

Disentangling effects of ethnicity, deprivation, and payment source on obstetric outcomes in American primigravidae: A structural equation model of observational data.

Jonathan Williams

(e-mail: jonathan.williams@wrh.ox.ac.uk)

Abstract

Background: Women from ethnic minorities have worse obstetric outcomes. Possible reasons for this are (1) social deprivation; (2) different standards of obstetric care; and (3) intrinsic ethnic differences. Here I aim to disentangle (1)-(3).

Methods: I constructed two path models of causal links between parental ethnicity and obstetric outcomes. The first, 'no-racism', model estimated independent causal effects of ethnicity, deprivation and payment source on pregnancy and birth outcomes. The second 'realistic' model additionally tested how far deprivation and payment source may mediate effects of ethnicity. Analyses of the models used Bayesian estimation. I analysed both the full sample of complete data and a random 1% sample.

Findings: Data were complete for 762786 births. The 'no-racism' model did not fit the data, but the 'realistic' model fitted adequately. It indicated that ethnicity, social deprivation, and private funding for care all adversely affected outcomes: (i) African American and Hispanic ethnicity caused deprivation; (ii) deprivation increased pregnancy hypertension, shortened gestation and reduced birthweight; (iii) private funding directly increased pregnancy hypertension and indirectly shortened gestation; (iv) participation in the Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) counteracted adverse effects of deprivation. (v) independently of (i)-(iv), ethnic-minority parents had shorter gestation and lighter babies.

Interpretation: Deprivation largely accounts for adverse obstetric outcomes in ethnic minorities. Private funding may also worsen pregnancy hypertension, but WIC improved outcomes. The uniformity of adverse birth outcomes for all ethnic minorities suggests that these result from a common factor, which may be systemic racism. Policies to reduce deprivation and increase government-funded care could importantly improve obstetric outcomes, irrespective of ethnicity.

Funding: none – I undertook the study at home.

Research in Context

Evidence before this study: Many studies during the past century have shown that ethnic minorities have worse social deprivation and worse access to health services. Ethnicity, deprivation and care can all determine health outcomes, and ethnic-minority mothers have worse obstetric outcomes. However, the independent contributions of ethnicity, deprivation and care to these adverse outcomes are unknown.

Added value of this study: I present here causal model of routine observational data that differentiates direct and indirect effects of ethnicity, deprivation and payment source on obstetric outcomes. The model allows (a) deprivation to mediate effects of ethnicity and (b) payment source to mediate effects of both ethnicity and deprivation. Hence, this model can disentangle the “intertwined” effects of ethnicity, deprivation and payment source on obstetric outcomes. The model also examines effects of participation in the Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children on outcomes.

The model fitted a 1% sample of the data after Bayesian estimation – so it bears interpretation as a representation of the real-world causal structure of the data. In the model, minority ethnicity causes deprivation and medical insurance and *all* of these factors independently determine adverse obstetric outcomes. Notably, medical insurance and private payment may increase the risk of pregnancy hypertension and consequently shorten gestation. Participation in WIC was beneficial.

Implications of all the available evidence: Causal modelling of routine natality data may allow effective audit of health care in its social context. Understanding causes of poor outcomes can enable prediction of effects of policy change. The present results indicate that policies to ameliorate social deprivation and expand access to WIC and government-subsidised care should improve obstetric outcomes – with long-term benefits for both mothers and their babies. Extrapolating beyond obstetrics, the present results may help to illuminate mechanisms of the healthcare crisis in America.

Introduction

Social deprivation is a major determinant of health^{1,2} and ethnic minorities generally suffer more deprivation.^{3,4} In America, deprivation can determine the source of payment for healthcare,^{5,6} which can condition care and outcomes.⁷⁻⁹ This is because (a) deprived areas may have limited access to health services,^{10,11} and (b) doctors may not accept patients who lack medical insurance.^{12,13} Hence, social determinants of health are “deeply intertwined with ... racial and rural disparities”.¹⁴

Obstetric outcomes are important, because they predict long-term health problems for both mothers and babies.¹⁴⁻¹⁹ Mothers from ethnic minorities have worse obstetric outcomes.²⁰⁻²⁷ These may reflect (1) direct effects of ethnicity;^{20,28-31} (2) social deprivation;^{14,21,22} or (3) differences in obstetric care between ethnic groups.^{24,32-34} It is important to disentangle (1)-(3), in order to inform both social policy and obstetric management.^{14,35} Previous studies separated effects of deprivation and ethnicity on obstetric outcomes³⁶⁻⁴⁰ but did not assess effects of payment source.⁴¹⁻⁴³ Here, I aim to disentangle effects of all these “intertwined”¹⁴ variables on obstetric outcomes^{36,44,45} (see Fig 1), *via* causal modelling of routine observational data.^{36,44-47}

The temporal progression of pregnancy permits modelling plausible paths by which ethnicity, risk factors, deprivation and payment source may cause obstetric outcomes (Figure 1). This progression is relatively predictable, compared with many medical disorders. Hence, pregnancy and childbirth may provide a ‘unique opportunity’ as a model system to disentangle the “intertwined” effects of ethnicity, deprivation, and source of payment in both obstetric settings and for wider outcomes.¹⁴

Deprivation is a complex concept that has geographical, economic, social and health dimensions.⁴⁸ Measures of material and social deprivation relate strongly to each other and to physical and mental health.⁴⁹ Here, I assess deprivation using educational, social and health indices, including paternal educational level and age,⁵⁰ together with maternal education, smoking, adult stature⁵¹ and BMI.^{52,53} I model ethnicity as a cause of deprivation and both deprivation and ethnicity as causes of risk factors and of the source of payment, prenatal care and outcomes (Figure 1). This model, therefore, embodies possible causal paths in the progression of pregnancy and birth.


Statistically, there are two approaches to test if deprivation, lack of medical insurance and prenatal care may mediate adverse effects of minority ethnicity on obstetric outcomes. The first is to assess the absolute fit of a ‘realistic’ model that includes these mediation effects. If this model fits the data adequately, then it may represent real-world social and clinical causes.^{45,54,55} A second approach is to test if the above ‘realistic’ model fits the data better than a ‘no-racism’ model that omits ethnicity’s effects on deprivation, source of payment and prenatal care. Here, I show that the ‘realistic’ model both outperforms the ‘no-racism’ model and can fit the data – which means that it may accurately represent real-world social and clinical causes of adverse obstetric outcomes.

Methods

Data and ethics

I analysed the US CDC’s natality data⁵⁶ from primigravidae who delivered live infants in their third trimester during 2019. The CDC has described the data⁵⁷ and Supplementary Table S1 shows the variables that I used. The data are anonymised and publicly-available,⁵⁶ so no ethical approval is necessary.⁵⁸ I use ‘ethnicity’ to include ‘race’, following the United Nations recommendation.⁵⁹

Figure 1 – a schematic diagram of the causal paths in the ‘realistic’ and ‘no-racism’ models



Legend: The diagram shows the causal paths and non-causal associations between ethnicity, deprivation, payment source, and other variables. Rectangular boxes represent manifest variables; the oval represents latent deprivation. Single-ended arrows represent causal paths, double-ended, mauve, dashed arrows represent correlations. The green arrow indicates that risk factors are manifest indicators of deprivation. The ‘no-racism’ model excluded the red dashed arrows. Supplementary Figure S1 shows more complete details of the study models’ path diagrams. Key: WIC = participation in the Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children.

