment, individuals in the 75-100 ADI and 50-75% NHW segment were more likely to receive a prescription opioid (RR 1.47, 95% CI 1.44-1.51). Within each ADI segment CMT and prescription NSAIDs had a strong association with NHW%. [Figure 5] (Supplement 5a) There were statistically significant, yet not clinically meaningful differences in the timing of introduction of most health care services between ADI and NHW segments. (Supplement 6)

### *Episode Cost*

Total cost increased as ADI decreased. (Supplement 7) Episodes in zip codes with high ADI and low NHW% had lower total cost associated with higher rates of pharmacological services, lower rates of first line non-pharmacological services, and lower rates of spinal surgery. Zip codes with low ADI and high NHW% population had higher total cost associated with lower rates of pharmacological services, higher rates of first-line non-pharmacological services, higher rates of MRI and spinal injection.

Ridge regression revealed many favorable (-) and unfavorable (+) associations with selected dependent measures. Notably, a higher number of DCs per 100 population was associated with a lower rate of opioid exposure, while a higher number of Pain Management physicians was associated with a higher rate of opioid exposure. The type of HCP initially contacted by an individual with a spinal disorder was associated with a significant difference in the rate of opioid exposure. Zip codes with higher ADI were associated with a higher rate of opioid prescribing while zip codes with a higher % non-Hispanic Asian population were associated with lower rates of opioid exposure. (Supplements 8 and 8a)

## **Discussion**

This study provides a comprehensive analysis of associations between population SES and race/ethnicity, and the management of spinal disorders. Zip codes with higher ADI, and a primarily non-white population, were associated with less availability of all types of HCP, particularly those providing guideline concordant first-line treatment options. Individuals with a spinal disorder in these zip codes were more likely to initially contact PCPs, nurses, and emergency medicine physicians, which was associated with greater use of prescription medications, including opioids. Individuals in zip codes with low ADI, and a primarily NHW population, were associated with more abundant availability of, access to and utilization of a range of HCPs and services.

This study has several potential limitations. While administrative data benefited from extensive quality and actuarial control measures, variability in benefit plan design and enrollee cost-sharing responsibility, errors and missing information were potential sources of confounding or bias. Similarly, HCP type and office location data may have included errors or missing information. Lack of data about individual and

HCP race/ethnicity prevented exploration of individual preferences for sex/racial/ethnic concordance when selecting an initial HCP. The data set did not describe a U.S representative sample.

5-digit zip code was selected as a reasonable approach to balancing limitations of each geographic unit of measurement. County- or state-level measures blur meaningful environmental and population factors. Census tract or census block groups, while improving precision of population factors, introduces limitations in evaluating HCP availability and raises potential individual confidentiality risks. Associating 5-digit zip code with the corresponding ZCTA is subject to minor risk of misclassification bias.

Transforming ADI zip+4 to a 5-digit zip code is associated with potential misclassification bias. This was partially mitigated by converting ADI data to categorical data for use as an independent variable.

Calculating the number of HCPs per 1,000 population is subject to both selection and misclassification bias. The HCP count was based on the number of unique in or out of network HCPs providing at least one service for any NMS condition during the three-year study period from an office location within the same zip code as the individual with a spinal disorder. Missing from this count are all possible HCPs with an office location in the zip code of interest.

There are potential limitations associated with using episode of care as the unit of analysis. As demonstrated in earlier studies of the same underlying data the risk of episode misclassification bias is low.<sup>3,4</sup> Further minimizing this risk was the assumption that any misclassification bias associated with episode type would be similar within each ADI and percent NHW segment.

A potential translation limitation of this study is that the results were derived from a commercially insured population with continuous coverage for a broad range of services available through direct

access to a range of HCPs. Even in this best-case scenario, the management of spinal disorders was associated with meaningful disparities in availability of, access to and utilization of health care services. It is unclear how these observed patterns are amplified or muted in a population with less or no coverage for guideline-recommended first-line services.

This study expands on earlier studies of the same LBP and NP cohorts<sup>3,4</sup> and contributes to the understanding of geographic variation in health care, and specifically variation in management of spinal disorders associated with environmental and population factors such as SES, race/ethnicity, and HCP availability.

