

1 **Inequalities in Accident and Emergency department attendance by socio-**  
2 **economic characteristics: population based study.**

3

4 Owen Gethings<sup>1</sup> (0009-0000-9238-984X), Perrine Machuel<sup>1</sup>, Vahe Nafilyan (0000-0003-  
5 0160-217X)<sup>1,2</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup>Office for National Statistics, Government Buildings, Cardiff Rd, Duffryn, Newport NP10  
8 8XG

9 <sup>2</sup>Department of Medical Statistics, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine,  
10 London, UK

11

12

13 **Correspondence to: [owen.gethings@ons.gov.uk](mailto:owen.gethings@ons.gov.uk)**

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

## 38 **Objectives**

39 To examine the relationship between deprivation and Accident and Emergency department  
40 attendance.

## 41 **Design**

42 Retrospective cohort study.

## 43 **Setting**

44 England, United Kingdom, from 21 March 2021 to March 2022

## 45 **Participants**

46 All individuals in the 2021 Census, aged 0 to 95 with an Emergency Department attendance  
47 record within the Emergency Care Dataset (ECDS). Our full sample included 51,776,958  
48 individuals and 11,498,520 A&E attendance records.

## 49 **Main outcome measures**

50 The primary outcome was any visit to an Accident and Emergency service in England  
51 between 21st March 2021 and 31st March 2022 as recorded in ECDS.

## 52 **Results**

53 After adjusting for age, sex and ethnicity, the odds of A&E attendance increased as the level  
54 of deprivation increased, with the odds for those in the most deprived decile being 1.69 (95%  
55 CI – 1.68 to 1.69) times greater than those in the least deprived decile. Adjusting for  
56 underlying health attenuated but did not fully explain the association between deprivation  
57 and A&E attendance, with the odds ratio of attendance for those in the most deprived decile  
58 reduced to 1.41 (95% CI – 1.40 to 1.41). This pattern was similar across age groups  
59 however the gradient of the slope was steeper for working age adults and the magnitude of  
60 the reduction in odds for the most deprived decile relative to the least deprived decile after  
61 adjusting for health was greatest in those aged 30 to 79. By acuity, those living in the most  
62 deprived decile had 2.26 times (95% CI = 2.23 to 2.28) higher odds of attending A&E for a  
63 condition classified as low acuity compared with those in the least deprived decile. Even  
64 after adjusting for health, those in the most deprived decile had 2.02 (95% CI = 1.99 to 2.02)  
65 times the odds of attending for a low acuity condition compared with those in the least  
66 deprived decile. This was true for all levels of acuity, except those classified as immediate  
67 care, where after adjustment for health, those in the most deprived decile had 0.83 (95% CI  
68 = 0.82 to 0.85) times the odds of attendance compared with those in the least deprived  
69 decile.

70

## 71 **Conclusions**

72 People living in more deprived areas were more likely to access A&E services than those  
73 living in less deprived areas and these differences are not fully explained by differences in  
74 underlying health. The differences were larger for A&E attendance for less severe  
75 conditions. Differences in access to primary care services may explain part of these  
76 differences in A&E access. Knowing which groups are more likely to attend A&E services will  
77 give valuable insight for health services providers, and allow decision makers to better  
78 understand how populations can access care differently depending on a range of factors.

79

## 80 **Key messages**

### 81 **What is already known on this subject**

- 82 • Previous work has found a clear link between deprivation and health.
- 83 • Small-scale or single-centre studies have found links between deprivation and
- 84 Accident and Emergency attendance.

### 85 **What this study adds**

- 86 • This study of 51,776,958 people, and 11,498,520 people with at least one Accident
- 87 and Emergency department attendance shows a clear deprivation effect, even after
- 88 adjusting for underlying health.
- 89 • People living in more deprived areas were more likely to attend A&E, particularly for
- 90 low conditions classed as low acuity.
- 91 • Underlying health is less important a driver of attendance patterns for people under
- 92 30 and is more important a factor for people aged 30 to 65 years of age.

93

## 94 **Introduction**

95 Demand for emergency services in England reached record levels in the Winter 2022/2023,  
96 after steadily increasing between 2011 and 2019 [1], with 6 million A&E attendances being  
97 recorded between January and March 2023 [2]. The reductions in service provision during  
98 the Covid-19 pandemic resulted in a significant backlog for care, which increased pressure  
99 on A&E services [3]. The pressure is also due to people attending A&E for conditions that  
100 could be treated in primary care or elsewhere in the NHS: A systematic review conducted in  
101 2009 found that between 20 and 40% of A&E attendances are for non-urgent conditions that  
102 could be treated elsewhere [4]. Understanding which groups disproportionately use A&E  
103 services for non-emergency care could help target interventions.

104 Socio-economically disadvantaged people are more frequent users of healthcare services in  
105 general [5] and also of emergency services, with evidence that those living in the most  
106 deprived areas are twice as likely to attend emergency services as those in the least  
107 deprived areas [6]. Reasons for A&E attendance are complex and although previous work  
108 has shown a clear link between deprivation and A&E attendance [6-9], the underlying cause  
109 of this remains unclear. Although the link between deprivation and prevalence of individual  
110 chronic diseases [10] and multimorbidity has been well established [11], some evidence  
111 suggests that more deprived individuals attend ED because of difficulties accessing General  
112 Practices and other community services [12]. Indeed, recent data from England suggests  
113 that the number of General Practitioners is lower per head in more deprived communities,  
114 despite lower health in these populations [13]. However, to date, there is no study assessing  
115 socio-economic differences in A&E attendance using population wide data in England and  
116 investigating whether these differences are driven by differences in health.