Data selection

I initially selected all primigravidae aged 14-45. I then excluded (i) births before the 35th or after the 42nd weeks of gestation; (ii) babies who weighed less than 1.5kg (which may be unhealthy⁶⁰); (iii) births of babies with anencephaly (since these are non-viable); mothers with extreme values of (iv) height (<1.44m or >1.88m), or (v) pre-pregnancy BMI (<16.5kg/m² or >40kg/m²), or (vi) pre-pregnancy hypertension or (vii) diabetes. Exclusions (iv)-(vii) may help to minimise pre-pregnancy maternal morbidities.⁶¹ Finally, I also excluded natality records with any missing data for the study variables (see Supplementary information for R code that generated the data-set).

Data pre-processing

I coarsened measures of payment and ethnicity: (a) I dichotomised payment source into (i) government-aided (Medicaid, CHAMPUS/TRICARE, Indian Health Service or other governmental payment) and (ii) private payment (via private insurance, or self-payers);⁵ (b) I created a category of “Other” ethnicities for all Asian, American Indian/Alaskan (AIAN) or Native Hawaiian or Pacific Island (NHPI) parents, because there were few NHPI or AIAN parents and the “Asian” group is already diverse⁵⁶ (the nHEA category is also genetically diverse⁶²); (c) I dichotomised smoking as mothers who reported no smoking or who smoked at any time; (d) I pooled the lowest and 2nd-lowest categories of educational level (lowest = 1 = less than 8th grade; 2nd-lowest = 2 = up to 12th grade with no diploma) and the highest and 2nd-highest categories (highest = 8 = higher academic or professional degree; 2nd-highest = 7 = Master’s degree), for both mothers and fathers.

I re-scaled and centred parental ages, maternal BMI and height (see Supplementary Methods) to have mean ≈ 0 and variance ≈ 1 . I centred initiation of pre-natal care on the 3rd month of gestation and the duration of gestation on 39 weeks. I scaled birthweight to kg and centred it on 3.5kg.

Model construction and estimation

I constructed a path model that estimated independent effects of ethnicity, deprivation and payment source on obstetric risk factors and outcomes (see Fig 1 and Fig S2). Note that the estimation fixes potential paths that are absent from the model at zero. Hence, the paths that are present can represent a causal model.^{63,64} Model estimation used Mplus.⁶⁵ The Supplementary Information shows all programs and outputs.

The model defined deprivation as a reflective factor with six manifest indicators, that can tap long-term hardship^{66,67} (see Figure 2): (1) younger paternal age,^{50,68,69} (2-3) lower levels of paternal and maternal education^{70,48,50}, (4) maternal smoking⁷¹⁻⁷⁴, (5) shorter maternal stature^{51,75-77} and (6) higher pre-pregnancy maternal BMI.^{71,53,78,79} Minority ethnicity may evoke structural racism,⁸⁰⁻⁸³ that can strongly determine deprivation.⁴ However, deprivation occurs in all ethnic groups. Therefore, I aimed to derive estimates deprivation that are independent of ethnicity. To this end, I adjusted the manifest indicators of deprivation for ethnicity when estimating the latent deprivation factor.

The 6 parental demographic factors, above, should show local independence,⁸⁴ conditional on the deprivation factor. However, I additionally modelled causal effects and associations between parental demographic factors (see Figure 2). I assumed that (1) smoking can cause BMI^{85,86} and educational level (because smoking usually begins before education ends^{87,88}); (2) longer maternal education may delay first pregnancy, but women may curtail education if they become pregnant – so the causal direction of the link between maternal age and education is uncertain; (3) paternal age can determine paternal education, but not vice versa; (4) assortative mating may strengthen correlations between parental ages and educational levels,⁸⁹⁻⁹² over and above links due to ethnicity and deprivation; (5) deprivation precedes pregnancy – so, I modelled maternal age as an effect of deprivation; (6) private payment (private insurance or self-payers) and participation in WIC relate inversely, over-and-above their separate dependence on deprivation (Figures 2a-b); (7) BMI correlates directly with participation in WIC⁹³ (in line with its direct correlation with deprivation^{53,78,79}) and with private payment.⁹⁴

The model's deprivation factor does not use direct economic measures as manifest indicators. Participation in the Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) is a direct indicator of material deprivation, because it requires families to have relatively low income.^{95,96} (although WIC may not index deprivation perfectly, because it may require participants to work⁹⁷). Conversely, most people with medical insurance have paid work.⁹⁸ Therefore, I tested the factor's validity by assessing its effects on both WIC and on source of payment for obstetric care.

I tested if education may cause participation in WIC,⁹⁹ over-and-above effects of ethnicity and deprivation. I allowed smoking status and BMI to correlate with both participation in WIC and source of payment. My rationale for including these correlations is that both smoking and BMI may increase participation in WIC and reduce insurance rates, by reducing disposable income.^{71,78,100} However, the models would not converge if I included smoking or BMI as *causes* of WIC and source of payment, but only converged if I included them as a *correlates*.

Finally, I compared the 'realistic' model with a 'no-racism' model that did not include effects of ethnicity on deprivation, source of payment or month of beginning pre-natal care (see Figure 1 and Figs. S2-S3). In effect, the 'no-racism' model allows ethnicity, deprivation and care (source of payment and initiation of prenatal care) to exert their effects separately, but not in combination. Hence, this comparison allows assessment of the "intertwined" effects of ethnicity with deprivation and care and so provides a pointer to the importance of racism in determining obstetric outcomes.

The model provided indirect effects from putative causal factors to outcomes. I present only those indirect effects that test if deprivation mediates adverse effects of non-nHEA ethnicity on outcomes. The Mplus outputs in the Supplementary Information contain complete tables of indirect effects.

The large sample size (~¾ million) makes the analysis very sensitive, in two ways. (1) analyses of large samples can detect small effects of no practical importance. Therefore, I assessed significance of path coefficients in the Frequentist analysis of the full sample using the approximate Bayes Factor: $|t| > \sqrt{\log(N)+10}$.¹⁰¹ I describe below only effects with $|t| > 4.86$, which implies an approximate Bayes Factor (BF) > 150 . For the Bayesian estimation, I calculated approximate t-values from the Mplus output as: $t = \text{“Estimate”} / \text{“Posterior S.D.”}$ and used the same criterion of $|t| > 4.86$. This strategy parallels the “five-sigma” level of improbability that is the standard for statistical significance in physics.¹⁰² (2) Following from (1), the χ^2 test is very sensitive for detecting lack of fit in large samples (> 1000).¹⁰³ Therefore, I assessed model fit in two ways: first, I used the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) and Standardised Root Mean squared Residual (SRMR); I set RMSEA and SRMR values less than 0.025 as indicating acceptable fit;¹⁰⁴ second, I analysed a random 1% sample (approximately 7800 births) that may be less sensitive to minor deviations from the model.

