



15 **ABSTRACT**

16 INTRODUCTION: Prostate cancer stands as one of the most diagnosed malignancies among  
17 men worldwide. With the recent expansion of Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act (ACA),  
18 millions more Americans now have health insurance coverage, potentially influencing healthcare  
19 access and subsequent outcomes for various illnesses, including prostate cancer. Yet, the direct  
20 correlation between Medicaid expansion and cancer-specific survival, particularly for early-stage  
21 prostate cancer, remains an area warranting comprehensive exploration.

22 OBJECTIVE: This study aims to determine the impact of the implementation of Medicaid  
23 expansion on Survival outcomes among men with prostate cancer.

24 METHODS: We utilized data from the SEER registry to determine the causal impact of the  
25 implementation of the ACA on outcomes among men with prostate cancer. The study covered  
26 the years 2003-2021, divided into pre-ACA (2003-2009) and post-ACA (2015-2021) periods,  
27 with a 1-year washout (2014-2015) since Medicaid expansion was implemented in 2014 in  
28 Kentucky. Using a Difference-in-Differences approach, we compared survival among men with  
29 prostate cancers from Kentucky to Georgia. We adjusted for patient demographics, income,  
30 metropolitan status, disease stage, and treatment modalities.

31 RESULTS: We analyzed a cohort of 68,222 men with prostate cancer during the study period.  
32 Of these, 37,810 (55.4%) were diagnosed in the pre-ACA period, with 70.8% from Georgia and  
33 29.2% from Kentucky. The remaining 30,412 (44.6%) were diagnosed in the post-ACA period,  
34 with 72.3% from Georgia and 27.7% from Kentucky. Medicaid expansion in Kentucky was  
35 associated with a 16.8% reduction in hazard of death (HD), indicating improved overall survival  
36 among low-income individuals. This trend was consistent across different racial/ethnic groups.  
37 Specifically, Non-Hispanic white men experienced a 16.2% reduction (DID = -0.162, 95% CI: -

38 0.315 to -0.008), Non-Hispanic Black men had a 17.9% reduction (DID = -0.179, 95% CI: -  
39 0.348 to -0.009), and Hispanic men saw a 15.9% reduction (DID = -0.159, 95% CI: -0.313 to -  
40 0.005) in HD among low-income individuals.

41 CONCLUSION: Medicaid Expansion was associated with a substantive improvement in overall  
42 survival among men with prostate cancers in Kentucky compared to non-expansion Georgia.

43

44

## 45 INTRODUCTION

46 Outside of skin cancer, prostate cancer is the most common cancer in men in the United States  
47 (U.S.) [1], with approximately 299,010 new cases of prostate cancer expected in 2024, along  
48 with about 35,250 deaths from the disease [2]. Since 2014, the incidence rate has sharply  
49 increased 3% per year overall and 5% per year for advanced-stage prostate cancer [2]. For men  
50 diagnosed with prostate cancer, the treatment can range from observation, curative surgery  
51 (prostatectomy), and targeted radiation therapy [3], however, what is not often discussed are the  
52 factors that determine the treatment of choice [3,4]. Financial toxicity is a term that is used to  
53 describe the financial consequences and the potential stress incurred by a disease diagnosis and  
54 treatment [5]. In 2020 alone, there was an estimated \$22.3 billion spent on prostate cancer care,  
55 with the majority of that being made up by direct medical expenses [6]. However, the economic  
56 impact goes far beyond medical bills. Prostate cancer leads to very significant lost earnings as a  
57 result of premature mortality and the inability of patients to work during their treatment and  
58 recovery process [7].

59  
60 Prostate cancer is a very complex disease whose pathogenesis involves both genetic and  
61 environmental factors and is mainly driven by alterations in androgen signaling [8]. There are a  
62 multitude of risk factors that contribute to the development of prostate cancer, including age,  
63 family history, and race [9]. African American men are at a higher risk of developing prostate  
64 cancer and usually tend to present with a more advanced disease at diagnosis compared to their  
65 counterparts [10]. It has also been shown that social determinants of health (SDOH) have a  
66 significant impact on prostate cancer outcomes(11). Factors such as socioeconomic status, access  
67 to healthcare, and living conditions not only influence the state at which prostate cancer is

68 diagnosed, but also overall survival rates [12]. Prior data suggests that incidence rates are  
69 associated with socioeconomic status [10]. Additionally, lower socioeconomic status is  
70 associated with poorer survival rates [10]. In order to reduce disparities in prostate cancer care  
71 and improve survival, it is crucial to address the SDOH that may be impacting the outcomes of  
72 disease.

73 The goal of Medicaid, initially enacted in 1965, was to allow States to receive federal funding to  
74 provide health insurance to persons with limited income [13]. This legislation was later expanded  
75 and termed The Affordable Care Act (ACA), passed in 2010 and fully implemented in 2014 [14].  
76 This legislation addressed Americans without health insurance facing systemic health  
77 inequalities [14]. This act is the most significant expansion of coverage in the US healthcare  
78 system following the creation of Medicare and Medicaid in 1965 [15]. Before the ACA, there  
79 were limitations to Medicaid eligibility on the state level, which covered only the poorest in  
80 specific categories (i.e., disabled people, pregnant women, and children) [15]. In contrast, with  
81 the ACA, citizens with income at or below 138% of the federal poverty line qualify for aid [14].  
82 Due to ACA, the number of uninsured individuals declined significantly from 2013 to 2022,  
83 from approximately 45.2 million to 26.4 million [5]. The overall implementation of the  
84 Affordable Care Act during 2013-2022 has led to an overall 45% increase in Americans with  
85 health insurance coverage [16].

86 When looking specifically at the effect of the ACA on patients newly diagnosed with breast,  
87 colorectal, and lung cancer from 2012 to 2015 there has been an increase in earlier stage of  
88 diagnosis and lower hazard of mortality among patients [17]. A study done written by Eugia et al  
89 assessed the effect of Medicaid expansion in states with coverage in patients with bladder,  
90 colorectal, esophageal, lung, bladder and gastric cancers and found that there was a increase in

91 number patients who had access to healthcare and noted a positive effect on access and  
92 utilization of oncologic care [18]. We understand the significance of the implementation of the  
93 affordable care act on the improved access of care utilization, however direct correlation between  
94 Medicaid expansion and cancer-specific survival, particularly for early-stage prostate cancer,  
95 remains an area warranting comprehensive exploration. This study aims to determine the impact  
96 of the implementation of the Affordable Care Act on cancer-specific survival among men with  
97 early-stage prostate malignancies.

## 98 **METHODOLOGY**

### 99 **Data Source and Study Population**

100 This retrospective cohort study utilized data from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End  
101 Results (SEER) database, focusing on men diagnosed with prostate cancer between 2000 and  
102 2021[19]. SEER collects cancer incidence and survival data from population-based cancer  
103 registries covering approximately 48% of the U.S. population as of 2021 [20]. The study utilized  
104 the "Incidence - SEER 18 Registries, Nov 2021 Sub (2000–2021)" database [19]. Inclusion  
105 criteria included: (1) men diagnosed with prostate malignancies identified using International  
106 Classification of Diseases for Oncology, 3rd edition (ICD-O-3) codes; (2) patients with complete  
107 clinicopathological information and survival data; (3) age at diagnosis between 18 - 64yrs; and  
108 (4) patients actively followed up. Exclusion criteria were: (1) patients diagnosed through autopsy  
109 or death certificate only, or with clinical diagnoses only; (2) patients with missing data on  
110 race/ethnicity, household median income, state identification, or years of follow-up. **This study**  
111 **involved publicly available data and did not include any identifiable patient information, so**

112 institutional review board approval was not required. Informed consent was also not necessary  
113 due to the retrospective nature of the study.