Within each ADI segment, zip codes with 75-100 percent non-white population were associated with a 150-200% greater likelihood of prescription NSAID use for LBP or NP, the largest disparity identified in the study. With the potential adverse events associated with chronic NSAID use,<sup>59</sup> this finding warrants further study, particularly with other studies not finding similar disparities in NSAID use.<sup>60-62</sup>

The geographic distribution of rate of opioid prescribing corroborates similar analyses.<sup>63,64</sup> (Supplement – Maps) Previous studies of variation in opioid prescribing have found a weak association with both availability of prescribers and prescribing practices, and demand from individuals with pain.<sup>48</sup> This study found the sparse availability of non-prescribing HCPs in areas of high ADI as a potentially important factor to consider in addressing opioid over-prescribing.

The strong inverse association between the availability of DCs and the rate of opioid prescribing, and the geographic distribution of DCs (Supplement – Maps), corroborates findings from other studies.<sup>65,66</sup> Episodes in zip codes with a high percent NHW population were more likely have a DC as the initial

contact HCP, corroborating similar findings.<sup>67</sup> Similarly, this study corroborates the finding that if a PT or LAc is the initial contact HCP the rate of opioid exposure is lower.<sup>3,4,17,68</sup> A previous study found that as part of a home exercise program PTs recommended fewer exercises for Black individuals.<sup>69</sup> An association between population race/ethnicity and percent of episodes including active care was not found in this study; however, individuals living in zip codes with low ADI were more likely to receive active care than individuals living in zip codes with high ADI.

Higher rates of plain film radiography use were found in zip codes with higher ADI and lower percent of NHW population, and higher rates MRI use were found in zip codes with lower ADI and higher percent NHW population. A similar association between type of imaging study and population SES has been demonstrated in Canada for non-NMS conditions.<sup>70,71</sup> Study findings differ from a study of MRI for acute work-related injury<sup>71</sup> that found states with lower median income were associated with higher rates of early MRI use. Previous findings of geographic variation in rates of spinal injection,<sup>72</sup> and spinal surgery<sup>73,74</sup> were also found in this study.

## **Conclusions**

For individuals with LBP or NP, the zip code one lives in has a strong association with the availability and likelihood of receiving guideline concordant high-value care. Individuals living in zip codes with socioeconomic disadvantage and a low percent NHW population have lower availability of non-prescribing HCPs. For LBP and NP, this is associated with more use of primary care and emergency department HCPs. Not surprisingly, these same zip codes are associated with higher rates of prescription NSAID and opioid use. Economic factors in these zip codes may present a barrier to a non-prescribing HCP maintaining a viable solo or small practice. Further exploration of this potential barrier warrants

further study. Individuals living in affluent zip codes with a high percent NHW population have an abundance of HCP options. While more likely to receive early first-line guideline concordant care, these individuals are also more likely to receive low-value care resulting in higher total episode cost. Similar to other conditions efforts to improve guideline concordance and value in the management of spinal disorders must consider local environmental and population factors.



## Declarations

### Ethics approval and consent to participate

Because data was linked from various sources, a review was performed to assess compliance with de-identification requirements. With data being de-identified or a Limited Data Set in compliance with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act and customer requirements, the UnitedHealth Group Office of Human Research Affairs determined that this study was exempt from Institutional Review Board review.

### Consent for publication

Not applicable

### Availability of data and materials

The data are proprietary and are not available for public use but, under certain conditions, may be made available to editors and their approved auditors under a data-use agreement to confirm the findings of the current study.

### Competing interests

At the time of manuscript submission **DE, MZ, and AO** were UnitedHealth Group employees and UNH stockholders. No other potential conflicts of interest or competing interests exist.

### Funding

None.

### Authors' contributions

Study conception and design; **DE, MZ**. Data acquisition; **DE, MZ**. Data analysis and interpretation; **DE, MZ**. Draft or substantially revise manuscript; **DE, MZ and AO**.

### Acknowledgements

Thomas Kosloff, DC and Scott Shimotsu, PhD MPH made important contributions to the study conception, design, and early draft review.

