

**Title:** Medicaid Expansions and Private Insurance ‘Crowd-Out’ (1999-2019)

**Authors:** Jason Semprini, MPP

**Affiliation:** University of Iowa College of Public Health; Department of Health Management and Policy

**Corresponding Author:**

Jason Semprini

145 N. Riverside R. N 277

Iowa City, IA 52240

[jason-semprini@uiowa.edu](mailto:jason-semprini@uiowa.edu)

**Funding:** NIDCR 1F31DE032250-01

**Conflict:** None to disclose

**Data availability:** Data and replication code available on author’s GitHub repository:

[https://github.com/jsemprini/medicaidexpansion\\_crowdout](https://github.com/jsemprini/medicaidexpansion_crowdout)

## **Medicaid Expansions and Private Insurance ‘Crowd-Out’ (1999-2019)**

### **Abstract**

Recent Medicaid expansions have rekindled the debate around private insurance “crowd-out”. Prior research is limited by short-time horizons and state-specific analyses. Our study overcomes these limitations by evaluating twenty years of Medicaid expansions across the entire United States. We obtain data from the U.S. Census Bureau for all U.S. states and D.C. for private insurance coverage rates of adults 18-64, for years 1999-2019. After estimating a naïve, staggered Two-Way Fixed Effects Difference-in-Differences regression model, we implement four novel econometric methods to diagnose and overcome threats of bias from staggered designs. We also test for pre-treatment differential trends and heterogenous effects over time. Our findings suggest that Medicaid expansion was associated with a 1.5%-point decline in private insurance rates ( $p < 0.001$ ). We also observe significant heterogeneity over time, with estimates peaking four years after expansion. The importance of a 1-2% point crowd-out, we leave for future research and debate.

Since its inception in 1965 as a safety-net insurance program, Medicaid has steadily grown. With each decade, states have expanded the breadth of the program to cover more groups of children and adults<sup>1-3</sup>. Beginning as a program designed to fund healthcare services for people living with disabilities or in extreme poverty, the program now covers children, older adults, parents, and most recently working adults without children<sup>4,5</sup>. Since the 1990's, nearly every state increased their Medicaid eligibility income thresholds. By expanding income eligibility over the years, working parents and childless adults gained access to low-to-no cost public health insurance<sup>6,7</sup>. Despite the obvious direct effect of increasing public health insurance coverage, the proliferation of Medicaid eligibility expansions have rekindled the “crowd-out” debate for private health insurance<sup>8-11</sup>.

The evidence regarding the impact of Medicaid expansion on private insurance is mixed and largely dependent on the specific context in which the expansion is implemented<sup>12-19,19-21</sup>. Some studies have suggested that Medicaid expansion has led to a considerable reduction in the number of individuals with private insurance<sup>12-17</sup>. Reducing the number of individuals who purchase private insurance could in turn lead to a reduction in revenue for private insurance companies, who then charge higher premiums, and ultimately causing a downward spiral of private coverage take-up<sup>22,23</sup>. There have also been reported impacts on quality of privately insured patient care and technology<sup>24</sup>. However, other studies have found that Medicaid expansion has had little to no impact on private insurance coverage<sup>18-20</sup>. Moreover, some studies have suggested that Medicaid expansion could have positive spillover effects into other health insurance markets<sup>25,26</sup>.

While the available evidence suggests a mixed impact of Medicaid expansion on private insurance, the short-term context and state-specific focus limit our ability to draw definitive conclusions. Further research with rigorous study designs and longer-term follow-up are necessary to fully understand the relationship between Medicaid expansion and private insurance crowd-out.

## Methods

### Data

The data used in this study were obtained from the Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement<sup>27</sup>. For the purposes of this study, we used state-level data from the for the years 1999-2019. Specifically, we focused on the rates of individual, between ages 18-64, with private health insurance, as a percentage of the population aged 18 to 64 years.