117 In this study, we used Census 2021 data linked with emergency care data to examine the  
118 socio-economic inequalities in A&E attendances in England between March 2021 and March  
119 2022 and assess whether these differences are driven by differences in health status  
120 between the groups.

121

122

## 123 **Methods**

### 124 *Study design and data*

125 We used a person-level dataset comprising of individuals in the 2021 Census, linked to the  
126 Personal Demographics Service to obtain NHS numbers with a linkage rate of 94.6%. Age  
127 was truncated at 95 and these individuals were then linked via NHS number to NHS  
128 England's Emergency Care Data set (ECDS) on Emergency Department attendances.  
129 ECDS is the national data set for urgent and emergency care and replaced Accident and  
130 Emergency Commissioning Data Set and provides information to support the care provided  
131 in emergency departments by including the data items needed to understand capacity and  
132 demand and help improve patient care.

133 The Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) dataset for Admitted Patient Care (APC) and  
134 Outpatients (OP) was used to obtain health data to determine patient's medical history  
135 between 01 January 2017 and 21 March 2021. The linked dataset included data on  
136 51,776,958 people in England, which covers approximately 91.7% of the population of  
137 England on census day 2021.

138

### 139 *Outcome*

140 The primary outcome was any visit to an A&E service in England between 21st March 2021  
141 and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2022 as recorded in ECDS. We included all Type 1 General Emergency  
142 Departments, Type 2 Specialist Emergency Departments (e.g. paediatric, ophthalmology),  
143 Type 3 Minor Injury Units and Type 4 Walk in Centres. As a secondary outcome, we  
144 stratified visits by acuity (ECDS codes; 1) Immediate Care, 2) Very Urgent Care, 3) Urgent  
145 Care, 4) Standard Care, 5) Low Acuity).

146

### 147 *Exposures*

148 Our main exposure of interest was Socio-Economic Status (SES), as measured by deciles of  
149 the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019 (IMD) of the area of residence at the time of the 2021  
150 Census. As SES is a complex concept we used several different measures as alternative in  
151 our analyses, which are presented in supplementary materials. We used information from  
152 the 2021 census on Level of highest qualification ("No qualifications", "Apprenticeship", "A  
153 levels, AS levels and equivalent", "5+ GCSEs and equivalent", "1-4 GCSEs and equivalent",  
154 "Degree and above") and individual National Statistics Socio-economic classification (NS-  
155 SEC) ("Never worked and long term unemployed", "Routine occupations", "Semi-routine  
156 occupations", "Lower supervisory and technical occupations", "Small employers and own  
157 account workers", "Intermediate occupations", "Lower managerial, administrative and  
158 professional occupations" and "Higher managerial, administrative and professional  
159 occupations").

160

### 161 *Covariates*

162 To estimate the differences in access by SES status, we fitted models that were adjusted for  
163 a range of confounding factors. Age was included as a restricted cubic spline with knots at

164 the 1<sup>st</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup> and 99<sup>th</sup> percentile. We also included sex (Male, Female), and ethnicity (White,  
165 Asian, Black, Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Group, Other).

166 To assess whether the differences in access by SES were driven by differences in health,  
167 we fitted models that were also adjusted for individual health. Prevalence of health  
168 conditions was measured using data from HES APC/OP records (see supplementary table  
169 1). We also included measures of health collected at the 2021 Census, including long-term  
170 health or disability (“Not Limited”, “Yes – reduced a little”, “Yes – reduced a lot”, “Yes – not  
171 reduced at all”), and self-reported general health (“Very Good Health”, “Good Health”, “Fair  
172 Health”, “Bad Health”) as well as using information from HES APC records (List conditions  
173 included). To proxy severity, we also created a variable for the number of provider spells  
174 from HES APC in the years prior to our study period, covering the period 1<sup>st</sup> January 2017 to  
175 21<sup>st</sup> March 2021.

176

### 177 *Statistical analysis*

178 Characteristics of the study population were summarised overall, using means for  
179 continuous variables and proportions for categorical variables. We calculated absolute risk  
180 by age and sex by estimating the proportion of people who attended A&E by sex and single  
181 year of age.

182

183 To estimate the differences in access by SES status, we fitted Generalized Linear Models  
184 with binomial errors and a logit link to estimate the odds of A&E attendance whilst controlling  
185 for patient characteristics as detailed above. First, we examined the differences in  
186 emergency attendance by SES, by fitting models adjusted for confounding factors only (age,  
187 sex, ethnicity). Second, we assessed to what extent health mediated the relationship  
188 between our exposures and emergency attendance by adjusting for health variables. To do  
189 so we included measures of health to the models and compared the odds ratios of the  
190 health-adjusted model to the odds ratios of the confounder-adjusted model. We included  
191 interactions between age and sex, age and ethnicity, age and disability, age and health in  
192 general, age and provider spell count and age and all HES health variables. We also  
193 included interactions between sex and ethnicity, sex and disability, sex and health in  
194 general, sex and provider spell count and sex and all HES health variables to ensure that  
195 confounder factors were appropriately adjusted for. Due to collinearity between socio-  
196 economic variables, we fitted separate regression models for each exposure.