#### 114 **Georgia vs. Kentucky**

115 Georgia (control state) and Kentucky (treated state) were selected for the study due to their  
116 contrasting approaches to healthcare policy, specifically regarding the implementation of the  
117 Affordable Care Act (ACA). Kentucky expanded Medicaid under the ACA in 2014, leading to a  
118 significant increase in Medicaid/CHIP enrollment and a reduction in the uninsured rate. In  
119 contrast, Georgia did not expand Medicaid, resulting in higher uninsured rates and more  
120 restrictive access to healthcare services. The differences in healthcare policy between the two  
121 states provide a unique opportunity to assess the impact of the ACA on prostate cancer  
122 outcomes, particularly cancer-specific survival and overall survival.

#### 123 **Primary Outcome of Interest**

124 The primary outcomes of interest were cancer-specific survival (CSS) and overall survival (OS).  
125 CSS was defined as the time from diagnosis to death due to prostate cancer, while OS referred to  
126 the time from diagnosis to death from any cause. Both outcomes were assessed over two periods:  
127 pre-ACA (2003-2009) and post-ACA (2015-2021).

#### 128 **Independent Variables of Interest**

129 The primary independent variables were the implementation of the ACA and Medicaid  
130 expansion, categorized into two time periods: pre-ACA (2003-2009) and post-ACA (2015-2021)  
131 with a 1-year washout period of January 2014- December 2014 to allow for the policy to become  
132 fully operational. Kentucky's Medicaid expansion served as the treatment, while Georgia, which  
133 did not expand Medicaid, served as the control. The interaction between state and time period

134 (State X ACA) was used to evaluate the differential impact of the ACA on prostate cancer  
135 outcomes between the two states.

### 136 **Covariates**

137 Covariates included demographic factors such as age at diagnosis (continuous variable),  
138 race/ethnicity (categorized as Non-Hispanic White people, Non-Hispanic Black people, Hispanic  
139 people, Non-Hispanic Asian/Pacific Islander people, and Native American people), and marital  
140 status (categorized as married, widowed, divorced, separated, or unknown). Socioeconomic  
141 status was assessed using household median income ( $> \$64,000$  and  $\leq \$64,000$ ). Tumor  
142 characteristics, including stage at diagnosis (localized, regional, distant), and treatment  
143 modalities (prostatectomy, chemotherapy, radiation) were also included as covariates.

### 144 **Theoretical Model: Andersen Behavioral Model**

145 This study uses the Andersen Behavioral Model of Health Services [21, 22] Use to explore the  
146 impact of the ACA and Medicaid expansion on prostate cancer mortality, comparing Kentucky  
147 (which implemented Medicaid expansion in 2014) and Georgia (which has not). The model  
148 categorizes factors into predisposing, enabling, and need factors:

149 Predisposing Factors: These include demographics such as age (18-45, 45-64 years),  
150 race/ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, etc.), and marital status (single, married, etc.), which  
151 influence healthcare-seeking behavior.

152 Enabling Factors: These are resources that facilitate access to care, including income ( $< 64K$ ,  
153  $\geq 64K$ ), metropolitan status (rural, small, medium, large metropolitan), and the state of residence  
154 (Louisiana vs. Georgia), reflecting the impact of Medicaid expansion.



155 Need Factors: These include clinical variables such as cancer grade (Stage I, Stage II, Stage III  
156 and Stage IV), and the receipt of treatments like surgery, chemotherapy, and radiotherapy, all of  
157 which influence prostate cancer outcomes.

### 158 **Difference-in-Differences (DID) Specification**

159 The present study used a DID model to estimate the impact of Medicaid expansion on prostate  
160 cancer outcomes; overall survival, overall deaths, and disease stage at presentation by comparing  
161 Kentucky (treatment group, which implemented Medicaid expansion) to Georgia (control group,  
162 which did not) during the pre-ACA and post-ACA periods. The variable ACA was set to 1 for  
163 the post-Medicaid expansion period (2015–2020) and 0 for the pre-expansion period (2003-  
164 2009). The variable State was defined as 1 if the observation was from Kentucky (expansion  
165 state) and 0 if from Georgia (non-expansion state).

166 The DID model is specified as:

$$167 y = X\beta + \beta_1 \cdot \text{ACA} + \beta_2 \cdot \text{State} + \beta_{12} \cdot (\text{ACA} \times \text{State}) + u \quad [23]$$

168  $y$  represents the breast cancer outcome of interest (e.g., survival, overall mortality, or disease  
169 stage at presentation).

170  $X$  includes covariates such as age, race, marital status, and treatment modalities.

171  $\beta_1$  captures the difference in outcomes between the pre- and post-ACA periods across both states.

172  $\beta_2$  captures the baseline difference between Louisiana and Georgia.

173  $\beta_{12}$  represents the effect of Medicaid expansion on breast cancer outcomes.

174 The interaction term  $\text{ACA} \times \text{State}$  (i.e.,  $\beta_{12}$ ) estimates the difference in the change in outcomes  
175 between Louisiana (the expansion state) and Georgia (the non-expansion state) from the pre- to  
176 the post-ACA period. This term provides the key estimate of the impact of Medicaid expansion.

### 177 **Statistical Analysis**

178 Descriptive statistics summarized the characteristics of the study population. Chi-square tests

179 were used for categorical variables, and appropriate regression models, such as the Cox

180 proportional hazards model, were applied to time-to-event data. Margins plots were generated to

181 visualize the adjusted probabilities of each outcome across states and time periods. Subsequently,  
182 the “lincom” command was used to calculate the DID and generate the standard error, p-value,  
183 and confidence intervals. Statistical significance was determined using two-tailed tests with an  
184 alpha level of 0.05. All analyses were conducted using STATA 16 statistical software.

## 185 **RESULT**

### 186 **Baseline Study Characteristics**

187 In Table 1, the baseline characteristics of individuals with prostate cancer in Georgia and  
188 Kentucky were compared across two time periods, pre-ACA (2003-2009) and post-ACA (2015-  
189 2021). In the pre-ACA period, the mean age of diagnosis was similar between the two states,  
190 with Georgia at  $57.3 \pm 5.2$  years and Kentucky at  $57.6 \pm 5.0$  years. Post-ACA, the mean age  
191 slightly increased in both states, with Georgia at  $58.1 \pm 4.8$  years and Kentucky at  $58.4 \pm 4.7$   
192 years. In terms of race and ethnicity, Georgia had a significantly higher proportion of Non-  
193 Hispanic Black people compared to Kentucky in both periods. Pre-ACA, 37.0% of patients in  
194 Georgia were Non-Hispanic Black people, compared to only 10.5% in Kentucky. Post-ACA, the  
195 proportion of Non-Hispanic Black people in Georgia further increased to 47.7%, while in  
196 Kentucky, it remained relatively low at 14.2%.