Results

Sample characteristics

The study sample comprised 762786 primigravidae with singleton live births in America in 2019 (see Table 1). The Supplementary Information shows the sample selection process (Figure S2) and differences between included and excluded mothers (Tables S2-S3).

Table 1: characteristics of the sample used for analysis, broken down by ethnic group.

Variable	Ethnicity:	n-H European	African American	Hispanic	Other
Number of mothers		451267	89356	136847	85316
Number of fathers		453111	104732	126795	78148
Smoking mothers (%)		6.8	3.0	1.7	1.7
Maternal Education*		6 (4 – 6)	4 (3 – 6)	4 (3 – 5)	6 (4 – 7)
Paternal Education*		5 (3 – 6)	3 (3 – 5)	3 (3 – 4)	6 (4 – 7)
Maternal age (y)		28 (24 – 31)	24 (21 – 29)	25 (21 – 29)	30 (27 – 33)
Paternal age (y)		30 (26 – 34)	26 (22 – 31)	27 (22 – 31)	32 (29 – 35)
Maternal height (m)		1.65 (1.60 – 1.70)	1.63 (1.57 – 1.68)	1.60 (1.55 – 1.65)	1.60 (1.57 – 1.65)
Maternal BMI (kg/m ²)		24.4 (21.7 – 28.3)	25.7 (22.2 – 30.1)	25.3 (22.3 – 29.3)	22.8 (20.5 – 25.8)
WIC participant (%)		17.3	50.2	44.7	16.7
Insured / self-payer (%)		77.0	42.2	48.7	76.7
Pre-natal care (month)		2 (2 – 3)	3 (2 – 4)	3 (2 – 3)	2 (2 – 3)
Pregnancy high BP (%)		9.9	9.7	7.2	5.4
Gestational diabetes (%)		5.0	3.9	4.9	10.9
Gestation (weeks)		39 (38 – 40)	39 (38 – 40)	39 (38 – 40)	39 (38 – 40)
Birthweight (kg)		3.36 (3.06 – 3.66)	3.18 (2.87 – 3.48)	3.29 (3.01 – 3.58)	3.20 (2.91 – 3.49)
Maternal deprivation score		-0.08 (-0.66 – 0.71)	0.92 (0.23 – 1.43)	0.93 (0.19 – 1.48)	-0.67 (-1.16 – 0.12)
Paternal deprivation score		-0.12 (-0.69 – 0.66)	0.94 (0.24 – 1.45)	0.95 (0.22 – 1.49)	-0.63 (-1.12 – 0.22)
Missing data (%)		19.8	39.1	36.1	16.4

Key: n-H European =non-Hispanic European American; Cigs = cigarettes; high BP = hypertension; BMI = body mass index; WIC = participation in Supplementary Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children.

Model fits

The 'realistic' model (Figures 1 and 2) fitted the data adequately, after WLSMV estimation (RMSEA = 0.015, 95% CI = 0.014-0.015; CFI = 0.999; TLI = 0.992; SRMR = 0.009), but not perfectly ($\chi^2 = 5404$, 33df, $p < 0.001$). The 'realistic' model fitted equally imperfectly after Bayesian estimation (Posterior Predictive χ^2 95% CI = 3952 – 4212, 185 free parameters, $p < 0.001$). The fit of the 'no-racism' model was much worse than that of the 'realistic' model (Posterior Predictive χ^2 95% CI = 73936– 148737, 167 free parameters, $p < 0.001$; Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2 = 44771$, 18df, $p < 0.001$).


The 'realistic' model fitted a 1% random sample of the data (Posterior Predictive χ^2 95% CI = -31.8 – 643.8, 185 free parameters, posterior predictive $p = 0.179$; see Supplementary Information).

Since the 'no-racism' model performed poorly, I do not consider it further, here in the main report. Full details of the 'no-racism' model are available in the Supplementary Information, together with tables (S6a - S6c) comparing its path coefficients with those of the 'realistic' model.

Structure of the deprivation factor

The latent dimension of deprivation loaded directly on maternal BMI and smoking, but inversely on paternal age and education, and on maternal education, age and height (Figure 2). Note that these loadings were independent of (i) effects of ethnic group on every indicator and on deprivation itself, (ii) correlations between paternal and maternal age and education, and (iii) effects of smoking on maternal education and BMI of smoking on BMI.

Figure 2: the structure of the deprivation factor



Legend: The inter-relations of parental characteristics and their loadings (red arrows) on the deprivation factor. Conventions for model symbols are the same as Figure 1. The values are the estimated standardised effects on each parental characteristic of increasing each putative causal factor by one notional standard deviation. Loadings of the latent variable “deprivation” are in red; single-ended black arrows show putative causal effects of maternal smoking, age and education on each other and on pre-pregnancy BMI; double-ended blue arrows show bidirectional correlations between maternal and paternal age and education and maternal smoking with paternal age. Abbreviation: NS = not significant (all other coefficients have $p < 0.001$)

Effects of ethnicity and deprivation on parental risk factors

Parental African American (AA) or Hispanic ethnicity increased deprivation (see Tables 1 & 3). In contrast, parents of Other ethnicities had less deprivation than non-Hispanic European American (nHEA) mothers (Tables 1 & 3a).

Deprivation worsened all parental risk factors (age, education, BMI and stature - Figure 2 and direct effects of Deprivation in Tables 1 & 2). Deprivation generally mediated apparent adverse effects of parental ethnicities on parental age, education and BMI. Hence, at equal levels of deprivation: (a) AA fathers were slightly older than nHEA fathers; (b) AA parents were, overall, better-educated than nHEA parents; (c) AA and Hispanic ethnicity did not increase maternal BMI; (d) AA and nHAE mothers were the same age and height (compare Tables 1 and 3). In contrast, direct effects of ethnicity predominantly determined the shorter stature of Hispanic and Other-ethnicity mothers and the lower self-reported smoking rates of most ethnicities (except AA fathers) (Table 2).

One-stage and multi-stage indirect causal effects involving deprivation were often different. For example, single- and multi-stage indirect effects of deprivation mediated opposite effects on BMI in ethnic minority mothers (Table 2a). Most indirect effects involved deprivation – most of those that did not involve deprivation were small beneficial effects on maternal education (Table 2a).

Effects of ethnicity on deprivation and source of payment and WIC participation

Deprivation increased participation in WIC and reduced rates of private payment (Table 3). Independently, mothers and fathers of all minority ethnicities were less likely to pay privately (via insurance or directly) and more likely to participate in WIC (Tables 1 and 3).

