

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Association between Insurance Type and Extended Length of Stay in Urban & Rural Vermont Hospitals

Patrick C. Payne, MPH¹ | Mia Klonsky, MPH¹ |
Katrina Moreau, M.A.T., MLS (ASCP)CM, MPH¹ |
Alyssa Oviedo, MPH¹ | Sarah Nowak PhD¹

¹Larner College of Medicine, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont, 05401, United States

Correspondence

Email: patrick.payne@uvm.edu

Funding information

No funding was received for this project.

Purpose

To evaluate the link between insurance status and patient length of stay (LOS) for inpatient admissions in rural and urban hospitals in Vermont.

Methods

We conducted a cross-sectional study utilizing 2016 to 2020 data from the Vermont Uniform Hospital at Data Discharge System (VUHDDS). Vermont residents 18-64 years of age admitted for heart and circulatory illnesses who spent least one day as inpatient at one of Vermont's 14 hospitals were included. Frequency statistics were run to determine distribution of sample characteristics and a two-side Z-test was conducted to compare differences between normal and extended lengths of stay. Three multivariate logistic regression models were utilized to control for confounding factors and identify differences in lengths of stay and mortality.

Findings

Private insurance was more common among patients with a normal LOS (46%) and public insurance more common among patients with extended lengths of stay (54%). Rural Medicare patients have 0.77 (CI: 0.66-0.90) times lower

odds of extended LOS, which is distinct from the 95% confidence interval for urban patients (CI: 0.94-1.46). Urban Medicaid insured patients had 1.413 (CI: 1.15-1.74) times greater odds of an extended LOS, which is outside of the 95% confidence interval for rural patients (CI: 0.80-1.09).

Conclusions

In conclusion, the rurality of a patient's residence appears to impact health outcomes for cardiac related discharges for individuals in Vermont related to their insurer. Further studies with more demographic data are needed to better understand the implications of these findings.

KEYWORDS

Rural Population, Urban Population, Heart Diseases, Vermont, Health Insurance, Length of Stay, Patient Discharge

Introduction

In the United States, a patient's insurance status – private, public, or no health insurance – often dictates many aspects of the care they can receive. The disparities between public and private insurance are noteworthy, with publicly insured individuals having significantly higher mortality rates for common conditions and less access to medical care.^{1,2} In addition to inequities based on insurance type, the difference between care in rural and urban settings makes this gap even larger. Rural areas often see lower private health insurance rates among their populations.³ Rural areas tend to have much higher rates of Medicaid insurance than their urban counterparts in patient populations under 65. This issue, coupled with fewer options for care, can lead to higher mortality rates for diseases like cancer and lower life expectancy within the population.^{4,5} Studies have found many of these rural communities that lack high rates of both public and private insurance coverage have a low understanding of health insurance and care options, causing the barriers to care to be more significant.⁶⁻⁸

Many studies have shown place indicates whether a person is insured, and rural communities tend to have much lower rates than urban ones.^{9,10} There is also substantial evidence that rural communities have poorer health outcomes than patients in urban communities.^{11,12} By researching insurance type compared to patient outcomes such as length of stay (LOS), discharge status, and diagnosis in Vermont, we intend to better understand the role health insurance plays in patient care between rural and urban in-patient environments for patients aged 18 and 64 years. This investigation will contribute to the growing body of research supporting health insurance reform by filling the gaps in our understanding of health insurance's health benefits as it relates to patient outcomes in rural and urban settings.