**List of Abbreviations:**

LBP – Low back pain

PCP – Primary care provider

CPG – Clinical practice guideline

HCP – Health care professional

SES – Socioeconomic status

US – United States

AGI – Adjusted gross income

ADI – Area Deprivation Index

HL – Health literacy

STROBE – Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology

ETG<sup>®</sup> – Episode Treatment Group<sup>®</sup>

ERG<sup>®</sup> – Episode Risk Group<sup>®</sup>

FIPS – Federal Information Processing Standard

ZCTA – zip Code Tabulation Area

ACP – American College of Physicians

NHW – Non-Hispanic White

NHB – Non-Hispanic Black

NHA – Non-Hispanic Asian

DO – Doctor of Osteopathy

OBGYN – Obstetrics and Gynecology

NMS - Neuromusculoskeletal

SD – Standard deviation

OR – Odds ratio

RR – Risk ratio

CI – Confidence interval

DC – Doctor of Chiropractic

PT – Physical Therapist

EM – Emergency Medicine

LAc – Licensed Acupuncturist

PA – Physician’s Assistant

MRI – Magnetic resonance imaging

CT – computed tomography

NSAID – Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug

CMT – Chiropractic manipulative treatment

OMT – Osteopathic manipulative treatment

## References

1. Beyera GK, O'Brien J, Campbell S. Health-care utilisation for low back pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis of population-based observational studies. *Rheumatol Int*. Oct 2019;39(10):1663-1679. doi:10.1007/s00296-019-04430-5
2. Dieleman JL, Cao J, Chapin A, et al. US Health Care Spending by Payer and Health Condition, 1996-2016. *JAMA*. Mar 3 2020;323(9):863-884. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.0734
3. Elton D, Kosloff TM, Zhang M, et al. Low back pain care pathways and costs: association with the type of initial contact health care provider. A retrospective cohort study. *medRxiv*. 2022:2022.06.17.22276443. doi:10.1101/2022.06.17.22276443
4. Elton D, Zhang, Meng. Neck pain care pathways and costs: association with the type of initial contact health care provider. A retrospective cohort study. *medRxiv*. 2022;doi:10.1101/2022.07.18.22277777v1
5. Meroni R, Piscitelli D, Ravasio C, et al. Evidence for managing chronic low back pain in primary care: a review of recommendations from high-quality clinical practice guidelines. *Disabil Rehabil*. Apr 2021;43(7):1029-1043. doi:10.1080/09638288.2019.1645888
6. Qaseem A, Wilt TJ, McLean RM, et al. Noninvasive Treatments for Acute, Subacute, and Chronic Low Back Pain: A Clinical Practice Guideline From the American College of Physicians. *Ann Intern Med*. Apr 4 2017;166(7):514-530. doi:10.7326/M16-2367
7. Thorson D CR, Massey M, Mueller B, Peterson S, Kramer C. . Adult Acute and Subacute Low Back Pain. Institute for Clinical Systems Improvement; 2018:
8. Andronis L, Kinghorn P, Qiao S, Whitehurst DG, Durrell S, McLeod H. Cost-Effectiveness of Non-Invasive and Non-Pharmacological Interventions for Low Back Pain: a Systematic Literature Review. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy*. Apr 2017;15(2):173-201. doi:10.1007/s40258-016-0268-8
9. Dolot J, Hyland M, Shi Q, Kim HY, Viola D, Hoekstra C. Factors Impacting Physical Therapy Utilization for Patients With Nonspecific Low Back Pain: Retrospective Analysis of a Clinical Data Set. *Phys Ther*. Aug 31 2020;100(9):1502-1515. doi:10.1093/ptj/pzaa082
10. Buchbinder R, van Tulder M, Oberg B, et al. Low back pain: a call for action. *Lancet*. Jun 9 2018;391(10137):2384-2388. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30488-4
11. Foster NE, Anema JR, Cherkin D, et al. Prevention and treatment of low back pain: evidence, challenges, and promising directions. *Lancet*. Jun 9 2018;391(10137):2368-2383. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30489-6
12. Hartvigsen J, Hancock MJ, Kongsted A, et al. What low back pain is and why we need to pay attention. *Lancet*. Jun 9 2018;391(10137):2356-2367. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30480-X
13. Reid RO, Rabideau B, Sood N. Low-Value Health Care Services in a Commercially Insured Population. *JAMA Intern Med*. Oct 1 2016;176(10):1567-1571. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.5031
14. Werber A, Schiltenswolf M. Treatment of Lower Back Pain-The Gap between Guideline-Based Treatment and Medical Care Reality. *Healthcare (Basel)*. Jul 15 2016;4(3)doi:10.3390/healthcare4030044
15. Stevans JM, Delitto A, Khoja SS, et al. Risk Factors Associated With Transition From Acute to Chronic Low Back Pain in US Patients Seeking Primary Care. *JAMA Netw Open*. Feb 1 2021;4(2):e2037371. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.37371
16. Amorin-Woods LG, Beck RW, Parkin-Smith GF, Loughheed J, Bremner AP. Adherence to clinical practice guidelines among three primary contact professions: a best evidence synthesis of the literature for the management of acute and subacute low back pain. *The Journal of the Canadian Chiropractic Association*. 2014;58(3):220-237.