Effects of ethnicity, deprivation, payment source and WIC on gestational diabetes and hypertension

Different maternal ethnicities showed different patterns of direct effects on gestational diabetes (PRGDM) and pregnancy hypertension (PRGBP) (Tables 1 and 4): (a) both maternal and paternal Hispanic ethnicity directly reduced PRGBP; (b) both maternal and paternal Other ethnicity directly reduced PRGBP, but increased PRGDM – the direct effect of maternal Other ethnicity was almost three times as strong as that of Deprivation ; and (c) AA paternity directly reduced PRGDM (all compared with nHEA fathers). Paternal AA and Hispanic ethnicity also increased PRGBP, indirectly – mainly via deprivation (Table 4).

Deprivation *per se* directly increased PRGBP, but its indirect effects reduced PRGBP and so partly cancelled its direct effect. This reflects deprivation's loadings on younger maternal age, lower maternal education and shorter maternal height – all of which directly reduce PRGBP in the model. Private payment directly increased PRGBP, but participation in WIC reduced it (Table 5).

Effects of ethnicity, deprivation, private payment and WIC on birthweight and duration of gestation

Deprivation directly reduced both birthweight and the duration of gestation (Table 5). Additionally, all minority ethnicities directly worsened these birth outcomes, compared with nHEA mothers (Table 5). Private payment indirectly shortened gestation, via PRGBP and earlier prenatal care (see Supplementary Information), but slightly increased birthweight (Table 5). Participation in WIC lengthened gestation both directly and indirectly, and also increased birthweight (Table 5).

Indirect effects of maternal ethnicity and deprivation on outcomes

The model estimated 164 indirect causal paths from each maternal ethnicity to birthweight and duration of gestation. Many indirect effects were antagonistic (for example, AA ethnicity reduced duration of gestation via deprivation, but increased it via WIC), so that they partly cancelled each other. There are too many indirect effects to describe in detail and most were very small. The Supplementary Information shows all indirect effects from ethnicity, demographic factors, source of payment and and deprivation to obstetric outcomes. I summarise only a few illustrative indirect effects here and in the Supplementary Information.

The overall indirect effects of ethnicities on outcomes were inconsistent (see Table 5 and Mplus outputs in the Supplementary Information). Notably, (i) the sum of *indirect* effects of maternal AA ethnicity on birthweight was slightly positive (Table 5); and (ii) both maternal and paternal AA ethnicity showed only small *indirect* adverse effects on lower birthweight via deprivation. Deprivation's *indirect* effects included lower risks of PRGBP (mainly via WIC) and PRGDM (mainly via lower maternal age), but slightly longer gestation (mainly via WIC) (see Table 3 and Mplus outputs). Private payment *indirectly* reduced the duration of gestation – mainly via higher rates of PRGBP and earlier initiation of pre-natal care (Table 5).

Heterogeneity between ethnicities

The model here shows only main effects of ethnicity on different demographic and outcome variables. I assessed heterogeneity in effects of ethnicity by comparing separate analyses of each ethnic group – see Supplementary information.

Table 2: Effects of ethnicity and deprivation on parental risk factors

a) deprivation, smoking, maternal height and BMI

Cause Effect:	SOCDEP	Maternal smoking (CIG0)					Maternal height (MHT)					Maternal pre-pregnancy BMI (BMI)				
Type of cause	Direct	nonD	othD	dirD	direct	total	nonD	othD	dirD	direct	total	nonD	othD	dirD	direct	total
nHEA	0	-145 (4.2%)					-5.0 (164.7cm)					-3.8 (24.8kg/m²)				
AFAMM	6.1	-	-	3.2	-17.0	-13.9	-	-	-1.1	0.0	-1.1	0.6	-2.2	3.4	0.8	2.6
MHISP	13.5	-	-	7.0	-22.8	-15.8	-	-	-2.4	-18.6	-21.1	0.0	-4.9	7.5	-0.6	1.9
OTHM	-14.5	-	-	-7.6	-8.5	-16.1	-	-	2.6	-21.5	-18.9	-0.8	5.3	-8.0	-8.3	-11.8
AFAMF	20.0	-	-	10.4	-6.1	4.3	-	-	-3.6	-	-3.6	0.2	-7.3	11.1	-	4.0
FHISP	19.1	-	-	9.9	-15.2	-5.3	-	-	-3.5	-	-3.5	0.4	-6.9	10.6	-	4.1
OTHF	-0.5	-	-	-0.2	-6.0	-6.3	-	-	0.1	-	0.1	0.2	0.2	-0.3	-	0.1
SOCDEP	-	-	-	-	52.2	52.2	-	-	-	-18.1	-18.1	-	-	-	55.4	55.4
MEDUC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22.7	22.7
Smoker/CIG0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-5.8	-5.8

b) parental age and education

Cause Effect:	Maternal age (MAGE)					Paternal age (FAGE)					Maternal education (MEDUC)					Paternal education (FEDUC)				
Type of cause	nonD	othD	dirD	direct	total	nonD	othD	dirD	direct	total	nonD	othD	dirD	direct	total	nonD	othD	dirD	direct	total
nHEA	54.4 (28.0 years)					2.2 (30.1 years)					-29.4 (70.2%)					-4.5 (52.9%)				
AFRAMM	-0.2	0	-4.3	-0.1	-4.5	-	-	-3.4	-	-3.4	1.0	-0.2	-4.9	0.6	-3.4	-	0	-4.6	-	-4.7
MHISP	-0.3	0.1	-9.5	1.2	-8.5	-	-	-7.6	-	-7.6	1.3	-0.4	-10.9	-4.0	-13.9	-	0	-10.3	-	-10.4
OTHM	-0.1	-0.1	10.2	-0.2	9.8	-	-	8.2	-	8.2	0.5	0.4	11.7	-3.9	8.8	-	0.1	11.1	-	11.2
AFRAMF	-0.1	0.1	-14.1	-	-14.0	-	-	-11.2	1.5	-9.8	0.4	-0.6	-16.1	-	-16.4	0	-0.1	-15.3	2.2	-13.2
FHISP	-0.2	0.1	-13.4	-	-13.5	-	-	-10.7	0.3	-10.4	0.9	-0.6	-15.4	-	-15.1	0	-0.1	-14.6	-4.2	-18.8
OTHF	-0.1	0	0.3	-	0.3	-	-	0.3	2.7	3.0	0.4	0	0.4	-	0.7	0	0	0.4	2.6	2.9
SOCDEP	-	-	-	-70.6	-70.6	-	-	-	-56.3	-56.3	-	-	-	-80.6	-80.6	-	-	-	-76.5	-76.5

Legend: values represent indirect, direct and total effects of parental minority ethnicities and deprivation on parental risk factors. Where possible, the table splits indirect causal effects into those mediated by deprivation (othD and dirD) or not (nonD): ‘othD’ means indirect effects that have multi-stage mediation via deprivation; ‘dirD’ means indirect effects for which deprivation is the sole mediator. Total effects sum the direct and any indirect effects that are present. Values in red are those where deprivation mediates effects of ethnicity; those in green are where direct effects of ethnicity predominate. Values in bold have p<0.001 and differ from zero by ≥5 posterior standard deviations.