Methods

We conducted a cross-sectional study utilizing 2016 to 2020 data from the Vermont Uniform Hospital Data Discharge System (VUHDDS). The VUHDDS database is managed by the Vermont Department of Health and administered by

the Green Mountain Care Board. This database contains emergency department and inpatient data for all 14 acute care hospitals in Vermont and is available as a limited use Data Set which includes reasons for admission, treatments, charges, diagnoses, and discharge data. This database was selected as Vermont was an early adopter of Medicaid expansion and has documented efforts of payer reform dating back to 2009.^{13,14}

| Study Population

The study population included all Vermont residents 18-64 years of age who spent at least one day as inpatient at one of Vermont's 14 hospitals between 2016 and 2020. Sex and age were the only socio-demographic variables available in the database and both were included. The hospital admission data was limited to patients who were transferred from a hospital, non-health care facility point of origin, and clinical or doctor office referral. The hospital discharge data utilized were patients transferred to another acute hospital, skilled nursing facility, home (own or family care), home health, departure against medical advice, and death. Case mix index (CMI) is determined based on the Medicare Severity Diagnosis Related Groups associated with each patient and the severity and complexity of their disease. The CMI was used as the average of relative weights for the patients assigned to a specific population or group.

| Exclusion Criteria

Individuals were excluded if they were not a resident of Vermont, were <18 or >64 years of age, and did not have a major diagnostic category of a "heart and circulatory" diagnosis. Since we were only interested in insurance coverage by type, we excluded patients with worker's compensation or no charge for coverage of payment.

| Statistical Analysis

SPSS version 26 was utilized to clean the data and for all computational methods. Frequency statistics were run to determine the distribution of sex, age groups, admission source and type, discharge status and year, hospital service area and rurality, and principle payer (insurance type). A two-sided Z-test was run to determine the difference between frequency statistics for normal and extended LOS. Additionally, individuals were coded as a rural or urban Vermont resident by hospital service area (HSA). Vermont has 14 hospitals with the Burlington hospital coded as urban and the other 13 coded as rural based off the U.S. Office of Management and Budget definition of rurality for the location of the hospital in the HSA. Frequency statistics were also run to determine the variability in insurance status (exposure) using the principal payment source data. We then performed descriptive analysis on LOS, producing Table 1.

Our outcome measure, LOS, was analyzed using multivariate logistic regression with three regressions models being designed, one on unstratified and the others with data stratified by rurality of the patient. The strata that were formed are urban patients and rural patients. LOS was converted to binary variables by defining the quartiles for the variable and identifying in the upper quartile for the LOS at the patient's hospital with the the same major diagnostic category, consistent with other publications.^{15,16} Results from the multivariate logistic regression analyses are reported for the study period with adjusted odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals. We completed a stepwise regression analysis to select variables for inclusion that were not initially identified through the purposeful selection of covariates. Insurance status was analyzed by principal payer type, rurality by hospital service area, and mortality by discharge status.

The extended LOS regression model contained admission type, admission source, age group, biological sex, principal payer, year of discharge, hospital service area, patient charges divided by LOS, and number of specialty care

days. This model included discharge status as a covariate to account for censorship. Analysis of missingness was conducted to determine if missing values had any correlations. Based on the missingness findings, only complete entries were utilized in the analysis. All tests were two-sided with a level of significance of 0.05. The University of Vermont Institutional Review Board has reviewed this project and determined that it qualifies as exempt from additional review.

Results

The sample contained 7,766 discharges of patients after applying the exclusion and inclusion criteria (Table 1). The sample consisted of 6,137 discharged patients that had a normal LOS and 1,629 discharged patients that had an extended LOS at the hospital where they received treatment. The patients were mostly male (63.5%), aged 60-64 (35.7%) and from a rural hospital service area (69.8%). The most common public insurance was Medicaid (24.7%) and most common private insurance BlueCross BlueShield of Vermont (BCBSVT) (29.0%).

The patients that experienced an extended LOS showed higher case complexities, with an average case mix index of 2.985. Having BCBSVT, a private insurer, was significantly more common among those who experienced a normal LOS (31.35%) and Medicare & Medicaid were significantly more common among those with an extended LOS (31.98% & 27.38%). The average age of the extended LOS patients is marginally greater (54.7 years, 54.0 years). Patients with extended lengths of stay were mainly discharged to home health (45.55%), whereas normal LOS patients were discharged to their own or family care (73.36%).