Using a variety of publicly available sources, we then obtained information on state-level policies to identify when states expanded their income thresholds for Medicaid eligibility<sup>6,28,29</sup>. States that expanded after June 30 of the current year were considered treated in the subsequent year. Table 1 reports the expansion year for all states. Figure 1 reports the year-by-year private uninsurance rate trends by expansion status and year of expansion.

### Design

This study employs a Two-Way Fixed Effects Difference-in-Differences (TWFE-DD) design to examine the effects of state-level expansion of Medicaid eligibility on health insurance rates, specifically private insurance coverage<sup>30</sup>. We specify our reduced form equation here:

$$1) Y_{st} = STATE_s + YEAR_t + B1 \cdot EXPANSION_{st} + e_{st}$$

Equation 1 models  $Y$  = private insurance rate, for each state =  $s$  in year =  $t$ . By including state and year fixed effects, we compare state-level insurance trends for states that expanded Medicaid eligibility with trends in states that did not or have not yet expanded Medicaid. The primary null hypothesis is that expanding Medicaid in year  $\geq t$  by state =  $s$ , was not associated with private insurance rates ( $B1 = 0$ ). Our  $B1$  estimate is unbiased if  $E(est) = 0$ , which would require an assumption that in the absence of expansion insurance rate trends would have remained parallel (common-trends) between states expanding and not expanding Medicaid<sup>31</sup>. This common trend assumption is satisfied if:

$$2) \Delta Y_{st}^1 = \Delta Y_{st}^0$$

Equation 2 simply states that, in the absence of Medicaid expansion, the insurance rate trends in expansion states would be like the trends before and after the expansion years. The pre-treatment common trends assumption can be visually examined and empirically tested, but post-treatment common trends assumptions are unobservable counterfactuals.

### *Addressing Staggered Treatment*

States did not randomly decide to expand Medicaid and did not all do so at the same time. Instead, state policy decisions related to Medicaid expansion were contextual and rolled out across states over time<sup>32-34</sup>. While a TWFE-DD design may be well-suited to address the potential endogeneity concerns associated with this type of policy exposure, recently scholars have exposed the valid concerns about the potential validity of staggered TWFE-DD designs in quasi-experimental policy research<sup>35,36</sup>.

### *Decomposition*

After estimating a naive staggered TWFE-DD model, we first decompose the estimates with the Bacon Decomposition theorem. The Bacon Decomposition theorem proves that the estimand from a staggered TWFE-DD design is simply a weighted average of all 2x2 combinations of Difference-in-Differences (DD) estimates<sup>35</sup>. The weights are statistically determined by the relative share of each group and the group-level variance or timing of the group's exposure to treatment. By understanding the sources of identifying variation within this staggered design, investigators can assess threats to the common-trends identification assumption and implement modern techniques to overcome threats to internal validity.

In unstaggered designs, heterogenous treatment effects are averaged over the entirety of the post-treatment period and do not necessarily bias the comparison between treatment and control groups after treatment. However, in staggered treatment designs, heterogenous treatment effects could bias all estimates where previously treated groups act as controls for later treated groups<sup>35</sup>. The bias is especially apparent if the treatment effects vary over time. For the staggered TWFE design, the common trend assumption in equation 2 must hold for all 2x2 DD's, including both comparisons where expansion states act as respective controls.

The decomposed effect estimates and associated weights yield an estimate for the variance weighted average treatment effect on the treated. Here, B1 from equation 1 is unbiased under two conditions: Zero-Weighted Common-Trends and Time-Invariant Treatment Effects. If either condition fails, B1 is biased under traditional (naïve) staggered TWFE-DD designs. Equation 3 shows the potential sources of bias<sup>35</sup>:

$$3) \quad B1 - B = VWCT - \Delta ATT = \sum_{kj} \sum_{st} (\Delta Y_{st}^1 - \Delta Y_{st}^0) - (Y_{st+1}^1 - Y_{st}^1)$$