The first row shows estimates for non-smoking, non-Hispanic European American (nHEA) mothers with mean deprivation, age, education, BMI and height, who did not participate in WIC and received government-funded care. The nHEA values are standardised intercepts, with estimated means in the variable’s original scale (in brackets). All values on lower rows are deviations from the nHEA intercepts, expressed as 100*(standardised path coefficients) that estimate effects, in standard deviations, of a 1 standard deviation change in each cause. Notes: (a) direct and indirect effects may not sum to total effects, due to rounding error; (b) categorical coefficients use the logit link. Abbreviations: AFAMM/AFAMF = AA mother/father; MHISP/FHISP = Hispanic mother/father; OTHM/OTHF = Other-ethnicity mother/father; SOCDEP = deprivation.

Table 3: Effects of ethnicity, deprivation, and parental characteristics on payment source, participation in WIC and initiation of pre-natal care

Cause Effect:	Participation in WIC (WIC)					Insured or self-payer (PAYER)					Month began prenatal care (PRECAREM)				
Type of cause	nonD	othD	dirD	direct	total	nonD	othD	dirD	direct	total	nonD	othD	dirD	direct	total
nHEA	-94.0 (8.1%)					73.8 (87.9%)					7.3 (2.71 months)				
AFRAMM	0	0.1	4.2	7.1	11.5	-	0.3	-4.8	-6.8	-11.3	-0.1	0.7	0.1	3.6	4.5
MHISP	-0.2	0.3	9.4	5.4	14.9	-	0.7	-10.8	-4.6	-14.6	-0.3	1.7	0.3	1.7	3.6
OTHM	-0.1	-0.2	-10.2	7.0	-3.5	-	-0.7	11.6	-9.2	1.7	0.9	-1.7	-0.3	2.5	1.2
AFRAMF	0	0.3	14.0	4.7	19.0	-0.1	1.0	-16.0	-3.2	-18.3	0	2.7	0.4	2.2	5.2
FHISP	0	0.3	13.3	4.8	18.5	0.3	1.0	-15.2	-2.7	-16.6	-0.4	2.4	0.4	1.1	3.6
OTHF	0	0	-0.3	4.7	4.4	-0.2	0	0.4	-3.1	-3.0	0	0	0	1.5	1.4
SOCDEP	-	1.5	-	70.0	71.4	-	5.1	-	-80.0	-74.8	-	13.4	-	2.0	15.3
FAGE	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-0.2	-0.3	0	-	-	-	0
MAGE	-	-	-	-5.9	-5.9	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-3.3	-3.4
FEDUC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-6.6	-6.6	0.9	-	-	-	0.9
MEDUC	-	-	-	3.2	3.2	-	-	-	-	-	-0.6	-	-	-5.9	-6.5
CIG0	-0.3	-	-	-	-0.3	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	-	2.4	2.8
BMI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-1.9	-1.9
WIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-6.6	-6.6
PAYER	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-13.3	-13.3

Legend: values represent indirect, direct and total effects of maternal and paternal minority ethnicities on deprivation, participation in WIC, source of payment and initiation of pre-natal care. The model's structure, labels, values, and conventions are similar to those of Table 3. Note: 'nonD', 'othD', (dirD' and 'direct' effects may not sum exactly to the 'Total' effects, due to non-linearity of the logit link (for WIC and payment source) or rounding error (for start of pre-natal care). Cells with grey backgrounds are not directly relevant to the task of disentangling effects of deprivation, ethnicity and sources of funding. However, these effects may differ between nHEA and other ethnicities - see Tables S7a-l in the Supplementary Information. Abbreviations as in Table 2, plus FAGE/MAGE = paternal/maternal age; FEDUC/MEDUC = paternal/maternal education; CIG0 = maternal smoking history (0/1)

Table 4: Indirect and total effects of all the model’s potential causal variables on pregnancy hypertension and gestational diabetes

Cause Effect:	Pregnancy hypertension (PRGBP)					Gestational diabetes (PRGDM)				
Type of cause	nonD	othD	dirD	direct	total	nonD	othD	dirD	direct	total
nHEA	-134 (8.3%)					-176 (3.3%)				
AFRAMM	-0.5	-0.5	1.0	1.7	1.7	-0.7	-0.4	0.2	-0.3	-1.1
MHISP	-1.0	-1.1	2.3	-4.7	-4.8	0.3	-0.7	0.6	0.9	0.9
OTHM	-3.1	1.2	-2.5	-1.6	-5.9	-0.7	0.8	-0.6	11.5	11.0
AFRAMF	-0.4	-1.7	3.4	-3.0	-1.7	-0.3	-1.0	0.8	-3.5	-4.1
FHISP	-0.4	-1.7	3.3	-2.6	-1.3	-0.9	-1.0	0.8	-1.2	-2.3
OTHF	-0.5	0	-0.1	-4.3	-4.8	-0.3	0.1	0	3.0	2.8
SOCDEP	-	-8.9	-	17.3	8.5	-	-5.6	-	4.1	-1.4
FAGE	0	-	-	-2.3	-2.3	0	-	-	1.6	1.6
MAGE	4.5	-	-	4.8	9.4	4.5	-	-	17.9	22.3
FEDUC	-0.3	-	-	-	-0.3	-0.1	-	-	-	-0.1
MEDUC	4.1	-	-	4.8	8.8	4.4	-	-	-0.1	4.2
CIG0	-0.7	-	-	1.0	0.2	-0.3	-	-	5.7	5.3
BMI	-	-	-	18.6	18.6	-	-	-	19.2	19.2
MHT	-	-	-	2.0	2.0	-	-	-	-7.3	-7.3
WIC	-	-	-	-4.2	-4.2	-	-	-	0.8	0.8
PAYER	-	-	-	4.6	4.6	-	-	-	0.9	0.9

Legend: values represent indirect, direct and total effects of all potentially-causal factors on participation on the proportions of mothers with pregnancy hypertension (PRGBP) or gestational diabetes (PRGDM). The table’s structure, labels, values, and conventions are similar to those of Table 3. Coefficients for deprivation represent the standardized change of the outcome per standard deviation change of the putative causal variable. Note: ‘nonD’, ‘othD’, ‘dirD’ and ‘direct’ effects may not sum exactly to the ‘Total’ effects, due to non-linearity of the logit link (for PRGBP and PRGDM) or rounding error (for gestation and birthweight). Abbreviations as Tables 3 and 4. Cells with grey backgrounds are not directly relevant to the task of disentangling effects of deprivation, ethnicity and sources of funding. However, these effects may differ between nHEA and other ethnicities - see Tables S7a-1 in the Supplementary Information.