After controlling for significant confounding factors, the multivariate logistic regression showed that patients with Commercial Insurance, CHAMPUS, or HMO insurance plans had odds of an extended LOS that were 1.32 (95% CI: 1.15 - 1.52), 2.035 (95% CI: 1.36-3.06), and 1.72 (95% CI: 1.40-2.12) times that of BCBSVT insured patients. The unstratified sample (Table 2) suggests that we are not able to conclude that patients with the Medicare and Medicaid have differences in LOS compared to the largest private insurer in Vermont, BCBSVT. However, stratifying by the patient being from a rural or urban hospital service area reveals a difference in the strata.

The strata show differences in LOS for rural and urban patients depending on the patient's insurer. Notably, the large public insurers decrease the odds of an extended LOS in rural patients, but increase the odds of an extended LOS for urban patients (Table 3). Rural medicare patients have 0.781 (95% CI: 0.669-0.912) times lower odds of extended LOS, which is significantly different from the 95% confidence interval for urban patients (95% CI: 0.944-1.460). Urban medicaid insured patients had 1.413 (95% CI: 1.151-1.735) times greater odds of an extended LOS. The 95% confidence intervals for urban and rural medicaid insured patients are non-overlapping, which is distinct from the 95% confidence interval for rural patients (Urban 1.151-1.735, Rural: 0.798-1.086).

There is a notable difference in the odds ratios for the rural patients with elective admissions and urban patients with elective admissions. Rural patients with elective admissions have 1.434 (95% CI: 1.212-1.697) times greater odds of an extended LOS. Whereas urban elective admissions have lower odds of extended LOS by a factor of 0.464 (95% CI: 0.383-0.561).

The models explained a moderate portion of the variability in LOS with Cox and Snell pseudo-R² values of 0.301, 0.319, and 0.304 for the models unstratified data, rural patient stratum, and urban patient stratum as present in Tables 2 and 3. The F1-score for these models were 0.844, 0.844, and 0.849, respectively.

Discussion

Focusing on the Vermont cardiac related discharges, we found that differences are present between the patient outcomes for individuals living in an urban population and those of the rural populations. The largest private insurer,

BCBSVT, had the lowest odds of an extended LOS for urban patients. Being insured with Medicare was associated with lower odds of an extended LOS for rural patients. The differences in LOS were most notable in the reduction in odds of extended LOS for rural Medicare patients. This potentially arises from the higher proportion of publicly insured patients in rural settings. Although it is not fully understood, the tendency for rural individuals to receive less treatment could be due to smaller hospital size and a lower proportion of board-certified physicians.¹⁷ This may also explain the higher odds of extended LOS for urban patients – they are receiving more treatments in a bigger hospital, with an intensive care unit and higher proportion of board-certified specialists.^{17,18}

The urban and rural populations also show a significant difference related to elective admissions, with urban patients receiving elective treatments having less than half the odds of an extended LOS and rural patients having higher odds when admitted for elective rather than emergency reasons. This may be related to the level of care received at the urban hospitals being higher, with elective surgeries and treatments being more routinely performed.

Limitations of the study were due to the limited demographic data and clinical detail available for each patient. Additional data regarding demographics such as socioeconomic status, race, and zip code were requested, but were unable to be obtained. Social determinants of health such as the socioeconomic status, race, and geographical location of a patient would have been beneficial to the analysis as the role these factors play in an individual's health have been well documented and could have had an impact on patient's LOS.

Many other studies analyzing the relationship between rural/urban healthcare settings and outcomes do so through one diagnostic category such as atrial fibrillation and myocardial infarction.^{19,20} Many studies have not accounted for existing comorbidities or insurance status, the latter of which we believe can be a protective factor in healthcare settings. Additionally, studies like that of Davidson et al. show that uninsured patients have the shortest LOS while minimal difference exists between other insurance types²¹ – however, this study does not address differences between rural and urban settings, which was important to address in this paper due to the disparities in health care between each location, as well as the rurality of Vermont.