Equation 3 shows the two sources of bias. The first term on the right-side of equation 3 is the Variance Weighted Common Trends (VWCT). This term measures the sum of the counterfactual differential trends between each treated and control group estimates. Because this is unobservable, we cannot directly test if this term equals zero. However, we can use pre-treatment comparisons and the full set of weights to estimate the potential magnitude and direction of the VWCT bias term. First, note that the term is weighted (for all group = k and group = j comparisons). According to the Decomposition theorem, even if the unobserved common trend is non-zero, the bias goes to zero as the difference in weights approaches zero<sup>35</sup>. Regarding early and late expansion states, their respective common trend weight is the difference between their weight as a treatment group from their weight as a control group. The VWCT term can also equal zero in the presence of common trends, which can only be observed prior to treatment. The counterfactual common trend cannot be tested. Next, the dynamic or time-variant average treatment effects on the treated (ATT) is the sum of each group-specific change in ATTs over the course of the post-treatment period<sup>37</sup>. Even if the change in ATT does not vary by group, time-variant, increasing ATT biases (downward) the comparison between late-expansion states as treatment and early-expansion states as controls. Decreasing ATT biases the same comparison in the opposite direction.

### *Identification*

In recent years, there has been growing interest in developing methods to overcome the limitations inherent with staggered TWFE-DD designs. In our study, we use three of the most popular methods for estimating causal effects with staggered TWFE-DD designs developed by Chaisemartin and D'Haultfoeuille, Callaway and Santanna, and 3) Borusyak.

The Chaisemartin estimator is a recent method that uses a “fuzzy” DD or Wald-DD principles, to estimate effects of a policy among groups changing their policy status (expanding Medicaid)<sup>36,38</sup>. This method overcomes any dynamic or time-variant effects and can also test for statistically significant non-common trends between expanding states and those states who have not yet expanded. Similarly, the Callaway and Santanna estimator overcomes potential bias from non-common trends and dynamic treatment effects by estimating effect parameters, not just by expansion status, but by group and cohort time periods<sup>39</sup>. The Callaway-Santanna method builds upon doubly-robust frameworks, which use inverse-propensity score weighting to match treatment and control groups, to estimate an effect of a policy across multiple dimensions and then aggregate the resulting estimates into a treatment effect measure. Finally, Borusyak’s method extends the theory and statistical technique of matrix imputation into the realm of unobserved potential outcomes<sup>40</sup>. Here, pre-expansion trends are used to impute “missing” or unobserved counterfactual insurance rate data to use as a comparison for estimating treatment effects and testing for non-common trends.

### Analysis

We analyze Equation 1 as a linear regression model with robust standard errors clustered at the state-level (except for the Callaway-Santanna method – where we instead estimated unclustered standard errors robust to heteroskedasticity). Bootstrapping procedures (999 reps) were used to account for time-variant dynamic treatment effects in the Chaisemartin method<sup>36</sup>. We visually examine our common-trends assumption using the Chaisemartin and Callaway-Santanna methods, and explicitly test for differential pre-treatment trends with all three methods as an event history analysis<sup>36,39,40</sup>. Statistical significance is set at  $\alpha = 0.0125$ , using the Bonferroni method to adjust for multiple hypothesis testing<sup>41</sup>. All analyses were performed in STATA v. 17 using the `xtreg`, `bacon_decomp`, `did_multipleqt`, `csdid`, and `did_imputation` packages<sup>42-46</sup>.

### Results

The naïve TWFE-DD estimate would suggest that Medicaid expansion had no statistically significant association with uninsurance rates (Table 2). However, the decomposition suggests that the average result masks considerable heterogeneity by both ATT estimates and corresponding weights (Figure 2). Meanwhile, the results of the methods which account for bias inherent to staggered TWFE-DD designs suggest otherwise, with estimates nearly 50% higher in magnitude than the naïve estimate. The Chaisemartin method estimates that expansion was associated with a 1.517%-point decline in private insurance rates. The Callaway-Santana method estimates that expansion was associated with a 1.525%-point reduction. Finally, the Borusyak method estimates a 1.354%-point reduction. All three results were statistically significant ( $p < 0.001$ ). These estimates correspond to a 2-3% relative decline in pre-expansion private insurance rates.