197

198 Analyses were then further stratified by age group (0-5, 6-15, 16-29, 30-49, 50-64, 65-79  
199 and 80 to 95) and acuity. Models with NSSEC and Level of highest Qualification as  
200 exposures were restricted to residents aged 25+ (25-49, 50-64, 65-79 and 80 to 95). Age  
201 was included as a restricted cubic spline. We included interactions for sex and ethnicity, sex  
202 and disability, sex and health in general, sex and provider spell count and sex and all HES  
203 health variables. Relative reduction in odds between the unadjusted and health-adjusted  
204 models was calculated by  $(OR_1 - OR_2)/(OR_2 - 1)$ , where  $OR_1$  is the health-adjusted  
205 model odds ratio and  $OR_2$  is the confounder-adjusted model odds ratio.

206

### 207 *Patient and public involvement*

208 We did not directly involve patients and the public in the design and conception of the study,  
209 primarily because this study was conducted rapidly.

210

211

212

213

214

## 215 **Results**

### 216 *Characteristics of the study population*

217 Our full individual-level dataset set contained 51,776,958 individuals. The average age was  
218 41 ( $\pm 23.7$ ), and 48% were male (Table 1).

219 Between 21st March 2021 and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2022, 11,498,520 (22%) people attended an A&E  
220 service in England at least once (Mean number of visits =  $1.7 \pm 1.6$  sd). Out of all  
221 attendances, 1,369,021 (12%) were among those from the most deprived decile, with  
222 957,993 (8%) being from the least-deprived decile. 53% of attendances were among  
223 females.

224

### 225 *A&E attendance by age and sex*

226 Figure 1 shows the proportion of people having attended A&E at least once between 21st  
227 March 2021 and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2022 by age and sex. The proportion of people who attended an  
228 emergency department was highest in infants (aged 0 to 2 years old) and in older adults  
229 (aged 80 years old and above). The proportion of people having attended A&E generally  
230 decreased with age from ages 2 to 10, with increases for males between the ages of 10 and  
231 20, and an increase for women between the ages of 17 and 29. It remained low for both  
232 sexes until around the age of 70 where it then increased with age.

233

### 234 **Index of Multiple Deprivation**

235 Odds ratios by IMD decile are given in table 2. After adjusting for age, sex and ethnicity, the  
236 odds of A&E attendance increased as the level of deprivation increased, with the odds for  
237 those in the most deprived decile being 1.69 (95% CI – 1.68 to 1.69) times greater than for  
238 those in the least deprived decile. After adjusting for underlying health, overall, the odds of  
239 A&E attendance again increased as deprivation increased, however, the odds of attendance  
240 for those in the most deprived decile reduced to 1.41 (95% CI – 1.40 to 1.41). This  
241 corresponds to a 40.9% (95% CI – 40.7% to 41.1%) difference in odds after adjusting for  
242 underlying health.

243 Figure 2 shows A&E attendance by age and IMD decile.

244 Odds ratios for deprivation by age are given in table 3 for decile 1, other deciles are given in  
245 supplementary table 2. Across all age groups, the odds of attendance increased as the level  
246 of deprivation increased, but the gradient was steeper for working age adults than for older  
247 adults and children. Prior to adjusting for health, 30 to 49 (OR = 1.86 95% CI - 1.85 to 1.87),  
248 50 to 64 (OR = 1.87, 95% CI - 1.86 to 1.88) and 65 to 79 years olds (OR = 1.73, 95% CI –  
249 1.71 to 1.74) living in the 10% most deprived areas (decile 1) had the greatest odds of A&E  
250 attendance, relative to their counterparts in decile 10. After adjusting for health, we observed  
251 a substantial reduction in the odds of A&E attendance. The odds of attendance for those in  
252 decile 1 compared with decile 10 reduced substantially for 30 to 49 (OR = 1.54, 95% CI –  
253 1.53 to 1.55), 40 to 64 (OR = 1.39, 95% CI – 1.38 to 1.40) and 65 to 79-year-olds (OR =

254 1.23, 95% CI – 1.22 to 1.24) In relative terms (Table 3), zero to 5-year-olds had the smallest  
255 relative reduction in odds (10.7% 95% CI – 10.5% to 11.1%) after adjusting for health, with  
256 65 to 79-year-olds seeing the largest reduction (68.5%, 67.6% to 69.0%).

257

258 Figure 3 shows A&E attendance by acuity and IMD decile. Odds ratios of A&E attendance  
259 for different levels of acuity by deprivation are given in table 4 for decile 1, other deciles are  
260 given in supplementary table 3. For low acuity (5), standard care (4), urgent care (3) and  
261 very urgent care (2), the odds of attendance increased as deprivation increased. The  
262 relationship was less clear for immediate care (1), with those in decile 3 (OR = 1.46, 95% CI  
263 = 1.44 to 1.49) and 5 (OR = 1.43, 95% CI = 1.40 to 1.46) having the highest odds of  
264 attendance. Those living in the most deprived decile had 2.26 times (95% CI = 2.23 to 2.28)  
265 higher odds of attending A&E for a condition classified as low acuity compared with those in  
266 the least deprived decile. After adjusting for underlying health, again, for low acuity (5),  
267 standard care (4), urgent care (3) and very urgent care (2), the odds of attendance increased  
268 as deprivation increased. Those in the most deprived decile had 2.02 (95% CI = 1.99 to  
269 2.02) times the odds of attending for a low acuity condition compared with those in the least  
270 deprived decile. However, for immediate level care, odds of attendance generally decreased  
271 as deprivation increased, with those in the most deprived decile having 0.83 (95% CI = 0.82  
272 to 0.85) times the odds of attendance compared with those in the least deprived decile.  
273 Those in the most deprived decile had 2.02 (95% CI = 1.99 to 2.02) times the odds of  
274 attending for a low acuity condition compared with those in the least deprived decile.