This study concluded that there were no apparent differences in LOS dependent on insurance status, with Medicare, Medicaid, and BCBSVT patients experiencing similar odds of an extended LOS when unstratified. However, when adding the additional factor of rurality, the regression showed that rural patients had greater protection from an extended LOS when having a public insurer like Medicare and the opposite finding was present in urban patients. It is important to use this information to assess accessibility and impact of health insurance in Vermont (and other states like Vermont), as well as outcomes for patients dependent on whether they are rural or urban. Further research is needed that considers demographic data and utilizes stronger regression models to further analyze the trends of patient outcomes based on their insurance status and rural/urban location.

Conclusion

The rurality of a patient appears to impact health outcomes for cardiac related discharges for patients in Vermont related to the patient's insurer. Further studies with more demographic are needed to better understand the implications of these findings.

TABLE 1 Sample Characteristics for patient samples having an extended and normal LOS. Statistically significant differences between the two categories are indicated a p-value less than 0.05. No test of comparison is performed for continuous variables.

	Normal LOS (N=6137)	Extended LOS (N=1629)	P value
Principal Payer			
Medicare	1349 (21.98%)	521 (31.98%)	<0.05
Medicaid	1470 (23.95%)	446 (27.38%)	<0.05
CHAMPUS	65 (1.06%)	20 (1.23%)	
Other Government	42 (0.68%)	11 (0.68%)	
Self Pay	195 (3.18%)	36 (2.21%)	<0.05
MVP	91 (1.48%)	19 (1.17%)	
Commercial Insurance	753 (12.27%)	178 (10.93%)	
HMO	248 (4.04%)	66 (4.05%)	
BCBSVT	1924 (31.35%)	332 (20.38%)	<0.05
Age Group			
18-24	69 (1.12%)	18 (1.10%)	
25-29	60 (0.98%)	25 (1.53%)	
30-34	104 (1.69%)	34 (2.09%)	
35-39	192 (3.13%)	52 (3.19%)	
40-44	319 (5.20%)	66 (4.05%)	
45-49	577 (9.40%)	121 (7.43%)	<0.05
50-54	1044 (17.01%)	273 (16.76%)	
55-59	1634 (26.63%)	408 (25.05%)	
60-64	2138 (34.84%)	632 (38.80%)	<0.05
Admission Source			
Transfer from a Hospital	1261 (20.55%)	328 (20.14%)	
Clinic or Doctor Office Referral	295 (4.81%)	93 (5.71%)	
Non-Health Care Facility Point of Origin	4581 (74.65%)	1208 (74.16%)	
Admission Type			
Urgent	1299 (21.17%)	359 (22.04%)	
Elective	638 (10.40%)	215 (13.20%)	<0.05
Emergency	4200 (68.44%)	1055 (64.76%)	<0.05
Discharge Status			
To Another Acute Hospital	710 (11.57%)	75 (4.60%)	<0.05
To a Skilled Nursing Facility	58 (0.95%)	149 (9.15%)	<0.05
Home - Home Health	671 (10.93%)	742 (45.55%)	<0.05
Against Medical Advice	113 (1.84%)	39 (2.39%)	
Died	83 (1.35%)	31 (1.90%)	
Home - Own or Family Care	4502 (73.36%)	593 (36.40%)	<0.05

TABLE 1 cont. Sample Characteristics for patient samples having an extended and normal LOS. Statistically significant differences between the two categories are indicated a p-value less than 0.05. No test of comparison is performed for continuous variables.