197 In terms of tumor stage at diagnosis, the proportion of localized cases decreased significantly in  
198 both states post-ACA. In Georgia, localized cases dropped from 85.8% pre-ACA to 77.2% post-  
199 ACA, while in Kentucky, they decreased from 80.5% to 68.5%. Additionally, the incidence of  
200 distant-stage prostate cancer increased in both states post-ACA, rising from 2.7% to 5.2% in  
201 Georgia and from 2.8% to 4.6% in Kentucky. Metropolitan status also revealed significant

202 differences, with a higher proportion of patients in Kentucky residing in rural areas compared to  
203 Georgia during both periods. For example, in the post-ACA period, 23.0% of patients in  
204 Kentucky lived in rural areas not adjacent to metropolitan areas, compared to only 4.2% in  
205 Georgia.

## 206 **Factor associated with CSS**

207 Table 2 reveals factors associated with CSS among individuals with prostate cancer; comparing  
208 Georgia and Kentucky across pre-ACA and post-ACA periods. The post-2015 period was  
209 associated with improved survival outcomes, with a hazard ratio (HR) of 0.78 (95% CI: 0.68–  
210 0.89), indicating a significant reduction in the risk of cancer-specific mortality. Additionally, the  
211 interaction between states and the post-Medicaid expansion period revealed that individuals in  
212 Kentucky had a substantial reduction in mortality post-expansion period (HR = 0.71, 95% CI:  
213 0.56–0.90), suggesting a beneficial effect of the policy in reducing cancer-specific mortality in  
214 this state.

215 Other covariates also played a critical role in the CSS. Older age (45-64yrs) was associated with  
216 increased mortality (HR = 1.44, 95% CI: 1.00–2.07), while being married was protective (HR =  
217 0.65, 95% CI: 0.58–0.74). Racial disparities were evident, with Non-Hispanic Black people  
218 having a higher risk of mortality (HR = 1.10, 95% CI: 1.00–1.22) compared to Non-Hispanic  
219 White people. Socioeconomic factors, such as living in large metropolitan areas, were associated  
220 with improved survival (HR = 0.74, 95% CI: 0.63–0.87). Advanced cancer stages were strongly  
221 associated with worse outcomes, with stage IV having the highest mortality risk (HR = 26.99,  
222 95% CI: 11.85–61.46). Additionally, treatment factors such as receiving a prostatectomy  
223 significantly reduced the risk of mortality (HR = 0.38, 95% CI: 0.33–0.43), while chemotherapy

224 and radiation were associated with increased mortality risk (HR = 1.62, 95% CI: 1.39–1.89; HR  
225 = 1.20, 95% CI: 1.09–1.33, respectively).

## 226 **Factors associated with Overall survival**

227 In table 3, it reports the factors associated with the overall survival among individuals with  
228 prostate cancers in both states and in both time periods. The post-2015 period was associated  
229 with improved overall survival, with a hazard ratio (HR) of 0.90 (95% CI: 0.82–0.99), indicating  
230 a significant reduction in the risk of overall mortality during the period. The interaction between  
231 state and post-Medicaid expansion period showed that individuals in Kentucky had a reduction  
232 in mortality post-ACA (HR = 0.87, 95% CI: 0.75–1.01), although this effect was marginally  
233 significant ( $p = 0.065$ ).

234 Other covariates also played a crucial role in overall survival. Age between 45-64yrs. was  
235 significantly associated with higher mortality (HR = 2.17, 95% CI: 1.69–2.81), while being  
236 married was also protective (HR = 0.65, 95% CI: 0.61–0.70). Racial disparities were evident,  
237 with Non-Hispanic Black people having a higher risk of mortality (HR = 1.10, 95% CI: 1.04–  
238 1.17) compared to Non-Hispanic White people. Socioeconomic factors, such as living in large  
239 metropolitan areas, were associated with improved survival (HR = 0.71, 95% CI: 0.65–0.78).  
240 Advanced cancer stages were strongly associated with worse outcomes, with stage IV having the  
241 highest mortality risk (HR = 4.05, 95% CI: 2.99–5.48). Additionally, treatment factors such as  
242 receiving a prostatectomy significantly reduced the risk of mortality (HR = 0.47, 95% CI: 0.44–  
243 0.51), while chemotherapy was associated with increased mortality risk (HR = 1.42, 95% CI:  
244 1.24–1.62).

## 245 **Predicted Probabilities (CSS)**

246 Table 4 reveals the predicted probabilities of the hazards of death for CSS between Georgia and  
247 Kentucky in the pre-ACA and post-ACA across different races/ethnicities and in the overall  
248 populations. In both states and across all races and ethnicities, the post-2015 period was  
249 associated with an improvement in CSS. Specifically, for the overall population, the probability  
250 of death decreased from 5.41 (95% CI: 1.55-9.28) in the pre-ACA period to 4.22 (95% CI: 1.10-  
251 7.35) in the post-ACA period in Georgia and from 6.02 (95% CI: 1.63-10.41) to 3.34 (95% CI:  
252 0.80-5.88) in Kentucky. Among Non-Hispanic White people, the probabilities followed a similar  
253 trend, with the post-ACA period showing reduced risks compared to the pre-ACA period, such  
254 as in Kentucky, where the probability decreased from 5.79 (95% CI: 1.58-10.00) to 3.21 (95%  
255 CI: 0.78-5.65). Non-Hispanic Black people also experienced a reduction in the predicted  
256 probabilities of death post-ACA, with a decrease from 6.39 (95% CI: 1.69-11.09) to 3.54 (95%  
257 CI: 0.82-6.27) in Kentucky. Hispanic people, Non-Hispanic Asian/Pacific Islander people, and  
258 Native American people also showed a reduction in the post-ACA period across both states.

### 259 **Predicted Probabilities (Overall Survival)**

260 Table 5 shows the predicted probabilities of overall survival between Georgia and Kentucky in  
261 the pre-ACA and post-ACA periods across racial and ethnic groups. In the overall population,  
262 the post-2015 period in Georgia experienced a reduction in the probability of death from 1.06  
263 (95% CI: 0.81-1.31) pre-ACA to 0.95 (95% CI: 0.70-1.21) post-ACA. Similarly, in Kentucky,  
264 the probability of death decreased from 1.25 (95% CI: 0.94-1.56) pre-ACA to 0.98 (95% CI:  
265 0.70-1.26) post-ACA. Among Non-Hispanic White people, a similar trend was observed, with  
266 the pre-ACA probability decreasing from 1.02 (95% CI: 0.78-1.26) to 0.92 (95% CI: 0.67-1.17)  
267 in Georgia and from 1.21 (95% CI: 0.91-1.51) to 0.94 (95% CI: 0.67-1.22) in Kentucky.