We find no evidence that trends private insurance rates differed by expansion status in the years leading up to expansion. All pre-expansion coefficients are null and statistically insignificant (Table 3). These conclusion are consistent across all three of the modern TWFE-DD methods. We do, however, observe significant heterogeneity over time after expansion. Table 3 also reports the event-history estimates of expansion, for each year relative to the time of expansion. The estimates at year = T (year of expansion) range from 0.65% to 0.76%, and only statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  for two of the methods. At year = T+1 (year following expansion), estimates range from -1.6% to -1.8% and are all statistically significant at  $p < 0.001$ . The estimates continue to rise, peaking at year T+4. Figures 3 and 4 depict the event-history heterogeneity. Finally, we do not find strong evidence that the reduction in private insurance rates differed by state. Except for states which expanded in 2006 (MA) and 2012 (CA), Figure 5 shows that Medicaid expansion was associated with significant reductions in private insurance for all states.

### Discussion

The findings of this study have significant implications for healthcare policy and practice, particularly regarding the expansion of Medicaid eligibility and its impact on private insurance rates. Our use of novel causal inference methodology allowed us to investigate a longer period and evaluate staggered expansions, accounting for time-variant dynamic and heterogeneous effects. Our approach allows us to overcome limitations present in previous studies and provide a more comprehensive understanding of the causal impact of Medicaid expansion on private insurance rates.

The key implication of our study is the observed crowding-out of private insurance rates caused by Medicaid expansion. While the decrease in private insurance rates may result in savings for individuals, an increase in Medicaid enrollment and associated costs may offset these savings. Therefore, careful analysis of the budgetary impact is necessary to assess the overall financial implications of expanding Medicaid eligibility<sup>47</sup>. With more individuals opting for Medicaid, the burden of providing healthcare services and associated costs will continue shifting from the private to the public sector<sup>48</sup>. The shift from private to public financing for insurance contrasts the increasingly privatized management of government insurance<sup>49</sup>. This redistribution can have both positive and negative implications, depending on the distributional impacts and overall efficiency of the healthcare system.

Moreover, our study investigates heterogeneous effects of expansion. Understanding that the impact of Medicaid expansion may vary across different populations and contexts is essential for designing targeted policies and assessing the distributional consequences of expansion. By examining heterogeneity, we shed light on how expansion affects private insurance rates. We found that the crowd-out effect of Medicaid expansion peaked between 2-5 years after expansion, then leveled off or diminished. We did not, however, observe significant state heterogeneity. With the exception of Massachusetts, all other average state effects from Medicaid expansion reduced private insurance rates. Knowing that

## Limitations

Our study has several limitations. First, the use of state-level data restricts the granularity of analysis and may overlook within-state variations. Second, the absence of control variables, chosen to maximize flexibility and limit bias from arbitrary analytic decisions, limits our ability to account for other influencing factors. Third, being an observational study, we cannot establish a definitive causal relationship, despite employing advanced causal inference techniques. Endogeneity concerns persist, despite rigorous econometric techniques employed to mitigate them. Future research should address these limitations through more granular data and subgroup analyses to enhance the robustness and generalizability of our findings.

## Conclusions

Medicaid expansions reduced private insurance rates. Yet, we cannot ascertain how this crowd-out may have affected consumer welfare or government budgets. Recognizing the crowd-out, however, enables policymakers to make informed decisions regarding healthcare policy. Future research and policymaking should consider this trade-off. We leave discussion of the importance of a 1-2% point crowd-out for future work.

## References

1. Corallo B, Moreno, S. Analysis of Recent National Trends in Medicaid and CHIP Enrollment. *KFF*. Published online 2023. Accessed May 19, 2023. <https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/issue-brief/analysis-of-recent-national-trends-in-medicaid-and-chip-enrollment/>
2. Paradise J, Lyons B, Rowl D. Medicaid at 50. The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation. Published May 6, 2015. Accessed November 1, 2019. <https://www.kff.org/medicaid/report/medicaid-at-50/>
3. Provost C, Hughes P. Medicaid: 35 Years of Service. *Health Care Financ Rev*. 2000;22(1):141-174.