275 Standard Care (30.3%, 28.8% to 29.2%), Urgent Care (60.9%, 61.5% to 62.5%), Very  
276 Urgent Care (60.4%, 59.8% to 60.6%) and Immediate Care (32.0%, 31.7% to 32.0%) saw  
277 the largest relative reduction in odds between health-unadjusted and adjusted models, with  
278 Low Acuity seeing only a 19.0% (18.7% to 18.8%) relative reduction.

279 Acuity by age

280

### 281 **Other measures of Socioeconomic status**

282 Results for our other proxy measures of socioeconomic status can be found in  
283 supplementary table 2 and 3. Patterns and results were similar for other SES positions.

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

## 299 **Discussion**

### 300 *Main findings*

301 In this study using a unique linkage of the 2021 Census with emergency care data, we found  
302 people living in more deprived areas were more likely to have attended A&E at least once,  
303 after adjusting for age, sex and ethnicity. This difference in A&E access by area deprivation  
304 was observed for all age groups but was most pronounced for people aged between 30 and  
305 65 and decreased for older ages.

306 Adjusting for health using comorbidities data from HES, self-reported general health, self-  
307 reported disability status and number of hospital admissions in the 4 years prior to our study  
308 partly, but not totally, explained the differences in attendance patterns. Adjusting for health  
309 reduced the odds ratios of accessing A&E between the most and least deprived area by  
310 about 40%. This pattern was consistent across all age groups, however the relative  
311 reduction in odds was greatest for patients aged 30 to 79, with health adjustments having  
312 very little effect for people less than 30.

313 We observed greater socio-economic differences in A&E attendance for low acuity  
314 conditions than for higher acuity conditions. The odds of attending A&E for a low acuity  
315 condition were 2 times greater for people living in the 10% most deprived areas, relative to  
316 their counterparts in the 10% least deprived areas. Further adjusting for health reduced the  
317 estimated differences in A&E attendance but the overall pattern remained the same: people  
318 in the most deprived deciles had greater odds of attendance for low acuity conditions than  
319 for high acuity conditions. These heightened differences in service use for conditions of low  
320 acuity for people in the most deprived areas cannot be explained by differences in age, sex,  
321 ethnicity, or underlying health.

322

### 323 *Comparison with other studies*

324 Consistent with our findings, previous work has found a clear relationship between  
325 deprivation and A&E attendances [6,7,8,13,15,16], with people from more deprived  
326 backgrounds generally having higher odds of attending an A&E service in England. Most of  
327 these previous studies have either been based on small national surveys [6, 14], restricted to  
328 specific geographies [7,8,9,16] which may not reflect patterns observed elsewhere or did not  
329 adjust for underlying health [6, 7, 15]. A large analysis of 17 million attendances by LSOA  
330 extracted from HES between April 2011 and March 2012 found that the number of both  
331 inappropriate and appropriate attendances increased as deprivation increased [15].  
332 However, they also found that after controlling for age, sex and gender, those from the least  
333 deprived quintile had the greatest odds of inappropriate attendances relative to appropriate  
334 attendances. In contrast to these previous studies, [9] found that IMD was not a predictor for  
335 A&E attendance, however they specifically only chose disadvantaged neighbourhoods,



336 where the variation in IMD between areas was perhaps not sufficient to detect a meaningful  
337 association.

338 Many of these studies have hypothesised that the differences in attendance rates by  
339 deprivation are largely driven by differences in underlying health. Indeed, the link between  
340 deprivation and prevalence of individual chronic diseases [10] and multimorbidity has been  
341 well established [11]. However, we find that even after adjusting for health, using a  
342 comprehensive set of measures of underlying health, people living in more deprived areas  
343 are more likely to attend A&E than those living in less deprived areas.

344 After adjusting for health, we found the difference between the most and least deprived 10%  
345 of areas decreased above the age of 65. This suggests that deprivation is less important a  
346 factor than general health, age, or perhaps frailty. Indeed, relative differences between the  
347 unadjusted and health-adjusted odds ratios were greatest for those 30 to 49, 50 to 64 and  
348 65 to 79 years, with the biggest relative reduction seen in those aged 65 to 79 years of age.  
349 This is consistent with findings from an analysis of NHS New Devon CCG data [16] and  
350 Glasgow A&E resident data [18], that found that over age 65, the biological effects of ageing  
351 outweigh the social effects of deprivation [16].

352 Very few studies have assessed differences in attendance by clinical acuity across  
353 the deprivation gradient. There is evidence that people from more deprived backgrounds  
354 were more likely to be classed as “more severe” upon arrival at A&E [19]. However, they  
355 defined severity based on a subjective analysis of diagnosis codes, limited their sample to  
356 ambulance arrivals and excluded self-referrals. We used a standardised measure of acuity  
357 available within ECDS to limit subjectivity and ensure findings were applicable across areas.  
358 Another study looking at children under the age of 13 found that there was a trend for an  
359 increased attendance in all triage categories for the most deprived populations [20]. We  
360 found increased odds of attendance for people in the most deprived deciles for all acuity  
361 classifications except immediate level care. An analysis from Canada also found that  
362 materially deprived residents, particularly young adults, used the emergency department  
363 disproportionately more than the least deprived do, generally for all medical conditions and  
364 particularly for low-acuity conditions [21]. This was especially true for low acuity conditions  
365 during the COVID-19 pandemic [22]. These heightened differences in service use for  
366 conditions of low acuity for people in the most deprived areas cannot be explained solely by  
367 differences in underlying health but could be driven by other factors such as access to  
368 primary care [12, 23, 24].