Table 5: Indirect and total effects of all the model's potential causal variables on duration of gestation and birthweight

Cause Effect:	Duration of gestation (OBGEST)					Birthweight (BWT)				
	nonD	othD	dirD	direct	total	nonD	othD	dirD	direct	total
nHEA	7.6 (39.1 weeks)					-40.3 (3.314kg)				
AFAMM	0.4	0.5	-0.5	-2.1	-2.2	1.3	-0.1	-0.4	-9.8	-8.9
MHISP	1.7	0.3	-1.2	-1.4	-0.9	-0.8	0.2	-0.9	-0.4	-2.0
OTHM	-1.0	-0.4	1.3	-3.2	-3.3	-4.0	-0.1	1.0	-2.6	-5.7
AFAMF	1.9	0.5	-1.8	-2.7	-2.1	1.1	0.1	-1.4	-4.4	-4.5
FHISP	1.4	0.5	-1.7	-1.6	-1.4	1.7	0.1	-1.3	-4.2	-3.6
OTHF	1.4	0	0	-0.7	0.6	1.3	0	0	-7.9	-6.5
SOCDEP	-	2.7	-	-9	-6.2	-	0.6	-	-6.9	-6.2
FAGE	0.5	-	-	-0.1	0.4	0.4	-	-	-1.5	-1.1
MAGE	-4.7	-	-	0.4	-4.2	1.6	-	-	-3.6	-2.0
FEDUC	0.2	-	-	-	0.3	0.1	-	-	-	0.1
MEDUC	-1.9	-	-	-2.0	-3.9	1.7	-	-	-2.9	-1.0
CIG0	-0.8	-	-	-0.2	-1.0	-0.4	-	-	-7.3	-7.7
BMI	-8.8	-	-	7.8	-0.9	-3.6	-	-	15.6	12.0
MHT	0.5	-	-	3.4	3.9	-0.3	-	-	19.3	19.1
WIC	0.9	-	-	1.2	2.1	0.8	-	-	1.2	2.0
PAYER	-2.1	-	-	-1.8	-4.0	-0.8	-	-	0	-0.8
PRECAREM	-	-	-	4.9	4.9	0	-	-	-0.1	-0.1
PRGBP	-	-	-	-31.5	-31.5	-	-	-	-18.5	-18.5
PRGDM	-	-	-	-14.4	-14.4	-	-	-	-1.2	-1.2

Legend: values represent indirect, direct and total effects of all potentially-causal factors on participation on the duration of gestation (OBGEST) and birthweight (BWT). The table's structure, labels, values, and conventions are similar to those of Table 3. Coefficients for deprivation represent the standardized change of the outcome per standard deviation change of the putative causal variable. Note: 'nonD', 'othD', 'dirD' and 'direct' effects may not sum exactly to the 'Total' effects, due to rounding error. Abbreviations as Tables 3 and 4. Cells with grey backgrounds are not directly relevant to the task of disentangling effects of deprivation, ethnicity and sources of funding. However, these effects may differ between nHEA and other ethnicities - see Tables S7a-l in the Supplementary Information.

Discussion

The 'realistic' model aimed to disentangle effects of deprivation, ethnicity and payment source on obstetric risks and outcomes. This model indicates that: (1) Deprivation is a major cause of obstetric risks and adverse outcomes, independently of ethnicity. (2) Deprivation may mediate many apparent adverse effects of African American (AA) or Hispanic ethnicity on obstetric risks. (3) Private funding of obstetric care may cause pregnancy hypertension (PRGBP) and so reduce the length of gestation and birthweight (4) Participation in WIC can ameliorate deprivation's effects. (5) AA, Hispanic and Other ethnicities *all* shorten gestation and lower birthweight directly (independently of deprivation and maternal risk factors). These results fit with extensive evidence that deprivation and ethnicity are major causes of morbidity and mortality.^{1,105–108,82} Hence, policies to reduce deprivation and increase public funding of obstetric services and participation in WIC may improve outcomes for most mothers and babies.

Model validity

The 'realistic' model fitted the 1% sample of the data adequately. This indicates that the model can represent the causal structure of the real-world data-generating processes.^{45,54,55} Additionally, the model's deprivation factor had predictive validity in that it directly determined (a) two economic indicators (payment source and participation in WIC), (b) a maternal risk factor (maternal age), and (c) adverse obstetric outcomes (PRGBP, shorter gestation and lower birthweight) – all of which associate with established measures of deprivation.^{109–112} Further, strengthening the factor's construct validity, smoking and higher BMI can worsen income and housing, as well as worsening health.^{71,78} To test the validity of the 'realistic' model more directly, I constructed a second ('no-racism') model that omitted ethnicity's causal effects on deprivation and indicators of obstetric care (see Figure 1 and Supplementary Information). This 'no-racism' model did not fit the data. Finally, the present findings are consistent with a previous path model of deprivation's effects,³⁶ which indicates they are reliable. Further studies should test how the present deprivation factor relates to other measures of personal and neighbourhood disadvantage.^{113–115}

Model interpretation

The 'realistic' model uses parental risk factors as indicators of deprivation, but also allows ethnicity to determine both the risk factors and deprivation (see Methods). Hence it estimates both direct and indirect effects of ethnicity and deprivation on outcomes. The model adjusts direct effects (Tables 3–5) for preceding effects, so that each is interpretable as an independent cause. Overall, in the model, adjustment for deprivation ameliorates or even *reverses* apparent risk factors in ethnic minority parents. I discuss this further, below and in the Supplementary Information.

The 'realistic' model aimed to extract causal effects from correlations between ethnicity, risk factors, deprivation, funding sources and obstetric outcomes. Two examples of this are: (1) smoking correlates with young maternal age in both the raw data and the 'no-racism' model (see Supplementary Tables); in contrast the results of the 'realistic' model align with experimental evidence that smoking directly reduces fecundity;^{116,117} (2) The 'realistic' model showed that smoking directly lowered birthweight, independently of deprivation and other risk factors– in line with causal evidence that tobacco use can directly reduce birthweight,¹¹⁸ The consistency between the 'realistic' model and external causal studies indicate that it can disentangle “intertwined”¹⁴ causal effects of ethnicity, deprivation, maternal risk factors and payment source on outcomes.

Deprivation showed large effects on risk factors, payment source and participation in WIC. In contrast, after accounting for deprivation, most causal direct effects on obstetric outcomes were small and the model explained small proportions of the variance (R^2) of the main outcomes (Table 2). Götz and colleagues have argued that small effect sizes are likely in real-world situations, where many uncontrolled variables affect each outcome.¹¹⁹ Here, after accounting for deprivation, ethnicity and payment source, known risk factors may be relatively unimportant for outcomes, compared with unmeasured factors (e.g. lifestyle choices, or environmental pollutants¹²⁰).