17. Fritz JM, Kim J, Dorius J. Importance of the type of provider seen to begin health care for a new episode low back pain: associations with future utilization and costs. *J Eval Clin Pract*. Apr 2016;22(2):247-52. doi:10.1111/jep.12464
18. Frogner BK, Harwood K, Andrilla CHA, Schwartz M, Pines JM. Physical Therapy as the First Point of Care to Treat Low Back Pain: An Instrumental Variables Approach to Estimate Impact on Opioid Prescription, Health Care Utilization, and Costs. *Health Services Research*. 2018;53(6):4629-4646. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12984>
19. Harwood KJ, Pines JM, Andrilla CHA, Frogner BK. Where to start? A two stage residual inclusion approach to estimating influence of the initial provider on health care utilization and costs for low back pain in the US. *BMC Health Serv Res*. May 23 2022;22(1):694. doi:10.1186/s12913-022-08092-1
20. Kazis LE, Ameli O, Rothendler J, et al. Observational retrospective study of the association of initial healthcare provider for new-onset low back pain with early and long-term opioid use. *BMJ Open*. Sep 20 2019;9(9):e028633. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-028633
21. Liu X, Hanney WJ, Masaracchio M, et al. Immediate Physical Therapy Initiation in Patients With Acute Low Back Pain Is Associated With a Reduction in Downstream Health Care Utilization and Costs. *Physical Therapy*. 2018;98(5):336-347. doi:10.1093/ptj/pzy023
22. Ojha HA, Wyrsta NJ, Davenport TE, Egan WE, Gellhorn AC. Timing of Physical Therapy Initiation for Nonsurgical Management of Musculoskeletal Disorders and Effects on Patient Outcomes: A Systematic Review. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. Feb 2016;46(2):56-70. doi:10.2519/jospt.2016.6138
23. The Dartmouth Atlas of Health Care. The Trustees of Dartmouth College.
24. (IOM) IoM. Variation in Health Care Spending: Target Decision Making, Not Geography. In: Newhouse JP, Garber AM, Graham RP, McCoy MA, Mancher M, Kibria A, eds. *Variation in Health Care Spending: Target Decision Making, Not Geography*. Institute of Medicine; 2013.
25. Clark CR, Chandler PD, Zhou G, et al. Geographic Variation in Obesity at the State Level in the All of Us Research Program. *Preventing Chronic Disease*. 2021;18:E104. doi:10.5888/pcd18.210094
26. Commission MPA. *Report to the Congress: Regional Variation in Medicare Part A, Part B, and Part D Spending and Service Use*. 2017. [https://www.medpac.gov/wp-content/uploads/import\\_data/scrape\\_files/docs/default-source/reports/sept17\\_regionalvariation\\_report\\_final\\_sec.pdf](https://www.medpac.gov/wp-content/uploads/import_data/scrape_files/docs/default-source/reports/sept17_regionalvariation_report_final_sec.pdf)
27. Dunlop AL, Essalmi AG, Alvalos L, et al. Racial and geographic variation in effects of maternal education and neighborhood-level measures of socioeconomic status on gestational age at birth: Findings from the ECHO cohorts. *PLOS ONE*. 2021;16(1):e0245064. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0245064
28. Obeng-Gyasi S, Timsina L, Bhattacharyya O, Fisher CS, Haggstrom DA. Breast Cancer Presentation, Surgical Management and Mortality Across the Rural–Urban Continuum in the National Cancer Database. *Annals of Surgical Oncology*. 2020/06/01 2020;27(6):1805-1815. doi:10.1245/s10434-020-08376-y
29. Geographic Variation in Health Care Spending (Congress of the United States Congressional Budget Office) (2008).
30. Rosenberg BL, Kellar JA, Labno A, et al. Quantifying Geographic Variation in Health Care Outcomes in the United States before and after Risk-Adjustment. *PLOS ONE*. 2016;11(12):e0166762. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0166762
31. Roth GA, Dwyer-Lindgren L, Bertozzi-Villa A, et al. Trends and Patterns of Geographic Variation in Cardiovascular Mortality Among US Counties, 1980–2014. *JAMA*. May 16 2017;317(19):1976-1992. doi:10.1001/jama.2017.4150
32. Schieber LZ, Guy GP, Jr, Seth P, et al. Trends and Patterns of Geographic Variation in Opioid Prescribing Practices by State, United States, 2006–2017. *JAMA Network Open*. 2019;2(3):e190665-e190665. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.0665