369 The reason for greater attendance rates, particularly for low acuity conditions,  
370 among people from lower SES is currently unclear. Previous work has found that young  
371 people from lower SES are more likely to attend A&E for injuries [25] and unintentional  
372 poisonings [26], however we did not look at cause-specific attendances within this analysis.  
373 Other work has suggested that difficulties accessing primary care services could also play a  
374 role [14], as well as dissatisfaction with primary care services [23, 24] and lower General  
375 Practice availability among more deprived communities [13]. Recent work has found fewer  
376 total GPs, Direct Patient Care staff and paramedics per 10,000 patients in deprived areas  
377 [27], with the inequalities widening significantly over time. Similarly, GP practices with high  
378 GP turnover have been shown to be significantly associated with more emergency hospital  
379 attendances per 100 patients, with turnover being higher in more deprived areas [28]. This  
380 could disproportionately affect more deprived patients, who tend to be in poorer health, and  
381 attend A&E due to inability to access a GP practice.

382

### 383 *Strengths and limitations of this study*

384 Our study has several strengths. The first, we used a unique population-level dataset based  
385 on the 2021 Census. Census 2021 covered around 97% of the population, and therefore is  
386 the most representative data source available to produce statistics about the population  
387 living in England. Our study is the largest study to examine the association between socio-  
388 economic status and A&E attendance to date, and make use of the information provided by  
389 Census such as socioeconomic classification and self-reported ethnicity, self-reported  
390 general health and disability status.

391 Second, an important strength of our study is that we combined multiple sources of  
392 health data to measure people's health status at the beginning of the study period. We have  
393 objective information on hospital admission from the Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) and,  
394 crucially, self-reported general health and disability status from the 2021 Census, which  
395 provide richer information on people's health than what is typically available in studies solely  
396 based on electronic health records and enables us to assess whether the differences in A&E  
397 access by socio-economic status are driven by differences in health status.

398 Our study also has some limitations. Not all people living in England in March 2021  
399 were enumerated at Census 2021, and of those who were, not all could be linked to an NHS  
400 number via the Personal Demographics Service. Linking to Census invariably means we  
401 may exclude some people, for example people without a fixed address who may be living in  
402 extremely disadvantaged circumstances were probably not captured by our data. However,  
403 our dataset covers 91.7% of the population living in England at the time of Census.

404 Another limitation is that we only looked at A&E attendances as a binary measure  
405 (e.g., whether someone attended an emergency department at least once between 2021  
406 and 2022), which does not discriminate between people who attended A&E only once, and  
407 those who attended multiple times. Therefore, we may not be capturing potential  
408 compounding effects of SES on the likelihood of attending A&E multiple times.

409

### 410 Conclusion

411 Our results suggest that the socio-economic differences in A&E are not solely driven by  
412 differences in health, but that other factors such as access to primary care services may  
413 explain a large part of these differences in A&E access. Increasing access to primary care  
414 services in the most deprived areas could help alleviate the pressure faced emergency  
415 departments.

416

### 417 **Ethical approval**

418 This study was ethically self-assessed against the ethical principles of the National  
419 Statistician's Data Ethics Advisory Committee (NSDEC) using NSDEC's ethics self-  
420 assessment tool. We engaged with the UK Statistics Authority Data Ethics team, who were  
421 satisfied that no further ethical approval was required.

422

### 423 **Funding**

424 This study did not receive external funding.

425

426 **Footnotes**

427 Contributors: OG, PM and VN all contributed equally. OG, PM and VN conceived the study.  
428 PM performed the methodology, analysis and produced figures. OG, PM and VN interpreted  
429 the data. OG and VN drafted the manuscript. All authors revised the manuscript for  
430 important intellectual content and approved the final submitted version. OG and PM  
431 accessed and verified the data. All authors had full access to the data in the study, acted as  
432 guarantors for the study, and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for  
433 publication. All authors vouch for the completeness and accuracy of the data and for the  
434 fidelity of the trial to the protocol. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors  
435 meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

436

437 **Acknowledgements**

438 We would like to acknowledge NHS England, particularly Mark Svenson for helpful  
439 comments about the study design.

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505

## References

- [1] Summary Reports - High level - NHS Digital (2021). Available at: <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/hospital-accident--emergency-activity/2020-21/summary-reports>.
- [2] A&E waiting times - Nuffield Trust (2023). Available at: <https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/resource/a-e-waiting-times>
- [3] Coronini-Cronberg S, Maile EJ, Majeed A. Health inequalities: the hidden cost of COVID-19 in NHS hospital trusts? *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*. 2020;113(5):179-184. doi:10.1177/0141076820925230
- [4] Carret ML, Fassa AC, Domingues MR. Inappropriate use of emergency services: a systematic review of prevalence and associated factors. *Cad Saude Publica*. 2009 Jan;25(1):7-28. doi: 10.1590/s0102-311x2009000100002. PMID: 19180283.
- [5] Saini P, McIntyre J, Corcoran R, Daras K, Giebel C, Fuller E, Shelton J, Wilson T, Comerford T, Nathan R, Gabbay M. Predictors of emergency department and GP use among patients with mental health conditions: a public health survey. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2019 Dec 26;70(690):e1-e8. doi: 10.3399/bjgp19X707093. PMID: 31848197; PMCID: PMC6917360.
- [6] Scantlebury R, Rowlands G, Durbaba S, et al.. Socioeconomic deprivation and accident and emergency attendances: cross-sectional analysis of general practices in England. *Br J Gen Pract* 2015;65:e649–e654. 10.3399/bjgp15X686893
- [7] Blatchford, O., Capewell, S., Murray, S., & Blatchford, M. (1999). Emergency medical admissions in Glasgow: general practices vary despite adjustment for age, sex, and deprivation. *British Journal of General Practice*, 49(444), 551-554.
- [8] Hull, S. A., Homer, K., Boomla, K., Robson, J., & Ashworth, M. (2018). Population and patient factors affecting emergency department attendance in London: retrospective cohort analysis of linked primary and secondary care records. *British Journal of General Practice*, 68(668), e157-e167.
- [9] Giebel C, McIntyre JC, Daras K, et al. What are the social predictors of accident and emergency attendance in disadvantaged neighbourhoods? Results from a cross-sectional household health survey in the north west of England. *BMJ Open* 2019;9:e022820. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-022820