268 For Non-Hispanic Black people, the predicted probability of death post-ACA decreased from  
269 1.13 (95% CI: 0.86-1.40) to 1.02 (95% CI: 0.74-1.29) in Georgia and from 1.33 (95% CI: 0.99-  
270 1.67) to 1.04 (95% CI: 0.73-1.35) in Kentucky. Hispanic people also experienced a decrease in  
271 the probability of death, particularly in Kentucky, where the post-ACA period saw a reduction  
272 from 1.00 (95% CI: 0.69-1.32) to 0.91 (95% CI: 0.60-1.21). This pattern was also seen among  
273 Non-Hispanic Asian/Pacific Islander people and Native Americans people.

#### 274 **DID for Cancer-Specific Survival**

275 Table 6 reports the DID output on the change in the hazard of death for CSS among individuals  
276 with prostate cancer. Overall, the coefficient for all individuals was -1.49 (95% CI: -3.00 to 0.02,  
277  $p=0.053$ ), indicating a marginally significant reduction in the hazard of death. When broken  
278 down by race/ethnicity, Non-Hispanic White people showed a similar reduction (Coef. = -1.44,  
279 95% CI: -2.89 to 0.01,  $p=0.052$ ), as did Non-Hispanic Black people (Coef. = -1.58, 95% CI: -  
280 3.19 to 0.02,  $p=0.054$ ), both nearing statistical significances. Hispanic people also experienced a  
281 reduction in hazard (Coef. = -1.24, 95% CI: -2.55 to 0.08,  $p=0.065$ ), though the result was  
282 slightly less significant. The reduction was more pronounced for NHAPI people (Coef. = -1.76,  
283 95% CI: -3.84 to 0.31,  $p=0.096$ ), though it did not reach statistical significance. Native  
284 Americans showed the least reduction in hazard, with a coefficient of -0.67 (95% CI: -2.14 to  
285 0.81,  $p=0.376$ ), indicating no significant change.

#### 286 **DID for Overall Cancer Survival**

287 Table 7 reveals the DID results on the change in the hazard of death for overall survival among  
288 individuals with prostate cancers. There was a substantive reduction in mortality risk across most  
289 racial and ethnic groups post-Medicaid expansion in Kentucky compared to Georgia. For the  
290 overall population, the analysis showed a modest but statistically significant decrease in the

291 hazard of death, with a coefficient of -0.17 (95% CI: -0.33 to -0.01, p=0.039). This trend was  
292 consistent across Non-Hispanic White people (Coef. = -0.16, 95% CI: -0.32 to -0.01, p=0.039)  
293 and Non-Hispanic Black people (Coef. = -0.18, 95% CI: -0.35 to -0.01, p=0.039) people, both of  
294 which experienced significant reductions in mortality risk. Hispanic people also experienced a  
295 significant reduction in hazard (Coef. = -0.16, 95% CI: -0.31 to -0.01, p=0.043). Non-Hispanic  
296 Asian/Pacific Islander people showed a similar, though marginally significant, reduction (Coef. =  
297 -0.12, 95% CI: -0.24 to 0.00, p=0.060). Native Americans had the smallest reduction, with a  
298 coefficient of -0.07 (95% CI: -0.19 to 0.05, p=0.245), indicating no significant change in overall  
299 survival.

## 300 **DISCUSSION**

301 Overall, there was a decline in the predicted probabilities of cancer-specific deaths in the post-  
302 2015 period, observed across both states regardless of Medicaid expansion status. However, this  
303 trend was not mirrored in the risk of overall deaths, as no significant difference was noted  
304 between the pre- and post-Medicaid expansion periods for overall survival in either state. While  
305 a more pronounced reduction in cancer-specific mortality was noted in Kentucky compared to  
306 Georgia, the difference was not statistically significant. Conversely, there was a significant 16.8  
307 percentage point decrease in overall mortality risk among individuals with prostate cancer in  
308 Kentucky relative to Georgia, with the reduction ranging from -32.6% to -9%. This improvement  
309 in overall survival was consistent across different racial/ethnic groups and was particularly  
310 notable among Black individuals, who experienced a 17.9 percentage point drop in the risk of  
311 overall deaths compared to their counterparts in Georgia. Other significant predictors of  
312 improved cancer-specific and overall survival included younger age, White race, higher  
313 household median income, married status, and residence in metropolitan areas. Undergoing

314 prostatectomy was significantly associated with improved survival, while radiation therapy did  
315 not show a significant effect. In contrast, chemotherapy was linked to worse cancer-specific and  
316 overall survival, potentially due to higher disease burden among individuals receiving this  
317 treatment modality.

318 The improvement in survival among individuals diagnosed with prostate cancer in recent years is  
319 likely multifactorial. Advances in early detection and screening methods, particularly widespread  
320 adoption of prostate-specific antigen (PSA) testing, have facilitated diagnosis at earlier, more  
321 treatable stages. Additionally, innovations in treatment modalities—including the development  
322 of more effective surgical techniques, radiotherapy, androgen deprivation therapy, and novel  
323 targeted therapies—have significantly enhanced disease management. Increased access to  
324 multidisciplinary care, improved supportive therapies, and heightened awareness of prostate  
325 cancer through public health campaigns have also contributed to better outcomes. Furthermore,  
326 there has been an overall improvement in healthcare delivery systems and a greater emphasis on  
327 personalized treatment approaches tailored to patients' genetic and molecular profiles, which  
328 may account for the observed survival gains.

329 When comparing the change in prostate cancer-specific mortality between Kentucky and  
330 Georgia, there were no statistically significant differences, although the results indicated a trend  
331 towards a greater decline in Kentucky. This suggests that while there may be a modest reduction  
332 in prostate cancer-specific deaths following the implementation of the ACA and Medicaid  
333 expansion in Kentucky, the findings do not provide robust evidence of a substantive  
334 improvement in outcomes relative to Georgia.

335 The absence of a substantive impact of Medicaid expansion on prostate cancer outcomes in  
336 Kentucky compared to Georgia may be attributed to several factors. Prostate cancer is generally



337 a slow-growing malignancy with a favorable prognosis, and the benefits of improved healthcare  
338 access may take years to manifest in survival outcomes. The indolent nature of the disease,  
339 coupled with high baseline survival rates, could dilute the measurable effects of policy changes  
340 within the study timeframe. Moreover, while we observed a trend towards a greater decline in  
341 prostate cancer-specific mortality in Kentucky, the lack of statistical significance suggests that  
342 the improvement may be influenced by other concurrent healthcare advancements or  
343 socioeconomic factors not directly related to Medicaid expansion. These nuances indicate that  
344 longer follow-up periods or studies focusing on more aggressive cancers might be needed to  
345 detect the full impact of Medicaid expansion on cancer-specific outcomes.

346 Kentucky, a Medicaid expansion state, demonstrated a significant 16.8% reduction in overall  
347 mortality risk compared to Georgia, a non-expansion state. This is particularly notable because  
348 overall mortality, unlike cancer-specific mortality, may more comprehensively capture the  
349 broader benefits of Medicaid expansion, such as improved access to preventive care,  
350 management of comorbidities, and timely interventions for acute conditions. Given the generally  
351 indolent nature of prostate cancer, the impact of Medicaid expansion on prostate cancer-specific  
352 deaths may take longer to manifest, whereas the significant reduction in all-cause mortality in  
353 Kentucky suggests that enhanced healthcare access had an immediate and measurable effect on  
354 broader health outcomes.