4. Mann, Cindy, Bachrach, Deborah. Medicaid as Health Insurer: Evolution and Implications. *Commonw Fund*. Published online July 23, 2015. Accessed May 19, 2023. <https://www.commonwealthfund.org/blog/2015/medicaid-health-insurer-evolution-and-implications>
5. MACPAC. *Federal Legislative Milestones in Medicaid and CHIP*.; 2022. Accessed May 19, 2023. <https://www.macpac.gov/reference-materials/federal-legislative-milestones-in-medicaid-and-chip/>
6. CEA. *The Effects of Earlier Medicaid Expansions: A Literature Review* | CEA. White House; 2021. Accessed May 19, 2023. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/cea/written-materials/2021/06/22/the-effects-of-earlier-medicaid-expansions-a-literature-review/>
7. Mazurenko O, Balio CP, Agarwal R, Carroll AE, Menachemi N. The Effects Of Medicaid Expansion Under The ACA: A Systematic Review. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2018;37(6):944-950. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2017.1491
8. Cutler DM, Gruber J. Does Public Insurance Crowd out Private Insurance?\*. *Q J Econ*. 1996;111(2):391-430. doi:10.2307/2946683
9. CMS. *CMS Office of the Actuary Releases 2021-2030 Projections of National Health Expenditures*. CMS; 2023. Accessed May 19, 2023. [https://www.cms.gov/newsroom/press-releases/cms-office-actuary-releases-2021-2030-projections-national-health-expenditures?utm\\_source=substack&utm\\_medium=email](https://www.cms.gov/newsroom/press-releases/cms-office-actuary-releases-2021-2030-projections-national-health-expenditures?utm_source=substack&utm_medium=email)
10. Kaestner R, Garrett B, Chen J, Gangopadhyaya A, Fleming C. Effects of ACA Medicaid Expansions on Health Insurance Coverage and Labor Supply. *J Policy Anal Manage*. 2017;36(3):608-642. doi:10.1002/pam.21993
11. Lennon C. Did the Affordable Care Act's Medicaid Eligibility Expansions Crowd Out Private Health Insurance Coverage? Published online August 24, 2022. doi:10.2139/ssrn.4199086
12. Wagner KL. Medicaid expansions for the working age disabled: Revisiting the crowd-out of private health insurance. *J Health Econ*. 2015;40:69-82. doi:10.1016/j.jhealeco.2014.12.007
13. Ellis CM, Esson MI. Crowd-Out and Emergency Department Utilization. *J Health Econ*. 2021;80:102542. doi:10.1016/j.jhealeco.2021.102542
14. Marquis MS, Long SH. Public insurance expansions and crowd out of private coverage. *Med Care*. 2003;41(3):344-356. doi:10.1097/01.MLR.0000053017.14257.00
15. McInerney M, Winecoff R, Ayyagari P, Simon K, Bundorf MK. ACA Medicaid Expansion Associated With Increased Medicaid Participation and Improved Health Among Near-Elderly: Evidence From the Health and Retirement Study. *Inq J Med Care Organ Provis Financ*. 2020;57:0046958020935229. doi:10.1177/0046958020935229
16. Xu L, Sharma H. Effect of Medicaid Expansion on Health Insurance for Low-Income Nursing Home Aides. *J Appl Gerontol Off J South Gerontol Soc*. 2023;42(2):231-240. doi:10.1177/07334648221132121
17. Dong X, Gindling TH, Miller NA. Effects of the Medicaid expansion under the Affordable Care Act on health insurance coverage, health care access, and use for people with disabilities. *Disabil Health J*. 2022;15(1):101180. doi:10.1016/j.dhjo.2021.101180
18. Lindner S, Levy A, Horner-Johnson W. The Medicaid expansion did not crowd out access for medicaid recipients with disabilities in Oregon. *Disabil Health J*. 2021;14(2):101010. doi:10.1016/j.dhjo.2020.101010
19. Yazici EY, Kaestner R. Medicaid Expansions and the Crowding Out of Private Health Insurance Among Children. *Inquiry*. 2000;37(1):23-32.