- 506 [10] Eachus J, Williams M, Chan P, Smith G D, Grainge M, Donovan J et al. Deprivation and  
507 cause specific morbidity: evidence from the Somerset and Avon survey of health BMJ 1996;  
508 312 :287 doi:10.1136/bmj.312.7026.287  
509
- 510 [11] Barnett, K., Mercer, S. W., Norbury, M., Watt, G., Wyke, S., & Guthrie, B. (2012).  
511 Epidemiology of multimorbidity and implications for health care, research, and medical  
512 education: a cross-sectional study. *The Lancet*, 380(9836), 37-43.  
513
- 514 [12] MacKichan, F., Brangan, E., Wye, L., Checkland, K., Lasserson, D., Huntley, A., ... &  
515 Purdy, S. (2017). Why do patients seek primary medical care in emergency departments?  
516 An ethnographic exploration of access to general practice. *BMJ open*, 7(4), e013816.  
517
- 518 [13]Fisher R, Dunn P, Asaria M, Thorlby R. Level or not?. The Health Foundation; 2020  
519 (<https://doi.org/10.37829/HF-2020-RC13>).  
520
- 521 [14] Shah, S. M., & Cook, D. G. (2008). Socio-economic determinants of casualty and NHS  
522 Direct use. *Journal of Public Health*, 30(1), 75-81.  
523
- 524 [15] McHale, P., Wood, S., Hughes, K., Bellis, M. A., Demnitz, U., & Wyke, S. (2013). Who  
525 uses emergency departments inappropriately and when-a national cross-sectional study  
526 using a monitoring data system. *BMC medicine*, 11, 1-9.  
527
- 528 [16] Pereira Gray D, Henley W, Chenore T, et al. 2017. What is the relationship between age  
529 and deprivation in influencing emergency hospital admissions? A model using data from a  
530 defined, comprehensive, all-age cohort in East Devon, UKBMJ Open 2017;7:e014045. doi:  
531 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014045  
532
- 533 [17] Johnson, L., Cornish, R., Boyd, A. et al. Socio-demographic patterns in hospital  
534 admissions and accident and emergency attendances among young people using linkage to  
535 NHS Hospital Episode Statistics: results from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and  
536 Children. *BMC Health Serv Res* 19, 134 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-019-3922-7>  
537
- 538 [18] K Levin, E Crighton, Sex, age and socioeconomic inequalities in older people's  
539 unscheduled care, *European Journal of Public Health*, Volume 29, Issue Supplement\_4,  
540 November 2019, ckz185.142, <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckz185.142>  
541
- 542 [19] Turner, A. J., Francetic, I., Watkinson, R., Gillibrand, S., & Sutton, M. (2022).  
543 Socioeconomic inequality in access to timely and appropriate care in emergency  
544 departments. *Journal of Health Economics*, 85, 102668.  
545
- 546 [20] Beattie, T. F., Gorman, D. R., & Walker, J. J. (2001). The association between  
547 deprivation levels, attendance rate and triage category of children attending a children's  
548 accident and emergency department. *Emergency Medicine Journal*, 18(2), 110-111.  
549
- 550 [21] VanStone, N. A., Belanger, P., Moore, K., & Caudle, J. M. (2014). Socioeconomic  
551 composition of low-acuity emergency department users in Ontario. *Canadian Family*  
552 *Physician*, 60(4), 355-362.  
553

554 [22] Hanscom, D., & Dutton, D. J. (2022). Effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on the  
555 socioeconomic composition of emergency department presentations. *Canadian Journal of*  
556 *Public Health*, 113(6), 878-886.  
557  
558 [23] Agarwal S, Banerjee J, Baker R, et al. Potentially avoidable emergency department  
559 attendance: interview study of patients' reasons for attendance. *Emergency Medicine*  
560 *Journal* 2012;29:e3.  
561  
562 [24] Kangovi, S., Barg, F. K., Carter, T., Long, J. A., Shannon, R., & Grande, D. (2013).  
563 Understanding why patients of low socioeconomic status prefer hospitals over ambulatory  
564 care. *Health affairs*, 32(7), 1196-1203.  
565  
566 [25] Edwards P, Green J, Lachowycz K, et al. Serious injuries in children: variation by area  
567 deprivation and settlement type. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 2008;93:485-489.  
568  
569 [26] Groom L, Kendrick D, Coupland C, et al. Inequalities in hospital admission rates for  
570 unintentional poisoning in young children. *Injury Prevention*. 2006;12(3):166–70.  
571  
572 [27] Nussbaum, C., Massou, E., Fisher, R., Morciano, M., Harmer, R., & Ford, J. B. (2021).  
573 Inequalities in the distribution of the general practice workforce in England: a practice-level  
574 longitudinal analysis. *BJGP Open*, 5 (5), BJGPO. 2021.0066.  
575  
576 [28] Parisi, R., Lau, Y. S., Bower, P., Checkland, K., Rubery, J., Sutton, M., ... &  
577 Kontopantelis, E. (2023). Predictors and population health outcomes of persistent high GP  
578 turnover in English general practices: a retrospective observational study. *BMJ Quality &*  
579 *Safety*, 32(7), 394-403.  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603