355 This finding is important in light of the fact that no statistically significant change in overall  
356 mortality was observed across the study period in either state, emphasizing that the mortality  
357 reduction in Kentucky may be directly attributable to increased healthcare access following the  
358 implementation of the ACA and its Medicaid expansion component. These results highlight the  
359 potential of Medicaid expansion to reduce health disparities and improve survival, particularly in

360 populations that were previously uninsured or underinsured, reinforcing the role of policy-driven  
361 healthcare reforms in enhancing population health outcomes.

362 Interestingly, individuals who received chemotherapy experienced a significantly higher hazard  
363 of both cancer-specific and overall mortality. This may be explained by a higher disease burden  
364 and more advanced cancer stage at the time of treatment, as chemotherapy is often reserved for  
365 high-risk or metastatic cases. Additionally, the observed mortality risk may reflect an imbalance  
366 in sociodemographic and clinical factors, as patients receiving chemotherapy were more likely to  
367 belong to vulnerable groups such as low-income families, unmarried or single individuals, and  
368 racial minorities—populations that often have limited access to comprehensive healthcare and  
369 may present with more aggressive disease. Moreover, disparities in treatment adherence and  
370 supportive care in these groups could further contribute to poorer outcomes, underscoring the  
371 need for tailored interventions to address these inequities and improve survival among  
372 chemotherapy-treated patients.

373 This study highlights persistent disparities in cancer outcomes, with Black individuals, those  
374 from the lowest-income households, single and unmarried individuals, and residents of rural  
375 areas facing the highest risk of both cancer-specific and overall mortality. These disparities may  
376 be driven by a combination of factors, including delayed diagnosis, limited access to high-quality  
377 care, and a greater burden of comorbidities in these populations. Additionally, socioeconomic  
378 barriers and geographical challenges often result in reduced access to advanced treatments and  
379 follow-up care, further exacerbating survival disparities.

#### 380 STRENGTH AND LIMITATIONS.

381 This study has several strengths, including the use of the SEER registry, a high-quality,  
382 population-based cancer database that provides comprehensive clinical and demographic

383 information, allowing for robust analysis of cancer outcomes. A key strength is our approach of  
384 comparing two states with similar demographic profiles—Kentucky and Georgia—rather than  
385 grouping states broadly into Medicaid expansion versus non-expansion categories. This approach  
386 mitigates the potential bias introduced by heterogeneity in Medicaid implementation timelines  
387 and healthcare infrastructure across states, enhancing the specificity of our findings.  
388 Furthermore, the use of a DID approach allows for stronger causal inferences from observational  
389 data by accounting for underlying time trends, thus providing a more accurate estimate of the  
390 impact of Medicaid expansion on survival outcomes. However, our study has limitations,  
391 including the inability to control pre-existing comorbidities or baseline insurance status, which  
392 may influence both treatment decisions and survival outcomes. Additionally, unmeasured factors  
393 such as differences in healthcare delivery systems, patient adherence, and provider practices  
394 could also affect mortality and potentially confound our results. Despite these limitations, our  
395 study offers valuable insights into the nuanced effects of Medicaid expansion on cancer  
396 outcomes and overall mortality.

397 In conclusion, while we did not observe a significant difference in prostate cancer-specific  
398 mortality or survival between Kentucky and Georgia, Kentucky’s Medicaid expansion was  
399 associated with a notable improvement in overall survival, evidenced by a significant reduction  
400 in all-cause mortality compared to Georgia. This finding underscores the broader impact of  
401 Medicaid expansion on health outcomes beyond cancer-specific measures, highlighting the  
402 policy’s potential to reduce overall mortality through improved healthcare access. However,  
403 significant disparities persist, with Black individuals, low-income households, rural residents,  
404 and unmarried individuals continuing to experience poorer outcomes in both cancer-specific and  
405 overall survival. These results emphasize the need for targeted strategies to address these

406 inequities and ensure that the benefits of expanded healthcare coverage reach the most  
407 vulnerable populations.

408

## 409 REFERENCE

- 410 1. CDC NBaCEDP. Prostate Cancer Statistics 2024 [Available from:  
411 <https://www.cdc.gov/prostate-cancer/statistics/index.html>.  
412
- 413 2. American Cancer Society. Key Statistics for Prostate Cancer 2024 [Available from:  
414 <https://www.cancer.org/cancer/types/prostate-cancer/about/key-statistics.html>.  
415
- 416 3. NIH NCI. Prostate Cancer Treatment (PDQ®)—Patient Version 2023 [Available from:  
417 <https://www.cancer.gov/types/prostate/patient/prostate-treatment-pdq>.  
418
- 419 4. Showalter TN, Mishra MV, Bridges JF. Factors that influence patient preferences for  
420 prostate cancer management options: A systematic review. *Patient Prefer Adherence*.  
421 2015;9:899-911.  
422
- 423 5. Imber BS, Varghese M, Ehdaie B, Gorovets D. Financial toxicity associated with  
424 treatment of localized prostate cancer. *Nat Rev Urol*. 2020;17(1):28-40.  
425
- 426 6. NIH NCI. Financial Burden of Cancer Care 2024 [Available from:  
427 [https://progressreport.cancer.gov/after/economic\\_burden](https://progressreport.cancer.gov/after/economic_burden).  
428
- 429 7. Islami F, Miller KD, Siegel RL, Zheng Z, Zhao J, Han X, et al. National and State  
430 Estimates of Lost Earnings From Cancer Deaths in the United States. *JAMA Oncology*.  
431 2019;5(9):e191460-e.  
432
- 433 8. Schrecengost R, Knudsen KE. Molecular pathogenesis and progression of prostate cancer.  
434 *Semin Oncol*. 2013;40(3):244-58.  
435
- 436 9. Gann PH. Risk factors for prostate cancer. *Rev Urol*. 2002;4 Suppl 5(Suppl 5):S3-s10.  
437
- 438 10. Coughlin SS. A review of social determinants of prostate cancer risk, stage, and survival.  
439 *Prostate Int*. 2020;8(2):49-54.  
440