20. Atherly A, Call K, Coulam R, Dowd B. Medicaid Expansions and Crowd-Out: Evidence from HIFA Premium Assistance Programs. *Health Serv Res.* 2016;51(1):117-128. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.12317
21. Dubay L, Kenney GM. Health Care Access And Use Among Low-Income Children: Who Fares Best? *Health Aff (Millwood).* 2001;20(1):112-121.
22. McWilliams JM. Health Consequences of Uninsurance among Adults in the United States: Recent Evidence and Implications. *Milbank Q.* 2009;87(2):443-494. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0009.2009.00564.x
23. Wray CM, Khare M, Keyhani S. Access to Care, Cost of Care, and Satisfaction With Care Among Adults With Private and Public Health Insurance in the US. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2021;4(6):e2110275. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.10275
24. Freedman S, Lin H, Simon K. Public health insurance expansions and hospital technology adoption. *J Public Econ.* 2015;121:117-131. doi:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2014.10.005
25. Peng L. How Does Medicaid Expansion Affect Premiums in the Health Insurance Marketplaces? New Evidence from Late Adoption in Pennsylvania and Indiana. *Am J Health Econ.* 2017;3(4):550-576. doi:10.1162/ajhe\_a\_00088
26. Barkowski S, Jun D, Zhang Y. Medicaid Expansion Spillover Effects on Health Care Consumption and Coverage: Evidence from Medicare Administrative Data. Published online March 2, 2022. doi:10.2139/ssrn.4047511
27. US Census. ACS Health Insurance Coverage Status by State and Age [1999-2019]. Published online 2022. Accessed May 19, 2023. <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/health-insurance/acs-hi.html>
28. KFF. States Getting a Jump Start on Health Reform's Medicaid Expansion. *KFF.* Published online April 2, 2012. Accessed May 25, 2022. <https://www.kff.org/health-reform/issue-brief/states-getting-a-jump-start-on-health/>
29. KFF. *Status of State Medicaid Expansion Decisions: Interactive Map.*; 2023. Accessed May 19, 2023. <https://www.kff.org/medicaid/issue-brief/status-of-state-medicaid-expansion-decisions-interactive-map/>
30. Wing C, Simon K, Bello-Gomez RA. Designing Difference in Difference Studies: Best Practices for Public Health Policy Research. *Annu Rev Public Health.* 2018;39(1):453-469. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040617-013507
31. Rambachan A, Roth J. A More Credible Approach to Parallel Trends. *Rev Econ Stud.* Published online February 15, 2023:rdad018. doi:10.1093/restud/rdad018
32. Sparer MS. Federalism and the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010: The Founding Fathers Would Not Be Surprised. *J Health Polit Policy Law.* 2011;36(3):461-468. doi:10.1215/03616878-1271099
33. Courtemanche C, Marton J, Ukert B, Yelowitz A, Zapata D. Early Impacts of the Affordable Care Act on Health Insurance Coverage in Medicaid Expansion and Non-Expansion States. *J Policy Anal Manage.* 2017;36(1):178-210. doi:10.1002/pam.21961
34. Sparer MS. Federalism And The ACA: Lessons For The 2020 Health Policy Debate. *Health Aff (Millwood).* 2020;39(3):487-493. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2019.01366
35. Goodman-Bacon A. Difference-in-differences with variation in treatment timing. *J Econom.* 2021;225(2):254-277. doi:10.1016/j.jeconom.2021.03.014