33. Callison K, Kaestner R, Ward J. DO SUPPLY-SIDE FORCES EXPLAIN GEOGRAPHIC VARIATION IN HEALTH CARE USE? *Economic Inquiry*. 2021;59(1):119-139. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/ecin.12926>
34. Naylor KB, Tootoo J, Yakusheva O, Shipman SA, Bynum JPW, Davis MA. Geographic variation in spatial accessibility of U.S. healthcare providers. *PLOS ONE*. 2019;14(4):e0215016. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0215016
35. Toms R, Bonney A, Mayne DJ, Feng X, Walsan R. Geographic and area-level socioeconomic variation in cardiometabolic risk factor distribution: a systematic review of the literature. *International Journal of Health Geographics*. 2019/01/08 2019;18(1):1. doi:10.1186/s12942-018-0165-5
36. Zhang Y, Li J, Yu J, Braun RT, Casalino LP. Social Determinants of Health and Geographic Variation in Medicare per Beneficiary Spending. *JAMA Network Open*. 2021;4(6):e2113212-e2113212. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.13212
37. Benjamin-Neelon SE, Gonzalez-Nahm S, Grossman E, et al. State Variations in Infant Feeding Regulations for Child Care. *Pediatrics*. 2017;140(6)doi:10.1542/peds.2017-2076
38. Bi Q, He F, Konty K, Gould LH, Immerwahr S, Levanon Seligson A. ZIP Code-Level Estimates from a Local Health Survey: Added Value and Limitations. *Journal of Urban Health*. 2020/08/01 2020;97(4):561-567. doi:10.1007/s11524-020-00423-z
39. Hamadi H, Moody L, Apatu E, Vossos H, Tafili A, Spaulding A. Impact of hospitals' Referral Region racial and ethnic diversity on 30-day readmission rates of older adults. *Journal of Community Hospital Internal Medicine Perspectives*. 2019/05/04 2019;9(3):181-188. doi:10.1080/20009666.2019.1613882
40. Handanagic S, Finlayson T, Burnett JC, Broz D, Wejnert C, National HIVBSSG. HIV Infection and HIV-Associated Behaviors Among Persons Who Inject Drugs - 23 Metropolitan Statistical Areas, United States, 2018. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. Oct 22 2021;70(42):1459-1465. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7042a1
41. Khan SS, Krefman AE, McCabe ME, et al. Association between county-level risk groups and COVID-19 outcomes in the United States: a socioecological study. *BMC Public Health*. Jan 13 2022;22(1):81. doi:10.1186/s12889-021-12469-y
42. Moss JL, Johnson NJ, Yu M, Altekrose SF, Cronin KA. Indicators of Socioeconomic Status for Individuals, Census Tracts, and Counties: How Well Do Measures Align for Demographic Subgroups? *J Registry Manag*. Spring 2020;47(1):4-12.
43. Cooper RA, Cooper MA, McGinley EL, Fan X, Rosenthal JT. Poverty, Wealth, and Health Care Utilization: A Geographic Assessment. *Journal of Urban Health*. 2012/10/01 2012;89(5):828-847. doi:10.1007/s11524-012-9689-3
44. Swift EK. *Committee on Guidance for Designing a National Healthcare Disparities Report*. National Academies Press (US); 2002.
45. Cher BAY, Yakusheva O, Liu H, Bynum JPW, Davis MA. The Effect of Healthcare Provider Availability on Spine Spending. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2021/03/01 2021;36(3):654-661. doi:10.1007/s11606-020-06191-5
46. Whedon JM, Haldeman S, Petersen CL, Schoellkopf W, MacKenzie TA, Lurie JD. Temporal Trends and Geographic Variations in the Supply of Clinicians Who Provide Spinal Manipulation to Medicare Beneficiaries: A Serial Cross-Sectional Study. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. Mar 2021;44(3):177-185. doi:10.1016/j.jmpt.2021.02.002
47. Davis M, Yakusheva O, Liu H, Anderson B, Bynum J. The Effect of Reduced Access to Chiropractic Care on Medical Service Use for Spine Conditions Among Older Adults. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. Jun 2021;44(5):353-362. doi:10.1016/j.jmpt.2021.05.002
48. Weeks WB, Goertz CM. Cross-Sectional Analysis of Per Capita Supply of Doctors of Chiropractic and Opioid Use in Younger Medicare Beneficiaries. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. May 2016;39(4):263-6. doi:10.1016/j.jmpt.2016.02.016