- 441 11. Vince RA, Jr., Jiang R, Bank M, Quarles J, Patel M, Sun Y, et al. Evaluation of Social  
442 Determinants of Health and Prostate Cancer Outcomes Among Black and White Patients:  
443 A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2023;6(1):e2250416.  
444
- 445 12. Vince RA, Jr, Jiang R, Bank M, Quarles J, Patel M, Sun Y, et al. Evaluation of Social  
446 Determinants of Health and Prostate Cancer Outcomes Among Black and White Patients:  
447 A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Network Open*. 2023;6(1):e2250416-e.  
448
- 449 13. National Archives MD. Medicare and Medicaid Act (1965) 2022 [Available from:  
450 <https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/medicare-and-medicaid-act>.  
451
- 452 14. Lyon SM, Douglas IS, Cooke CR. Medicaid expansion under the Affordable Care Act.  
453 Implications for insurance-related disparities in pulmonary, critical care, and sleep. *Ann*  
454 *Am Thorac Soc*. 2014;11(4):661-7.  
455
- 456 15. Cohen WJ. Reflections on the enactment of Medicare and Medicaid. *Health Care Financ*  
457 *Rev*. 1985;Suppl(Suppl):3-11.  
458
- 459 16. Kominski GF, Nonzee NJ, Sorensen A. The Affordable Care Act's Impacts on Access to  
460 Insurance and Health Care for Low-Income Populations. *Annu Rev Public Health*.  
461 2017;38:489-505.  
462
- 463 17. Takvorian SU, Oganisian A, Mamtani R, Mitra N, Shulman LN, Bekelman JE, et al.  
464 Association of Medicaid Expansion Under the Affordable Care Act With Insurance Status,  
465 Cancer Stage, and Timely Treatment Among Patients With Breast, Colon, and Lung  
466 Cancer. *JAMA Network Open*. 2020;3(2):e1921653-e.  
467
- 468 18. Eguia E, Cobb AN, Kothari AN, Molefe A, Afshar M, Aranha GV, et al. Impact of the  
469 Affordable Care Act (ACA) Medicaid Expansion on Cancer Admissions and Surgeries.  
470 *Ann Surg*. 2018;268(4):584-90.  
471
- 472 19. NIH NCI. SEER Databases in SEER\*Stat [Available from: [https://seer.cancer.gov/data-](https://seer.cancer.gov/data-software/documentation/seerstat/)  
473 [software/documentation/seerstat/](https://seer.cancer.gov/data-software/documentation/seerstat/).  
474
- 475 20. NIH NCI. Overview of the SEER Program [Available from:  
476 <https://seer.cancer.gov/about/overview.html>.  
477
- 478 21. Alkhalwaldeh A, M AL, Rayan A, Abdalrahim A, Musa A, Eshah N, et al. Application and  
479 Use of Andersen's Behavioral Model as Theoretical Framework: A Systematic Literature  
480 Review from 2012-2021. *Iran J Public Health*. 2023;52(7):1346-54.

- 481  
482 22. Krzyż EZ, Antunez Martinez OF, Lin HR. Uses of Andersen health services utilization  
483 framework to determine healthcare utilization for mental health among migrants-a scoping  
484 review. *Front Public Health*. 2023;11:1284784.  
485
- 486 23. Forecasting SMA. Introduction To The Difference-In-Differences Regression  
487 Model [Available from: [https://timeseriesreasoning.com/contents/introduction-](https://timeseriesreasoning.com/contents/introduction-to-the-difference-in-differences-regression-model)  
488 [to-the-difference-in-differences-regression-model](https://timeseriesreasoning.com/contents/introduction-to-the-difference-in-differences-regression-model)  
489
- 490 24. Janopaul-Naylor JR, Corriher TJ, Switchenko J, Hanasoge S, Esdaille A, Mahal BA, et al.  
491 Disparities in time to prostate cancer treatment initiation before and after the Affordable  
492 Care Act. *Cancer Med*. 2023;12(17):18258-68.  
493
- 494 25. Bhatia S, Landier W, Paskett ED, Peters KB, Merrill JK, Phillips J, et al. Rural-Urban  
495 Disparities in Cancer Outcomes: Opportunities for Future Research. *J Natl Cancer Inst*.  
496 2022;114(7):940-52.  
497
- 498 26. Miao Q, Wei Z, Liu C, Ye Y, Cheng G, Song Z, et al. Overall survival and cancer-specific  
499 survival were improved in local treatment of metastatic prostate cancer. *Frontiers in*  
500 *Oncology*. 2023;13.  
501
- 502 27. Liu W, Goodman M, Filson CP. Association of State-Level Medicaid Expansion With  
503 Treatment of Patients With Higher-Risk Prostate Cancer. *JAMA Network Open*.  
504 2020;3(10):e2015198-e.  
505
- 506 28. Lowder D, Rizwan K, McColl C, Paparella A, Ittmann M, Mitsiades N, et al. Racial  
507 disparities in prostate cancer: A complex interplay between socioeconomic inequities and  
508 genomics. *Cancer Lett*. 2022;531:71-82.  
509
- 510 29. Zeng H, Xu M, Xie Y, Nawrocki S, Morze J, Ran X, et al. Racial/ethnic disparities in the  
511 cause of death among patients with prostate cancer in the United States from 1995 to  
512 2019: a population-based retrospective cohort study. *eClinicalMedicine*. 2023;62.  
513
- 514 30. Krajc K, Mirošević Š, Sajovic J, Klemenc Ketiš Z, Spiegel D, Drevenšek G, et al. Marital  
515 status and survival in cancer patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Cancer*  
516 *Med*. 2023;12(2):1685-708.  
517
- 518 31. Lewis-Thames MW, Langston ME, Khan S, Han Y, Fuzzell L, Xu S, et al. Racial and  
519 Ethnic Differences in Rural-Urban Trends in 5-Year Survival of Patients With Lung,

- 520 Prostate, Breast, and Colorectal Cancers: 1975-2011 Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End  
521 Results (SEER). *JAMA Network Open*. 2022;5(5):e2212246-e.  
522
- 523 32. Maganty A, Byrnes ME, Hamm M, Wasilko R, Sabik LM, Davies BJ, et al. Barriers to  
524 rural health care from the provider perspective. *Rural Remote Health*. 2023;23(2):7769.  
525
- 526 33. Afshar N, English DR, Milne RL. Factors Explaining Socio-Economic Inequalities in  
527 Cancer Survival: A Systematic Review. *Cancer Control*. 2021;28:10732748211011956.  
528
- 529 34. Cella DF, Orav EJ, Kornblith AB, Holland JC, Silberfarb PM, Lee KW, et al.  
530 Socioeconomic status and cancer survival. *J Clin Oncol*. 1991;9(8):1500-9.  
531
- 532 35. Courtemanche C, Marton J, Ukert B, Yelowitz A, Zapata D, Fazlul I. The three-year  
533 impact of the Affordable Care Act on disparities in insurance coverage. *Health Serv Res*.  
534 2019;54 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):307-16.  
535
- 536 36. Aljassim N, Ostini R. Health literacy in rural and urban populations: A systematic review.  
537 *Patient Educ Couns*. 2020;103(10):2142-54.  
538
- 539 37. Unger JM, Moseley A, Symington B, Chavez-MacGregor M, Ramsey SD, Hershman DL.  
540 Geographic Distribution and Survival Outcomes for Rural Patients With Cancer Treated in  
541 Clinical Trials. *JAMA Network Open*. 2018;1(4):e181235-e.  
542
- 543 38. Forjaz G, Ries L, Devasia TP, Flynn G, Ruhl J, Mariotto AB. Long-term Cancer Survival  
544 Trends by Updated Summary Stage. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*.  
545 2023;32(11):1508-17.  
546
- 547 39. Benitez JA, Creel L, Jennings J. Kentucky's Medicaid Expansion Showing Early Promise  
548 On Coverage And Access To Care. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2016;35(3):528-34.  
549
- 550 40. Martinez ME, Gomez SL, Canchola AJ, Oh DL, Murphy JD, Mehtsun W, et al. Changes  
551 in Cancer Mortality by Race and Ethnicity Following the Implementation of the  
552 Affordable Care Act in California. *Front Oncol*. 2022;12:916167.  
553
- 554 41. Hotca A, Bloom JR, Runnels J, Salgado LR, Cherry DR, Hsieh K, et al. The Impact of  
555 Medicaid Expansion on Patients with Cancer in the United States: A Review. *Curr Oncol*.  
556 2023;30(7):6362-73.  
557