Smoking

Smoking is a major obstetric risk factor.^{121,122} Here, parents of ethnic minorities self-reported low rates of maternal smoking (Tables 1 and 2). This is consistent with previous obstetric data (Table 1 in^{61,123,124}), but contrasts with objective evidence and self-reports in other settings that ethnic minorities smoke as much as non-Hispanic European Americans.^{125–127} The present results indicate that smoking in AA and Hispanic mothers results partly from deprivation. The contrast with non-obstetric settings implies that ethnic minority mothers may under-report their smoking in obstetric settings. Such under-reporting may reflect miscommunication or cultural distrust of obstetric clinicians.^{108,128,129} Under-reporting would have important consequences, here, because (a) the model uses self-reported smoking as a manifest indicator of deprivation and (b) smoking reduces birthweight.¹¹⁸ So, if ethnic minorities under-report smoking, then the model may under-estimate both their deprivation and adverse effects of both deprivation and smoking. Further studies should test objectively if primigravidae of minority ethnicities smoke less before and during pregnancy.

Effects of ethnicity on deprivation, source of payment and initiation of prenatal care

AA and Hispanic parental ethnicity directly increased deprivation, but maternal Other ethnicities reduced it. Note that the model adjusted its manifest indicators of deprivation for parental ethnicity (e.g., shorter maternal stature loaded on deprivation even though both Hispanic and Other-ethnicity mothers were shorter than nHEA mothers). Hence, the deprivation factor reflects covariation between its indicators that is common to all ethnicities, including nHEA mothers.

All ethnic-minority parents were less likely than nHEA parents to pay for obstetric care via private insurance, or directly. This difference was apparent in the raw data and persisted after adjustment for deprivation (compare Tables 1 and 3). The uniformity of the effect – for all ethnic-minority parents – implies that it reflects a common cause, e.g. systemic racism, or income inequality.^{130–132}

All ethnic-minority parents delayed initiation of prenatal care, in line with earlier reports.^{133–135} This difference was apparent in the raw data and persisted after adjustment for deprivation (compare Tables 1 and 3). Again, the uniformity of the effect – for all ethnic-minority parents – implies that it reflects a common cause, e.g. systemic racism, or income inequality.^{130–132}

Effects of ethnicity on outcomes

Minority ethnicities showed different direct effects on pregnancy problems – PRGBP and gestational diabetes (PRGDM). In particular, ‘Other’ (mostly, Asian) ethnicities developed more PRGDM, but Hispanic parentage reduced rates of PRGBP.¹³⁶ This may reflect ethnicity-specific causes, such as cultural practices (e.g. diet^{137,138}), or genetic heritage.^{30,139,81,140}

In contrast to the ethnicity-specific effects on PRGBP and PRGDM, all minority ethnicities *directly* caused shorter gestation and lower birthweight. These results are in line with previous findings.^{28,141,142} Lower birthweights may partly reflect genetic factors in AA and Asian mothers;³⁰ but babies born to fathers of all ethnic minorities have lower birthweight babies in the present study,³¹ and genetics do not completely account for lower birthweight in AA and Asian babies.^{30,143} The uniformity – for all minority ethnicities – of these direct effects on birth outcomes implies that they may partly reflect a common cause, such as vitamin D deficiency¹⁴⁴ or systemic racism.^{4,145–149,131,150–152,143} Further studies should test these possibilities.

Effects of deprivation on parental risk factors

Deprivation caused markedly worse obstetric risk factors for nHEA mothers in the present study, in line with previous reports (see Introduction & Table 2). Deprivation also mediated apparent adverse effects of ethnicity on risk factors in the raw data. For example, AA fathers were younger than nHEA fathers and AA parents, overall, received less education than nHEA parents (see Table 1) – but after adjustment for deprivation AA parents showed the opposite pattern of direct effects (see Table 2). These results are broadly consistent with previous findings that controlling for deprivation can ameliorate apparent adverse effects of ethnicity.^{153,154} However, ethnicity explains only 1/6th of the variation in deprivation – so policies to reduce deprivation would help mostly nHEA mothers.

Effects of deprivation and ethnicity on source of payment and participation in WIC

AA and Hispanic parents were less likely to pay privately (Table 1) and Deprivation strongly reduced private payment (Table 3). Moreover, after accounting for deprivation, parents of *all* minority ethnicities were less likely to pay privately. Deprivation's effect on government payment supports the validity of the present deprivation factor (see above). Perhaps the most likely reason for residual low rates of private payment by ethnic-minority parents is education-adjusted income inequalities and/or unemployment,¹³² because ethnic minorities are more likely to lose private medical insurance during their reproductive years.¹⁵⁵ Further studies should test this possibility.

Deprivation strongly increased participation in WIC. Moreover, even after accounting for deprivation, parents of minority ethnicities directly increased participation in WIC (in line with previous findings⁹⁹). Strikingly, higher levels of maternal education predicted participation in WIC (see Table 3), which contrasts with previous findings that WIC participants had lower levels of education *even after* adjusting for income.⁹⁹ A possible explanation of this contrast is that the present model accounts more accurately for causes of WIC via deprivation and ethnicity. In this case, the present findings indicate that lower educational level may present a barrier to participation in WIC, among women who would otherwise be eligible. Further studies should test this possibility.

Effects of deprivation on outcomes

Deprivation directly increased the risk of PRGBP, shortened gestation and reduced birthweight. These effects are consistent with previous results.^{156,157,25} However, the present findings clarify that deprivation can adversely affect outcomes independently of ethnicity, payment source, smoking, etc. (see Figs. 1-2). Further studies should clarify the mechanisms of these adverse effects.

Effects of private payment on outcomes

Private payment directly determined higher rates of PRGBP. This fits with independent data (rows 1-2 of Insurance x Severe Preeclampsia in Table 1 in⁵⁸: $\chi^2 = 240$, 1df, $p < 0.001$; insurance x any hypertension in Table 1 in¹⁵⁸: $\chi^2 = 35.5$, 1df, $p < 0.001$), strengthening its reliability. Possible explanations for this are: (1) Financial stresses of funding medical care could directly cause PRGBP;^{cf159,160} or (2) clinicians have lower thresholds for diagnosing PRGBP in women who pay privately.^{161–163} This second possibility could also explain why women with Medicaid funding have worse PRGBP and more preeclampsia.¹⁶⁴ It also fits the view that over-treatment may be common in America,¹⁶⁵ particularly in the nHEA population,¹⁶⁶ which has higher rates of private insurance coverage.¹⁶⁷ PRGBP can cause adverse sequelae,^{168,169} including shorter gestation (due to pre-term induction) and lower birthweight. So, the present result mandates further studies to test (1) and (2).

Effects of participation in WIC on outcomes

Participation in WIC directly lowered rates of PRGBP and lengthened gestation (see Table 4). These effects fit previous findings that WIC increased birthweight¹⁷⁰ and reduced maternal mortality.¹⁷¹ Participation in WIC may be indicative of deprivation that is generally detrimental for maternal health, but – after accounting for deprivation – WIC could prevent PRGBP by reducing financial stresses.⁹⁶ WIC's beneficial effects contrast with the adverse effect of deprivation (see above), which highlights the potential to improve outcomes *via* policies that reduce deprivation.^{cf159,172}

Effects of pre-natal care on outcomes

All ethnic minority parents and smokers delayed starting pre-natal care (PNC).^{see also108} Every other maternal factor caused earlier PNC. However, starting PNC earlier determined with slightly higher risk of PRGBP, and slightly shorter gestation. The inverse correlation with PRGBP may occur because symptoms of early-onset PRGBP prompt some women to seek PNC. But, against this, starting PNC later did not also correlate with lower risk of PRGDM (which could also cause symptoms). An alternative explanation is that maternal anxiety about pregnancy caused earlier entry to PNC, increased PRGBP and shortened gestation.^{cf159,173} Further studies should test this possibility.