	Normal LOS (N=6137)	Extended LOS (N=1629)	P value
Year of Discharge			
2016	1186 (19.33%)	302 (18.54%)	
2017	1242 (20.24%)	318 (19.52%)	
2018	1283 (20.91%)	330 (20.26%)	
2019	1287 (20.97%)	349 (21.42%)	
2020	1139 (18.56%)	330 (20.26%)	
Sex			
Female	2197 (35.80%)	637 (39.10%)	<0.05
Male	3940 (64.20%)	992 (60.90%)	<0.05
Hospital Service Area			
Burlington	1875 (30.55%)	472 (28.97%)	
Morrisville	383 (6.24%)	87 (5.34%)	
Randolph	147 (2.40%)	41 (2.52%)	
Newport	171 (2.79%)	45 (2.76%)	
St. Johnsbury	159 (2.59%)	37 (2.27%)	
St. Albans	725 (11.81%)	200 (12.28%)	
Middlebury	282 (4.60%)	90 (5.52%)	
Rutland	907 (14.78%)	236 (14.49%)	
Bennington	222 (3.62%)	47 (2.89%)	
Springfield	147 (2.40%)	42 (2.58%)	
White River Jct.	67 (1.09%)	12 (0.74%)	
Brattleboro	110 (1.79%)	32 (1.96%)	
Barre	942 (15.35%)	288 (17.68%)	<0.05
Is the patient from a rural or urban area?			
Urban	1875 (30.55%)	472 (28.97%)	
Rural	4262 (69.45%)	1157 (71.03%)	
Mean charge per day (95% CI)	\$10,546 (10342 , 10755)	\$6,442 (6273, 6612)	
Median Number of days in a specialty care unit	0	0	
Mean Case Mix Index Weight (95% CI)	1.593 (1.561, 1.626)	2.985 (2.869, 3.100)	

CI = Confidence Interval

TABLE 2 Results of a multivariate logistic regression of extended LOS among patients discharged between 2016 and 2020. The data used in this model represents the entire dataset after inclusions and exclusion, i.e. the data is unstratified.

	OR	Lower CI	Upper CI	P value
Principal Payer				
Medicare	0.934	0.825	1.058	0.283
Medicaid	1.123	0.995	1.268	0.060
CHAMPUS	2.035	1.356	3.055	0.001
Other Government	1.190	0.729	1.942	0.486
Self Pay	0.980	0.736	1.306	0.892
MVP	1.101	0.768	1.579	0.601
Commercial Insurance	1.321	1.146	1.522	< 0.001
HMO	1.722	1.397	2.122	< 0.001
BCBSVT	REF	REF	REF	
Age Group				
18-24	1.822	1.204	2.759	0.005
25-29	2.149	1.487	3.105	< 0.001
30-34	0.995	0.727	1.361	0.973
35-39	1.380	1.081	1.761	0.010
40-44	1.021	0.830	1.257	0.845
45-49	0.941	0.797	1.112	0.474
50-54	1.144	1.008	1.297	0.036
55-59	1.013	0.908	1.130	0.818
60-64	REF	REF	REF	
Admission Source				
Transfer from a Hospital	1.803	1.553	2.093	< 0.001
Clinic or Doctor Office Referral	1.004	0.777	1.296	0.977
Non-Health Care Facility Point of Origin	REF	REF	REF	
Admission Type				
Urgent	1.267	1.099	1.459	0.001
Elective	0.820	0.726	0.927	0.001
Emergency	REF	REF	REF	
Discharge Status				
To Another Acute Hospital	0.644	0.518	0.800	< 0.001
To a Skilled Nursing Facility	19.704	14.987	25.906	< 0.001
Home - Home Health	8.293	7.515	9.152	< 0.001
Against Medical Advice	2.136	1.573	2.900	< 0.001
Died	4.487	3.392	5.936	< 0.001
Home - Own or Family Care	REF	REF	REF	

OR = odds ratio, CI = Confidence Interval

TABLE 2 cont. Results of a multivariate logistic regression of extended LOS among patients discharged between 2016 and 2020. The data used in this model represents the entire dataset after inclusions and exclusion, i.e. the data is unstratified.