604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616

617 **Table 1. Characteristics of the full study population, and characteristics of population with at least one Accident and Emergency**  
 618 **attendance.**

Variable	Levels	Characteristics of the full study population		Attended A&E	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Sex	Male (Reference)	24,939,885	48.2%	5,451,800	47.4%
Sex	Female	26,837,075	51.8%	6,046,720	52.6%
Age group	<5	3,465,435	6.7%	1,183,370	10.3%
Age group	6 to 17 years old	7,575,290	14.6%	1,630,645	14.2%
Age group	18 to 29 years old	6,968,920	13.5%	1,659,520	14.4%
Age group	30 to 49 years old	13,481,765	26.0%	2,605,620	22.7%
Age group	50 to 64 years old	10,371,340	20.0%	1,914,680	16.7%
Age group	65 to 79 years old	7,332,785	14.2%	1,567,305	13.6%
Age group	80 to 95 years old	2,581,425	5.0%	937,385	8.2%
Ethnicity	White (Reference)	42,447,695	82.0%	9,369,880	81.5%
Ethnicity	Black	1,990,730	3.8%	477,400	4.2%
Ethnicity	Mixed/multiple ethnic group	1,472,185	2.8%	358,840	3.1%
Ethnicity	Asian	4,804,180	9.3%	1,030,515	9.0%
Ethnicity	Other	1,062,165	2.1%	261,885	2.3%
IMD Decile	1	5,017,900	9.7%	1,369,020	11.9%
IMD Decile	2	5,105,645	9.9%	1,303,325	11.3%
IMD Decile	3	5,191,665	10.0%	1,253,000	10.9%
IMD Decile	4	5,198,220	10.0%	1,195,605	10.4%
IMD Decile	5	5,206,780	10.1%	1,140,645	9.9%
IMD Decile	6	5,289,110	10.2%	1,121,790	9.8%
IMD Decile	7	5,195,920	10.0%	1,074,875	9.3%
IMD Decile	8	5,227,770	10.1%	1,062,295	9.2%
IMD Decile	9	5,186,325	10.0%	1,019,975	8.9%
IMD Decile	10 (Reference)	5,157,620	10.0%	957,995	8.3%



Health in general	Very good health (Reference)	24,938,600	48.2%	4,806,405	41.8%
Health in general	Good health	17,523,130	33.8%	3,653,440	31.8%
Health in general	Fair health	6,627,135	12.8%	1,952,965	17.0%
Health in general	Bad health	2,082,770	4.0%	815,890	7.1%
Health in general	Very bad health	605,320	1.2%	269,820	2.3%
Disability	Not limited (Reference)	39,089,090	75.5%	7,775,155	67.6%
Disability	Yes - not reduced at all	3,626,320	7.0%	788,235	6.9%
Disability	Yes - reduced a little	5,249,275	10.1%	1,517,625	13.2%
Disability	Yes - reduced a lot	3,812,270	7.4%	1,417,505	12.3%
The National Statistics Socio-economic classification	Higher managerial administrative and professional occupations (Reference)	5,635,755	10.9%	895,330	7.8%
The National Statistics Socio-economic classification	Lower managerial, administrative and professional occupations	8,494,045	16.4%	1,607,350	14.0%
The National Statistics Socio-economic classification	Intermediate occupations	4,915,500	9.5%	1,021,730	8.9%
The National Statistics Socio-economic classification	Small employers and own account workers	4,450,280	8.6%	936,360	8.1%
The National Statistics Socio-economic classification	Lower supervisory and technical occupations	2,248,500	4.3%	514,190	4.5%
The National Statistics Socio-economic classification	Semi-routine occupations	4,825,120	9.3%	1,154,490	10.0%
The National Statistics Socio-economic classification	Routine occupations	5,060,880	9.8%	1,226,295	10.7%
The National Statistics Socio-economic classification	Never worked and long-term unemployed	3,499,995	6.8%	970,120	8.4%
The National Statistics Socio-economic classification	Not classified	12,646,885	24.4%	3,172,655	27.6%
Level of highest qualification	No qualifications	7,601,715	14.7%	2,016,425	17.5%
Level of highest qualification	Other or not classified	11,008,585	21.3%	2,827,375	24.6%
Level of highest qualification	Apprenticeship	2,264,315	4.4%	537,480	4.7%
Level of highest qualification	Level 1: 1-4 GCSEs and equivalent	4,130,020	8.0%	922,610	8.0%
Level of highest qualification	Level 2: 5+ GCSEs and equivalent	5,659,000	10.9%	1,213,940	10.6%
Level of highest qualification	Level 3: A levels, AS levels and equivalent	6,871,590	13.3%	1,425,140	12.4%
Level of highest qualification	Degree level and above (Reference)	14,241,735	27.5%	2,555,555	22.2%