- 558 42. Akinyemi OA, Weldeslase TA, Fasokun ME, Odusanya E, Mejulu EO, Salihu EY, et al.  
 559 Causal Effects of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) Implementation on Non-Hodgkin's  
 560 Lymphoma Survival: A Difference-in-Differences Analysis. *Cureus*. 2024;16(1):e52571.  
 561  
 562 43. Enyeji AM, Barengo NC, Ramirez G, Ibrahimou B, Arrieta A. Regional Variation in  
 563 Health Care Utilization Among Adults With Inadequate Cardiovascular Health in the  
 564 USA. *Cureus*. 2023;15(8):e44121.  
 565  
 566

567 Table 1: Demographic, Clinical, and Treatment Characteristics of Individuals with Prostate Cancer in  
 568 Georgia and Kentucky Before and After Medicaid Expansion in Kentucky in 2014.

Variables	Pre-ACA (2003-2009) (N=37,810)			Post-ACA (2015-2021) (N=30,412)		
	Georgia (N=26,772)	Kentucky (N=11,038)	P-value	Georgia (N=48,910)	Kentucky (N=19,312)	P-value
Age (years; Mean ± SD)	57.3 ± 5.2	57.6 ± 5.0	<0.01	58.1 ± 4.8	58.4 ± 4.7	<0.01
Age						
18-44yrs.	567 (2.1%)	163 (1.5%)	<0.01	251 (1.1%)	72 (0.9%)	0.046
45-64yrs.	26,205 (97.9%)	10,875 (98.5%)		21,887 (98.9%)	8,202 (99.1%)	
Race/Ethnicity			<0.01			<0.01
White Person	16,158 (60.4%)	9,698 (87.9%)		10,366 (46.8%)	6,679 (80.7%)	
Black Person	9,895 (37.0%)	1,163 (10.5%)		10,566 (47.7%)	1,171 (14.2%)	
Hispanic Person	453 (1.7%)	57 (0.5%)		740 (3.3%)	80 (1.0%)	
Other	266 (1.0%)	120 (1.1%)		466 (2.1%)	344 (4.2%)	
Income			<0.001			<0.001
<65K	12,679 (47.4%)	9,432 (85.5%)		9,739 (44.0%)	7,008 (84.7%)	
≥65K	14,093 (52.6%)	1,606 (14.6%)		12,399 (56.0%)	1,266 (15.3%)	
Marital Status			<0.001			<0.01
Single	2,944 (11.0%)	754 (6.8%)		3,465 (15.7%)	968 (11.8%)	
Married	18,772 (70.1%)	7,358 (66.7%)		12,862 (58.3%)	4,883 (59.3%)	
Widowed	507 (1.9%)	196 (1.8%)		331 (1.5%)	162 (2.0%)	
Divorced	2,277 (8.5%)	997 (9.0%)		1,566 (7.1%)	845 (10.3%)	
Separated	273 (1.0%)	56 (0.5%)		197 (0.9%)	46 (0.6%)	
Unknown	1,988 (7.5%)	1,677 (15.2%)		3,649 (16.5%)	1,334 (16.2%)	
Metropolitan Status			<0.001			<0.001
Rural areas not adjacent to metropolitan areas	1,081 (4.0%)	2,464 (22.3%)		930 (4.2%)	1,900 (23.0%)	
Rural areas adjacent to metropolitan areas	3,648 (13.6%)	1,809 (16.4%)		2,437 (11.0%)	1,273 (15.4%)	
Small metropolitan areas	4,037 (15.1%)	925 (8.4%)		3,020 (13.6%)	793 (9.6%)	



Medium metropolitan areas	3,005 (11.2%)	1,704 (15.4%)		2,459 (11.1%)	1,262 (15.3%)	
Large metropolitan areas	15,001 (56.0%)	4,136 (37.5%)		13,292 (60.0%)	3,046 (36.8%)	
Stage at presentation			<0.01			<0.01
Localized	15,383 (85.8%)	5,731 (80.5%)		6,855 (77.2%)	2,395 (68.5%)	
Regional	1,802 (10.1%)	1,081 (15.2%)		1,237 (13.9%)	557 (15.9%)	
Distant	480 (2.7%)	196 (2.8%)		463 (5.2%)	160 (4.6%)	
Unknown	271 (1.5%)	109 (1.5%)		328 (3.7%)	384 (11.0%)	
Surgery, n (%)			<0.001			<0.01
Yes	14,217 (54.0%)	3,635 (35.7%)		13,867 (63.0%)	4,088 (54.8%)	
None/Unknown	12,135 (46.1%)	6,551 (64.3%)		8,143 (37.0%)	3,369 (45.2%)	
Chemotherapy, n (%)			0.345			0.106
Yes	191 (0.7%)	69 (0.6%)		445 (2.0%)	191 (2.3%)	
None/Unknown	26,581 (99.2%)	10,969 (99.4%)		21,693 (98.0%)	8,083 (97.7%)	
Radiotherapy, n (%)			<0.01			<0.01
Yes	7,994 (34.2%)	1,908 (19.5%)		5,210 (25.5%)	2,197 (27.6%)	
None/Unknown	15,390 (65.8%)	7,898 (80.5%)		15,242 (74.5%)	5,766 (72.4%)	

569

570 Table 2: Cox Proportional Hazards Model Assessing Factors Associated with Cancer-Specific Survival  
571 among Individuals with Prostate Cancer.

Variables	Haz. Ratio	Std. Err.	z	P>z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
State						
Kentucky (ref. Georgia)	1.181	0.039	5.050	0.000	1.107	1.259
ACA						
Post-ACA (ref. Pre-ACA)	0.901	0.042	-2.260	0.024	0.823	0.986
State x ACA						
Kentucky x Post-ACA	0.868	0.067	-1.850	0.065	0.747	1.009
Age						
18-44yrs.	Reference					
45-64yrs.	2.175	0.283	5.980	0.000	1.686	2.806
Race/Ethnicity						
White Person	Reference					
Black Person	1.103	0.031	3.480	0.001	1.044	1.166
Hispanics	0.983	0.103	-0.170	0.867	0.801	1.206
Other	0.741	0.162	-1.370	0.171	0.482	1.139
Household Median Income						
Income ≥ 64K (ref. < 64K)	0.878	0.030	-3.840	0.000	0.822	0.938
Marital Status						
Single	Reference					
Married	0.649	0.023	-11.960	0.000	0.605	0.697