	OR	Lower CI	Upper CI	P value
Year of Discharge				
2016	REF	REF	REF	
2017	0.984	0.860	1.127	0.820
2018	1.130	0.985	1.296	0.080
2019	1.271	1.108	1.457	0.001
2020	1.725	1.499	1.985	< 0.001
Sex				
Female	0.834	0.761	0.914	< 0.001
Male	REF	REF	REF	
Hospital Service Area				
Burlington	1.339	1.168	1.535	< 0.001
Morrisville	0.813	0.666	0.993	0.043
Randolph	1.192	0.822	1.727	0.354
Newport	0.815	0.598	1.110	0.194
St. Johnsbury	0.835	0.584	1.194	0.324
St. Albans	1.152	0.981	1.353	0.085
Middlebury	1.244	1.016	1.522	0.034
Rutland	0.974	0.829	1.144	0.748
Bennington	0.253	0.178	0.360	< 0.001
Springfield	0.609	0.418	0.887	0.010
White River Jct.	0.870	0.505	1.500	0.617
Brattleboro	0.813	0.533	1.240	0.336
Barre	REF	REF	REF	
Log of the mean charge per day	0.048	0.040	0.057	< 0.001
Number of days in a specialty care unit	0.984	0.980	0.989	< 0.001

OR = odds ratio, CI = Confidence Interval

TABLE 3 Results from a stratified multivariate logistic regression. The strata represent the patients from urban hospital service areas and the rural hospital service areas. The model for the strata differ on one variable. The hospital service area variable is not included in the urban regression as there is only one area, Burlington.

	Rural Patient Stratum (n = 5419)				Urban Patient Stratum (n = 2347)			
	OR	Lower CI	Upper CI	P value	OR	Lower CI	Upper CI	P value
Principal Payer								
Medicare	0.781	0.669	0.912	0.002	1.174	0.944	1.460	0.148
Medicaid	0.931	0.798	1.086	0.365	1.413	1.151	1.735	0.001
CHAMPUS	1.286	0.731	2.262	0.383	4.470	2.404	8.309	< 0.001
Other Government	0.946	0.501	1.788	0.865	1.157	0.507	2.644	0.729
Self Pay	0.720	0.493	1.052	0.090	1.519	0.955	2.419	0.078
MVP	1.227	0.751	2.004	0.413	0.832	0.486	1.426	0.503
Commercial Insurance	0.979	0.813	1.179	0.825	1.897	1.509	2.385	< 0.001
HMO	1.396	1.039	1.876	0.027	2.508	1.849	3.402	< 0.001
BCBSVT	REF	REF	REF		REF	REF	REF	
Age Group								
18-24	1.796	1.012	3.188	0.045	1.780	0.950	3.334	0.072
25-29	2.261	1.394	3.669	0.001	2.085	1.170	3.716	0.013
30-34	0.897	0.600	1.341	0.596	1.028	0.608	1.739	0.917
35-39	1.089	0.795	1.491	0.597	1.874	1.243	2.823	0.003
40-44	1.491	1.158	1.919	0.002	0.426	0.279	0.651	< 0.001
45-49	0.919	0.743	1.137	0.438	1.043	0.785	1.386	0.772
50-54	1.081	0.921	1.267	0.340	1.224	0.991	1.511	0.061
55-59	0.904	0.787	1.039	0.154	1.217	1.015	1.460	0.034
60-64	REF	REF	REF		REF	REF	REF	
Admission Source								
Transfer from a Hospital	2.361	1.983	2.811	< 0.001	1.045	0.697	1.568	0.830
Clinic or Doctor Office Referral	0.807	0.587	1.109	0.186	1.788	1.141	2.801	0.011
Non-Health Care Facility Point of Origin	REF	REF	REF		REF	REF	REF	
Admission Type								
Urgent	1.429	1.209	1.688	< 0.001	1.079	0.799	1.455	0.621
Elective	1.434	1.212	1.697	< 0.001	0.464	0.383	0.561	< 0.001
Emergency	REF	REF	REF		REF	REF	REF	
Discharge Status								
To Another Acute Hospital	0.649	0.511	0.824	< 0.001	1.502	0.796	2.832	0.209
To a Skilled Nursing Facility	17.660	12.820	24.326	< 0.001	25.231	14.540	43.783	< 0.001
Home - Home Health	8.135	7.166	9.234	< 0.001	8.797	7.456	10.380	< 0.001
Against Medical Advice	1.943	1.337	2.825	< 0.001	3.499	1.931	6.341	< 0.001
Died	3.876	2.686	5.593	< 0.001	4.049	2.618	6.261	< 0.001
Home - Own or Family Care	REF	REF	REF		REF	REF	REF	