619

620

621

622 **Table 2. Odds ratios for Accident and Emergency Attendance by IMD for unadjusted and health-adjusted models**

Level	Model adjustment	Odds ratio	lower 95%	Upper 95%
IMD Decile 1	Health adjusted	1.41	1.40	1.41
IMD Decile 1	Not health adjusted	1.69	1.68	1.69
IMD Decile 2	Health adjusted	1.34	1.33	1.34
IMD Decile 2	Not health adjusted	1.55	1.54	1.55
IMD Decile 3	Health adjusted	1.27	1.27	1.28
IMD Decile 3	Not health adjusted	1.44	1.44	1.44
IMD Decile 4	Health adjusted	1.22	1.21	1.22
IMD Decile 4	Not health adjusted	1.35	1.34	1.35
IMD Decile 5	Health adjusted	1.16	1.16	1.16
IMD Decile 5	Not health adjusted	1.26	1.25	1.26
IMD Decile 6	Health adjusted	1.13	1.12	1.13
IMD Decile 6	Not health adjusted	1.20	1.20	1.20
IMD Decile 7	Health adjusted	1.10	1.10	1.11
IMD Decile 7	Not health adjusted	1.16	1.15	1.16
IMD Decile 8	Health adjusted	1.09	1.09	1.09
IMD Decile 8	Not health adjusted	1.13	1.12	1.13
IMD Decile 9	Health adjusted	1.06	1.05	1.06
IMD Decile 9	Not health adjusted	1.08	1.08	1.08

623

624

625

626

627

628

629 **Table 3. Odds ratios by age and IMD for unadjusted and health-adjusted models with lower and upper 95% confidence intervals.**  
 630 **Percent relative reduction between unadjusted and health-adjusted models.**

IMD Decile	Model type	Age group	Odds ratio	lower 95%	Upper 95%	Relative reduction	Lower 95% Relative reduction	Upper 95% relative reduction
IMD Decile 1	Health adjusted	0 to 5 years old	1.50	1.48	1.51	-10.7%	-11.1%	-10.5%
IMD Decile 1	Not health adjusted	0 to 5 years old	1.56	1.54	1.57			
IMD Decile 1	Health adjusted	6 to 15 years old	1.40	1.38	1.41	-13.0%	-15.6%	-12.8%
IMD Decile 1	Not health adjusted	6 to 15 years old	1.46	1.45	1.47			
IMD Decile 1	Health adjusted	16 to 29 years old	1.43	1.42	1.44	-24.6%	-25.0%	-24.1%
IMD Decile 1	Not health adjusted	16 to 29 years old	1.57	1.56	1.58			
IMD Decile 1	Health adjusted	30 to 49 years old	1.54	1.53	1.55	-37.2%	-37.6%	-36.8%
IMD Decile 1	Not health adjusted	30 to 49 years old	1.86	1.85	1.87			
IMD Decile 1	Health adjusted	50 to 64 years old	1.39	1.38	1.40	-55.2%	-55.8%	-54.5%
IMD Decile 1	Not health adjusted	50 to 64 years old	1.87	1.86	1.88			
IMD Decile 1	Health adjusted	65 to 79 years old	1.23	1.22	1.24	-68.5%	-69.0%	-67.6%
IMD Decile 1	Not health adjusted	65 to 79 years old	1.73	1.71	1.74			
IMD Decile 1	Health adjusted	80 to 95 years old	1.19	1.18	1.21	-58.7%	-60.0%	-56.3%
IMD Decile 1	Not health adjusted	80 to 95 years old	1.46	1.45	1.48			


631  
 632  
 633  
 634  
 635  
 636  
 637  
 638


639 **Table 4. Odds ratios by acuity and IMD for unadjusted and health-adjusted models with lower and upper 95% confidence intervals.**  
 640 **Percent relative reduction between unadjusted and health-adjusted models.**

Emergency attendance type	Level	Model type	Odds ratio	lower 95%	Upper 95%	Relative reduction	Lower 95% Relative reduction	Upper 95% relative reduction
Immediate care level emergency care	IMD Decile 1	Health adjusted	0.83	0.82	0.85	-32.0%	-31.7%	-32.0%
Immediate care level emergency care	IMD Decile 1	Not health adjusted	1.22	1.20	1.25			
Low acuity care level emergency care	IMD Decile 1	Health adjusted	2.02	2.00	2.04	-19.0%	-18.7%	-18.8%
Low acuity care level emergency care	IMD Decile 1	Not health adjusted	2.26	2.23	2.28			
Standard care level emergency care	IMD Decile 1	Health adjusted	1.46	1.46	1.47	-30.3%	-29.2%	-28.8%
Standard care level emergency care	IMD Decile 1	Not health adjusted	1.66	1.65	1.66			
Urgent care level emergency care	IMD Decile 1	Health adjusted	1.25	1.24	1.25	-60.9%	-62.5%	-61.5%
Urgent care level emergency care	IMD Decile 1	Not health adjusted	1.64	1.64	1.65			
Very urgent level emergency care	IMD Decile 1	Health adjusted	1.40	1.39	1.41	-60.4%	-60.6%	-59.8%
Very urgent level emergency care	IMD Decile 1	Not health adjusted	2.01	1.99	2.02			

641


642





### Odds of attending A&E by IMD deprivation decile and acuity level

England, 21 March 2021 to 31 March 2022



Individuals with a 2021 Census record that linked to the 2019 PDS