49. Whedon JM, Song Y, Davis MA, Lurie JD. Use of chiropractic spinal manipulation in older adults is strongly correlated with supply. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)*. Sep 15 2012;37(20):1771-7. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e31825762b7
50. Choo EK, Charlesworth CJ, Gu Y, Livingston CJ, McConnell KJ. Increased Use of Complementary and Alternative Therapies for Back Pain Following Statewide Medicaid Coverage Changes in Oregon. *J Gen Intern Med*. Mar 2021;36(3):676-682. doi:10.1007/s11606-020-06352-6
51. Machlin SR, Chevan J, Yu WW, Zodet MW. Determinants of utilization and expenditures for episodes of ambulatory physical therapy among adults. *Phys Ther*. Jul 2011;91(7):1018-29. doi:10.2522/ptj.20100343
52. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Int J Surg*. Dec 2014;12(12):1495-9. doi:10.1016/j.ijsu.2014.07.013
53. Peterson C, Grosse SD, Dunn A. A practical guide to episode groupers for cost-of-illness analysis in health services research. *SAGE Open Med*. 2019;7:2050312119840200. doi:10.1177/2050312119840200
54. Insight O. Symmetry episode treatment groups: measuring health care with meaningful episodes of care. 2012.
55. Bureau USC. ACS Demographic and Housing Estimates. Accessed July 8, 2020. <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=United%20States&g=0100000US&y=2018&tid=ACSDP1Y2018.DP05&hidePreview=true>.
56. Service IR. US Department of Treasury SOI tax stats - individual income tax statistics - 2017 ZIP code data. Accessed July 20, 2020. <https://www.irs.gov/statistics/soi-tax-stats-individual-income-tax-statistics-2017-zip-code-data-soi>.
57. Kind AJH, Buckingham WR. Making Neighborhood-Disadvantage Metrics Accessible - The Neighborhood Atlas. *N Engl J Med*. Jun 28 2018;378(26):2456-2458. doi:10.1056/NEJMp1802313
58. Viera AJ. Odds ratios and risk ratios: what's the difference and why does it matter? *South Med J*. Jul 2008;101(7):730-4. doi:10.1097/SMJ.0b013e31817a7ee4
59. Bindu S, Mazumder S, Bandyopadhyay U. Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) and organ damage: A current perspective. *Biochem Pharmacol*. Oct 2020;180:114147. doi:10.1016/j.bcp.2020.114147
60. Davis JS, Lee HY, Kim J, et al. Use of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs in US adults: changes over time and by demographic. *Open Heart*. 2017;4(1):e000550. doi:10.1136/openhrt-2016-000550
61. Delaney JA, Biggs ML, Kronmal RA, Psaty BM. Demographic, medical, and behavioral characteristics associated with over the counter non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug use in a population-based cohort: results from the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf*. Jan 2011;20(1):83-9. doi:10.1002/pds.2065
62. Dominick KL, Bosworth HB, Jeffreys AS, Grambow SC, Oddone EZ, Horner RD. Racial/ethnic variations in non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) use among patients with osteoarthritis. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf*. Oct 2004;13(10):683-94. doi:10.1002/pds.904
63. McDonald DC, Carlson K, Izrael D. Geographic variation in opioid prescribing in the U.S. *J Pain*. Oct 2012;13(10):988-96. doi:10.1016/j.jpain.2012.07.007
64. U.S. County Opioid Dispensing Rates, 2018 (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) (2018).
65. Corcoran KL, Bastian LA, Gunderson CG, Steffens C, Brackett A, Lisi AJ. Association Between Chiropractic Use and Opioid Receipt Among Patients with Spinal Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Pain Med*. Feb 1 2020;21(2):e139-e145. doi:10.1093/pm/pnz219
66. Whedon JM, Song Y. Geographic variations in availability and use of chiropractic under medicare. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. Feb 2012;35(2):101-9. doi:10.1016/j.jmpt.2011.12.004