36. de Chaisemartin C, D'Haultfœuille X. Two-Way Fixed Effects Estimators with Heterogeneous Treatment Effects. *Am Econ Rev*. 2020;110(9):2964-2996. doi:10.1257/aer.20181169
37. Sun L, Abraham S. Estimating dynamic treatment effects in event studies with heterogeneous treatment effects. *J Econom*. 2021;225(2):175-199. doi:10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.09.006
38. de Chaisemartin C, D'Haultfœuille X. Fuzzy Differences-in-Differences. *Rev Econ Stud*. 2018;85(2):999-1028. doi:10.1093/restud/rdx049
39. Callaway B, Sant'Anna PHC. Difference-in-Differences with multiple time periods. *J Econom*. 2021;225(2):200-230. doi:10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.12.001
40. Borusyak K, Jaravel X, Spiess J. *Revisiting Event Study Designs: Robust and Efficient Estimation*. Social Science Research Network; 2022. doi:10.2139/ssrn.2826228
41. Kitchin J. 6 - Basic Statistical Inference. In: Stanford JL, Vardeman SB, eds. *Methods in Experimental Physics*. Vol 28. Statistical Methods for Physical Science. Academic Press; 1994:155-186. doi:10.1016/S0076-695X(08)60256-2
42. McCaffrey DF, Lockwood JR, Mihaly K, Sass TR. A Review of Stata Commands for Fixed-Effects Estimation in Normal Linear Models. *Stata J*. 2012;12(3):406-432. doi:10.1177/1536867X1201200305
43. Chaisemartin C de, D'Haultfœuille X, Guyonvarch Y. DID\_MULTIPLEGT: Stata module to estimate sharp Difference-in-Difference designs with multiple groups and periods. *Stat Softw Compon*. Published online May 4, 2023. Accessed May 19, 2023. <https://ideas.repec.org/c/boc/bocode/s458643.html>
44. Rios-Avila F, Sant'Anna PHC, Callaway B. CSDID: Stata module for the estimation of Difference-in-Difference models with multiple time periods. *Stat Softw Compon*. Published online February 25, 2023. Accessed May 19, 2023. <https://ideas.repec.org/c/boc/bocode/s458976.html>
45. Goodman-Bacon A, Goldring T, Nichols A. BACONDECOMP: Stata module to perform a Bacon decomposition of difference-in-differences estimation. *Stat Softw Compon*. Published online September 21, 2022. Accessed May 19, 2023. <https://ideas.repec.org/c/boc/bocode/s458676.html>
46. Borusyak K. DID\_IMPUTATION: Stata module to perform treatment effect estimation and pre-trend testing in event studies. Published online April 24, 2023. Accessed May 19, 2023. <https://econpapers.repec.org/software/bocbocode/s458957.htm>
47. Gruber J, Sommers BD. Fiscal Federalism and the Budget Impacts of the Affordable Care Act's Medicaid Expansion. Published online March 2020. doi:10.3386/w26862
48. KFF. *Health Insurance Historical Tables*.; 2022. Accessed May 19, 2023. <https://www.kff.org/other/state-indicator/total-population/>
49. Hinton E, Raphael J. 10 Things to Know About Medicaid Managed Care. *KFF*. Published online March 1, 2023. Accessed May 19, 2023. <https://www.kff.org/medicaid/issue-brief/10-things-to-know-about-medicaid-managed-care/>

## Tables and Figures

**Table 1: State Medicaid Expansion Status**

<b>Expansion Year</b>	<b>States</b>
never	AL, FL, GA, ID, KS, ME, MS, MO, NE, NC, OK, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, WI, WY
<1999	DE, NY, VT
2006	MA
2011	DC, WA
2012	CA
2014	AZ, AR, CO, CT, HI, IL, IA, KY, MD, MI, MN, NV, NJ, NM, ND, OH, OR, RI, WV
2015	IN, NH, PA
2016	AK, MT
2017	LA
2019	VA

Table 1 reports the year each state expanded Medicaid income eligibility.