OR = odds ratio, CI = Confidence Interval

TABLE 3 cont. Results from a stratified multivariate logistic regression. The strata represent the patients from urban hospital service areas and the rural hospital service areas. The model for the strata differ on one variable. The hospital service area variable is not included in the urban regression as there is only one area, Burlington.

	Rural Patient Stratum (n = 5419)				Urban Patient Stratum (n = 2347)			
	OR	Lower CI	Upper CI	P value	OR	Lower CI	Upper CI	P value
Year of Discharge								
2016	REF	REF	REF		REF	REF	REF	
2017	0.982	0.831	1.162	0.837	1.001	0.789	1.269	0.995
2018	1.110	0.935	1.318	0.233	1.064	0.837	1.352	0.613
2019	1.234	1.040	1.464	0.016	1.321	1.040	1.679	0.022
2020	1.470	1.227	1.760	< 0.001	2.370	1.871	3.002	< 0.001
Sex								
Female	0.925	0.824	1.039	0.188	0.664	0.566	0.779	< 0.001
Male	REF	REF	REF		REF	REF	REF	
Hospital Service Area								
Burlington	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Morrisville	1.266	0.865	1.852	0.014	-	-	-	-
Randolph	1.325	0.905	1.938	0.224	-	-	-	-
Newport	0.836	0.609	1.149	0.298	-	-	-	-
St. Johnsbury	0.964	0.663	1.401	0.665	-	-	-	-
St. Albans	1.141	0.966	1.347	0.235	-	-	-	-
Middlebury	1.326	1.079	1.631	0.019	-	-	-	-
Rutland	1.062	0.900	1.253	0.803	-	-	-	-
Bennington	0.317	0.223	0.451	< 0.001	-	-	-	-
Springfield	0.741	0.507	1.084	0.016	-	-	-	-
White River Jct.	0.889	0.511	1.544	0.590	-	-	-	-
Brattleboro	0.951	0.615	1.469	0.635	-	-	-	-
Barre	REF	REF	REF		-	-	-	-
Log of the mean charge per day	0.025	0.020	0.032	< 0.001	0.083	0.063	0.109	< 0.001
Number of days in a specialty care unit	0.984	0.979	0.989	< 0.001	0.986	0.974	0.998	0.022