67. Whedon JM, Song Y. Racial disparities in the use of chiropractic care under Medicare. *Altern Ther Health Med*. Nov-Dec 2012;18(6):20-6.
68. Karmali RN, Skinner AC, Trogdon JG, Weinberger M, George SZ, Hassmiller Lich K. The Association Between the Supply of Nonpharmacologic Providers, Use of Nonpharmacologic Pain Treatments, and High-risk Opioid Prescription Patterns Among Medicare Beneficiaries With Persistent Musculoskeletal Pain. *Med Care*. May 2020;58(5):433-444. doi:10.1097/MLR.0000000000001299
69. Cavanaugh AM, Rauh MJ. Does Patient Race Affect Physical Therapy Treatment Recommendations? *J Racial Ethn Health Disparities*. Dec 2021;8(6):1377-1384. doi:10.1007/s40615-020-00899-0
70. Demeter S, Reed M, Lix L, MacWilliam L, Leslie WD. Socioeconomic status and the utilization of diagnostic imaging in an urban setting. *CMAJ*. Nov 8 2005;173(10):1173-7. doi:10.1503/cmaj.050609
71. Pransky G, Foley G, Cifuentes M, Webster BS. Geographic Variation in Early MRI for Acute Work-Related Low Back Pain and Associated Factors. *Spine*. 2015;40(21):1712-1718. doi:10.1097/brs.0000000000001124
72. Friedly J, Chan L, Deyo R. Geographic Variation in Epidural Steroid Injection Use in Medicare Patients. *JBJS*. 2008;90(8)
73. Azad TD, Vail D, O'Connell C, Han SS, Veeravagu A, Ratliff JK. Geographic variation in the surgical management of lumbar spondylolisthesis: characterizing practice patterns and outcomes. *Spine J*. Dec 2018;18(12):2232-2238. doi:10.1016/j.spinee.2018.05.008
74. Bederman SS, Coyte PC, Kreder HJ, Mahomed NN, McIsaac WJ, Wright JG. Who's in the Driver's Seat? The Influence of Patient and Physician Enthusiasm on Regional Variation in Degenerative Lumbar Spinal Surgery: A Population-Based Study. *Spine*. 2011;36(6):481-489. doi:10.1097/BRS.0b013e3181d25e6f







**Figure 1** - % of spinal disorder episodes with initial contact with primary care, non-prescriber, specialist and emergency medicine/urgent care health care providers segmented by individual home address zip code Area Deprivation Index (ADI) and percent non-Hispanic (NHW) white population




**Figure 2** - Risk ratio and 95% confidence interval for spinal disorder type of initial contact health care provider by 5 digit zip code population Area Deprivation Index (ADI) and % non-Hispanic white (NHW%) segmentation compared to reference segment of 25-50 ADI and 75-100% NHW



**Figure 3** - % of spinal disorder episodes including first, second and third line services segmented by individual home address zip code Area Deprivation Index (ADI) and percent non-Hispanic (NHW) white population



**Figure 4** - Risk ratio and 95% confidence interval for spinal disorder service use by 5 digit zip code population Area Deprivation Index (ADI) and % non-Hispanic white (NHW%) segmentation compared to reference segment of 25-50 ADI and 75-100% NHW



**Figure 5** - Risk ratio and 95% confidence interval for spinal disorder service use by 5 digit zip code population Area Deprivation Index (ADI) and % non-Hispanic white (NHW%) segmentation compared to reference segment of 25-50 ADI and 75-100% NHW