**Table 2: TWFE-DD Estimates of Medicaid Expansion on Private Insurance Rates**

	Naïve	Chaisemartin	Callaway-Santana	Borusyak
<i>ATT</i>	-0.985	-1.517****	-1.525****	-1.354****
	(0.577)	(0.403)	(0.376)	(0.380)

Table 2 reports the results of the TWFE-DD linear regression models estimating the effect of Medicaid expansion on private insurance rates (1999-2019; adults between age 18-64). Standard errors are reported in parentheses.

\*\*\*\* p < 0.001.


**Table 3: Event History Estimates of Relative Time to Medicaid Expansion on Private Insurance Rates**

	Chaisemartin	Callaway-Santana	Borusyak
<i>T</i> -5	0.221 (0.492)	0.120 (0.254)	0.371 (0.441)
<i>T</i> -4	0.349 (0.382)	-0.270 (0.167)	0.126 (0.482)
<i>T</i> -3	0.182 (0.346)	0.093 (0.192)	0.509 (0.539)
<i>T</i> -2	0.300 (0.264)	0.114 (0.191)	0.537 (0.575)
<i>T</i> -1	0.375 (0.245)	-0.366 (0.267)	0.231 (0.686)
<i>T</i> = 0	-0.648**** (0.199)	-0.757**** (0.254)	-0.751** (0.377)
<i>T</i> + 1	-1.550**** (0.321)	1.600**** (0.167)	-1.780**** (0.396)
<i>T</i> + 2	-1.631**** (0.445)	1.761**** (0.192)	-1.723**** (0.377)
<i>T</i> + 3	-1.789**** (0.518)	1.856**** (0.191)	-1.834**** (0.395)
<i>T</i> + 4	-1.821**** (0.527)	1.918**** (0.267)	-2.058**** (0.460)
<i>T</i> + 5	-1.786**** (0.689)	1.820*** (0.626)	-1.687*** (0.527)

Table 3 reports the results of the Event History Analyses linear regression models estimating the pre-expansion (*T*-5 to *T*-1) differential trends and post-treatment (*T* = 0 to *T*+5) by expansion status on insurance (1999-2019; adults between age 18-64). Standard errors are reported in parentheses. *T*-5 indicates 5 relative years before expanding Medicaid; *T*-1 indicates 1 relative year before expanding Medicaid. *T* = 0 indicates year of Medicaid expansion.

\*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ .

**Figure 1: Private Insurance Rate Trends (1999-2019: Age 18-64)**



F1 visualizes the trends in private insurance rates (%) from 1999-2019 for adults between ages 18-64. Vertical grey lines indicate when each state (group ID) expanded Medicaid income eligibility. 0 = never (AL, FL, GA, ID, KS, ME, MS, MO, NE, NC, OK, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, WI, WY); 1 = <1999 (DE, NY, VT) ; 2 = 2006 (MA) ; 3 = 2011 (DC, WA) ; 4 = 2012 (CA) ; 5 = 2014 (AZ, AR, CO, CT, HI, IL, IA, KY, MD, MI, MN, NV, NJ, NM, ND, OH, OR, RI, WV) ; 6 = 2015 (IN, NH, PA) ; 7 = 2016 (AK, MT) ; 8 = 2017 (LA) ; 9 = 2019 (VA).

**Figure 2: Decomposition of Naïve TWFE-DD Estimates of Medicaid Expansion on Private Insurance**




Figure 2 reports the results of the Bacon Decomposition following the naïve TWFE-DD regression. The redline represents the overall DD Estimate =  $-0.985$  ( $p < 0.1$ ). Timing group estimates involve previously expanding states as controls to expansion states.

**Figure 3: Event History Study Analysis of Medicaid Expansions Effect on Private Insurance**




Figure 3 reports the Medicaid expansion coefficient estimates for each time-period relative to the year of expansion.



**Figure 4: Event-History Analysis of Medicaid Expansions Effect on Private Insurance**




Figure 4 aggregates the group and time-period estimates into an event-history analysis showing the differential trends by expansion status in private insurance before and after expansion.

**Figure 5: State Heterogeneity of Medicaid Expansions Effect on Private Insurance**