Widowed	1.126	0.091	1.470	0.141	0.961	1.319
Divorced	0.994	0.046	-0.130	0.895	0.908	1.088
Separated	1.060	0.112	0.550	0.581	0.861	1.305
Unknown	0.751	0.040	-5.430	0.000	0.678	0.833
<b>Metropolitan Status</b>						
Rural areas not adjacent to metropolitans	Reference					
Rural areas adjacent to metropolitans	0.964	0.045	-0.770	0.441	0.880	1.058
Small metropolitan areas	0.819	0.041	-3.990	0.000	0.743	0.904
Medium metropolitan areas	0.776	0.039	-5.060	0.000	0.703	0.856
Large metropolitan areas	0.713	0.033	-7.340	0.000	0.652	0.781
<b>Grade</b>						
Localized	Reference					
Regional	1.133	0.099	1.430	0.154	0.954	1.345
Distant	3.482	0.387	11.230	0.000	2.801	4.329
<b>Stage at Presentation</b>						
Stage I	Reference					
Stage II	1.449	0.168	3.200	0.001	1.155	1.819
Stage III	2.135	0.318	5.100	0.000	1.595	2.858
Stage IV	4.047	0.625	9.060	0.000	2.991	5.477
Prostatectomy	0.473	0.017	-21.050	0.000	0.441	0.507
Chemotherapy	1.421	0.097	5.130	0.000	1.243	1.625
Radiation	1.017	0.032	0.530	0.598	0.956	1.082

572

573 Table 3: Cox Proportional Hazards Model Assessing Factors Associated with Overall Survival among  
574 Individuals with Prostate Cancer.

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Haz. Ratio</b>	<b>Std. Err.</b>	<b>z</b>	<b>P&gt;z</b>	<b>[95% Conf. Interval]</b>	
<b>State</b>						
Kentucky (ref. Georgia)	1.112	0.068	1.750	0.080	0.987	1.253
<b>ACA</b>						
Post-ACA (ref. Pre-ACA)	0.780	0.054	-3.610	0.000	0.682	0.893
<b>State x ACA</b>						
Kentucky x Post-ACA	0.711	0.087	-2.770	0.006	0.559	0.905
<b>Age</b>						
18-44yrs.	Reference					
45-64yrs.	1.440	0.266	1.980	0.048	1.003	2.068
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>						
White	Reference					
Black	1.103	0.055	1.970	0.049	1.000	1.215

Hispanics	0.862	0.154	-0.830	0.406	0.608	1.223
Other	1.229	0.374	0.680	0.499	0.676	2.233
Household Median Income						
Income ≥ 64K (ref. < 64K)	0.935	0.055	-1.140	0.253	0.832	1.049
Marital Status						
Single	Reference					
Married	0.653	0.040	-6.980	0.000	0.580	0.736
Widowed	1.065	0.148	0.450	0.652	0.810	1.399
Divorced	0.834	0.066	-2.310	0.021	0.714	0.973
Separated	0.835	0.154	-0.980	0.330	0.581	1.200
Unknown	0.863	0.078	-1.630	0.102	0.723	1.030
Metropolitan Status						
Rural areas not adjacent to metropolitan areas	Reference					
Rural areas adjacent to metropolitan areas	0.915	0.077	-1.050	0.294	0.775	1.080
Small metropolitan areas	0.752	0.068	-3.140	0.002	0.629	0.898
Medium metropolitan areas	0.816	0.073	-2.270	0.023	0.684	0.973
Large metropolitan areas	0.738	0.062	-3.630	0.000	0.626	0.870
Grade						
Localized	Reference					
Regional	1.269	0.268	1.130	0.258	0.839	1.919
Distant	4.357	0.981	6.540	0.000	2.803	6.773
Stage at Presentation						
Stage I	Reference					
Stage II	3.203	1.152	3.240	0.001	1.583	6.482
Stage III	10.432	4.363	5.610	0.000	4.596	23.677
Stage IV	26.988	11.333	7.850	0.000	11.851	61.461
Prostatectomy	0.378	0.025	-14.840	0.000	0.332	0.430
Chemotherapy	1.622	0.127	6.180	0.000	1.391	1.891
Radiation	1.204	0.060	3.740	0.000	1.092	1.327

575

576 Table 4: Predicted Probabilities of Cancer-Specific Survival Among Individuals Prostate Cancer

Variables	ALL	White	Black	Hispanic	NHAPI	Native Americans
Georgia x Post-ACA	5.41 (1.55-9.28)	5.21 (1.49-8.93)	5.74 (1.61-9.88)	4.49 (0.94-8.04)	6.40 (0.44-12.36)	2.42 (-2.63-7.47)
Georgia x Pre-ACA	4.22 (1.10-7.35)	4.07 (1.06-7.07)	4.48 (1.15-7.82)	3.51 (0.67-6.35)	5.00 (0.25-9.75)	1.89 (-2.06-5.84)
Kentucky x Post-ACA	6.02 (1.63-10.41)	5.79 (1.58-10.00)	6.39 (1.69-11.09)	5.00 (0.98-9.01)	7.12 (0.41-13.83)	2.69 (-2.94-9.32)

Kentucky x Pre-ACA	3.34 (0.80-5.88)	3.21 (0.78-5.65)	3.54 (0.82-6.27)	2.77 (0.47-5.08)	3.95 (0.13-7.77)	1.49 (-1.64-4.63)
--------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	-------------------

577

578 Table 5: Predicted Probabilities of Cancer-Specific Survival Among Individuals Prostate Cancer

Variables	ALL	White	Black	Hispanic	NHAPI	Native Americans
Georgia x Post-ACA	1.06 (0.81-1.31)	1.02 (0.78-1.26)	1.13 (0.86-1.40)	1.00 (0.69-1.32)	0.76 (0.39-1.13)	0.45 (-0.18-1.07)
Georgia x Pre-ACA	0.95 (0.70-1.21)	0.92 (0.67-1.17)	1.02 (0.74-1.29)	0.91 (0.60-1.21)	0.68 (0.34-1.03)	0.40 (-0.17-0.97)
Kentucky x Post-ACA	1.25 (0.94-1.56)	1.21 (0.91-1.51)	1.33 (0.99-1.67)	1.19 (0.81-1.57)	0.89 (0.45-1.34)	0.53 (-0.21-1.27)
Kentucky x Pre-ACA	0.98 (0.70-1.26)	0.94 (0.67-1.22)	1.04 (0.73-1.35)	0.93 (0.60-1.25)	0.70 (0.34-1.06)	0.41 (-0.17-0.99)

579

580

581 Table 6: DID Output for Cancer-Specific Survival by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Std. Err.	z	P>z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
All	-1.492	0.770	0.053	-3.000	0.017
White Person	-1.436	0.740	0.052	-2.885	0.014
Blacks Person	-1.583	0.820	0.054	-3.191	0.025
Hispanic Person	-1.238	0.671	0.065	-2.554	0.078
Asian & Pacific Islanders	-1.764	1.059	0.096	-3.839	0.311
Native Americans	-0.667	0.753	0.376	-2.142	0.808

582

583 Table 7: DID Output for Overall Survival by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Coefficient	Std. Err	P>z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
All	-0.168	0.081	0.039	-0.326	-0.009
White Person	-0.162	0.078	0.039	-0.315	-0.008
Black Person	-0.179	0.086	0.039	-0.348	-0.009
Hispanic Person	-0.159	0.079	0.043	-0.313	-0.005
Asian & Pacific Islanders	-0.120	0.064	0.060	-0.245	0.005
Native Americans	-0.071	0.061	0.245	-0.190	0.048

584