OR = odds ratio, CI = Confidence Interval

References

- [1] Woolhandler Steffie, Himmelstein David U. The relationship of health insurance and mortality: Is lack of insurance deadly? *Ann. Intern. Med.*. 2017;167:424–431.
- [2] Hao Scarlett, Snyder Rebecca A, Irish William, Parikh Alexander A. Association of race and health insurance in treatment disparities of colon cancer: A retrospective analysis utilizing a national population database in the United States *PLoS Med.*. 2021;18:e1003842.
- [3] Zahnd Whitney E, Murphy Cathryn, Knoll Marie, et al. The intersection of rural residence and minority race/ethnicity in cancer disparities in the United States *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*. 2021;18:1384.
- [4] Cross Sarah H, Califf Robert M, Warraich Haider J. Rural-urban disparity in mortality in the US from 1999 to 2019 *JAMA*. 2021;325:2312–2314.
- [5] Iglehart John K. The challenging quest to improve rural health care *N. Engl. J. Med.*. 2018;378:473–479.
- [6] Monnat Shannon M. The new destination disadvantage: Disparities in Hispanic health insurance coverage rates in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan new and established destinations *Rural Sociol.*. 2017;82:3–43.
- [7] Edward Jean, Thompson Robin, Jaramillo Andrea. Availability of health insurance literacy resources fails to meet consumer needs in rural, Appalachian communities: Implications for state Medicaid waivers *J. Rural Health*. 2021;37:526–536.
- [8] Erlangga Darius, Suhrcke Marc, Ali Shehzad, Bloor Karen. The impact of public health insurance on health care utilisation, financial protection and health status in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review *PLoS One*. 2019;14:e0219731.
- [9] Stone Lisa Cacari, Boursaw Blake, Bettez Sonia P, Larzelere Marley Tennille, Waitzkin Howard. Place as a predictor of health insurance coverage: A multivariate analysis of counties in the United States *Health Place*. 2015;34:207–214.
- [10] Robinson Lara R, Holbrook Joseph R, Bitsko Rebecca H, et al. Differences in health care, family, and community factors associated with mental, behavioral, and developmental disorders among children aged 2-8 years in rural and urban areas - United States, 2011-2012 *MMWR Surveill. Summ.*. 2017;66:1–11.
- [11] Andrilla C Holly A, Patterson Davis G, Garberson Lisa A, Coulthard Cynthia, Larson Eric H. Geographic variation in the supply of selected behavioral health providers *Am. J. Prev. Med.*. 2018;54:S199–S207.
- [12] Morales Dawn A, Barksdale Crystal L, Beckel-Mitchener Andrea C. A call to action to address rural mental health disparities *J. Clin. Transl. Sci.*. 2020;4:463–467.
- [13] Lin Yilu, Monnette Alisha, Shi Lizheng. Effects of medicaid expansion on poverty disparities in health insurance coverage *International Journal for Equity in Health*. 2021;20.
- [14] Jones Craig, Watkins Lisa Dulsky, Samuelson Jenney, Morgan James, Price Terri, Hawkins Diane. Vermont Blueprint for Health: 2009 Annual Report 2010.
- [15] Hoffman Ryan D, Danos Denise M, Lau Frank H. National health disparities in incisional hernia repair outcomes: An analysis of the Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project National Inpatient Sample (HCUP-NIS) 2012-2014 *Surgery*. 2021;169:1393–1399.
- [16] Lingsma Hester F, Bottle Alex, Middleton Steve, Kievit Job, Steyerberg Ewout W, Mheen Perla J. Evaluation of hospital outcomes: the relation between length-of-stay, readmission, and mortality in a large international administrative database *BMC Health Serv. Res.*. 2018;18:116.
- [17] Baldwin Laura-Mae, MacLehose Richard F, Hart L Gary, Beaver Shelli K, Every Nathan, Chan Leighton. Quality of care for acute myocardial infarction in rural and urban US hospitals *J. Rural Health*. 2004;20:99–108.

- [18] Sheldon Weisgrau. Issues in rural health: access, hospitals, and reform *Health Care Financial Review*. 1995;17:1-14.
- [19] O'Neal Wesley T, Sandesara Pratik B, Kelli Heval M, Venkatesh Sanjay, Soliman Elsayed Z. Urban-rural differences in mortality for atrial fibrillation hospitalizations in the United States *Heart Rhythm*. 2018;15:175-179.
- [20] James Paul A, Li Pengxiang, Ward Marcia M. Myocardial infarction mortality in rural and urban hospitals: rethinking measures of quality of care *Ann. Fam. Med.*. 2007;5:105-111.
- [21] Davidson Thomas, Mirza Farhaan, Baig Mirza M. Impact of socio-economic status and race on emergency hospital admission outcomes: Analysis from hospital admissions between 2001 and 2012 *Health Serv. Manage. Res.*. 2022;35:127-133.