Strengths of the study

The present study's strengths are: (1) it used routine electronic birth certification (EBC) data from a large national sample of primigravidae; (2) the model's causal structure provides an "open theory",⁶³ which is a step towards explanation and prediction;^{54,63,64,55,45} (3) the adequacy of the 'realistic' model's fit implies that its structure can reflect clinical realities; (4) the analysis quantifies the model's imperfect fit; (5) by excluding mothers and babies with extreme physical characteristics, the present results may more accurately describe the great majority of births.

The 'realistic' model simply represents plausible clinical causal pathways. Consequently, it may be non-identified¹⁷⁴ and it does not try to avoid important biases that can cloud causal interpretation of observational data^{174–176} – such as "butterfly bias", "collider bias" or "recanting witnesses". Even so, most of the present findings (a) fit with previous reports, (b) parallel external causal analyses that used interventional methods (where available), and (c) appear plausible (*contra* known instances of collider or butterfly bias – e.g.^{45,177–179}). Moreover, the 'realistic' model fits a 1% sample of the data. Therefore, the model may represent the real-world causal structure of the data-generating processes,^{45,54,55} which provides a basis for designing interventional studies to test its predictions.

Limitations of the study

The study had important limitations: (1) Its sample excluded 1/3 of American primigravidae (see Methods), who overall had both worse deprivation and worse outcomes (see Supplementary Tables S2-S4). The main reason for exclusion was missing paternal ethnicity, which was more common for mothers of ethnic minorities. Given the concordance between parental ethnicities (Supplementary Table S5), missing ethnicity was probably more likely for AA and Hispanic fathers. Therefore, this selection bias almost certainly caused the model to *under*-estimate adverse impacts of deprivation and ethnicity.¹⁸⁰ I discuss this further in the Supplementary Information. (2) The proportion of missing data may also vary geographically,¹⁸¹ so geopolitical factors may partly obscure effects of deprivation and/or ethnicity. Further studies should include geopolitical factors in the present model, in order to disentangle their effects on outcomes from those of deprivation, ethnicity and source of payment for care. (3) Electronic Birth Certificate data can be inaccurate^{181,182} - particularly for diagnoses of PRGBP and classification of self-payers.^{181,182} Again, it is likely that such inaccuracies would lead to *under*-estimation of adverse impacts of deprivation and ethnicity. (4) The model only includes the initiation of pre-natal care and not its frequency or quality. (5) The model does not account for obstetric interventions (e.g. early delivery in PRGBP) that may moderate effects of risk factors on outcomes. However, such interventions are links in causal chains that have earlier origins, and it is reasonable to view final birth outcomes as results of those earlier causes. Nevertheless, (2)-(5) may distort the model's estimates of causal effects.

Model fit

The 'no-racism' model, that excluded deprivation, did not fit the data, but the 'realistic' model fitted the data adequately, but imperfectly. The imperfect fit may be due to the large sample size, because this makes the analysis very sensitive to detect not only causal paths that are present in the model, but also small unknown causes that are absent from the model. In line with this explanation, estimation of the model using a 1% sample generated the same pattern of results and posterior predictive probability >0.10, signifying an adequate, though approximate, fit.

The model's imperfect fit to the data of the full sample may reflect (a) remediable limitations of the present methods and/or (b) substantive deficiencies of the model. The most obvious remediable limitation is coarsening of education, smoking and ethnicity data – especially pooling data from Alaskan and American Indian mothers with those of American and Native Pacific Islanders and Asians, since the former two groups generally experience more social deprivation,¹⁸³ while the latter groups are relatively advantaged.^{183,184} Possible substantive deficiencies are that the model (i) assumes linear effects of maternal age, BMI and height on outcomes, but these effects may be non-linear^{20,69,185-188} (c.f the association between BMI and smoking^{94,189}); (ii) ignores the possibility of heterogeneous interactive effects between ethnicity and other causal factors (see below and Tables S7a-l in the Supplementary Information); (iii) does not include known interactions (e.g. risks of low birthweight may increase mainly for older women in deprived areas¹⁸⁵); (iv) omits many factors that can impact obstetric outcomes, including pregnancy weight gain, immigrant status, rurality, and geopolitical context;^{4,25,190,191} (v) defined its deprivation factor as unidimensional, even though deprivation may have several dimensions;^{66,67} (vi) did not account for multicollinearity resulting from assortative mating. Further studies should test how far these omissions can explain the model's imperfect fit.

The possibility of heterogeneous interactions between demographic variables and ethnicity presents the greatest threat to the validity of the realistic model. Tables S7a-l in the Supplementary Information provide strong informal evidence of many such interactions in samples of births where parents have the same ethnicity. The most striking of these interactions is that social deprivation has much worse effects on birthweight and the duration of gestation in African Americans than in any other ethnic group (see Table S7b). I have not interpreted these heterogeneous interactive effects, because I had no *a priori* hypotheses about their natures. My use them only to test how far they may account for the imperfect fit of the realistic model. They are so numerous and various that they may account in large part for its imperfect fit. Even so, the fact that the realistic model fitted a 1% sample of the data indicates that that the heterogeneous interactions of ethnicities with other demographic variables are not fatal for the present study. The present findings (Tables S7a-l) should stimulate further studies to confirm and account for the observed heterogeneities.

Obstetric policy implications

The present study provides a model that can predict the distribution of important outcomes, such as birthweight, for individual pregnancies with any combination of parental risk factors. Such models should yield more accurate prognostic predictions than the simple heuristics in present use¹⁹² (for example, the current criterion for low birthweight is the same for both sexes – even though male babies are typically 100g heavier⁶⁰). In effect, the present analysis may provide a causal model of the CDC's observational natality data. There is a recognised need for causal models,^{193–195} and these may guide policies to identify and reduce risks from unnecessary interventions^{165,196} – e.g. possible over-diagnosis of pregnancy hypertension in mothers who pay privately (see above), with its attendant risks of pre-term induction¹⁹⁷ and consequent low birthweight.

Wider policy implications

The present findings indicate that ethnicity, deprivation and source of payment for care are important determinants of obstetric outcomes that can have serious, long-term sequelae for both mothers and their babies.^{15–18,198} Obstetrics has relatively well-defined progression and outcomes and so can serve as a model system to disentangle the effects of the above social factors. Extending the present methods may help to elucidate effects of these social factors in other health settings. By analogy with their obstetric effects, the present results imply that policies that reduce deprivation and private insurance and increase state funding of health and social care should help to reduce the overall poor outcomes and high costs of American medicine.¹⁹⁹

Data Sharing: All of the data in the present study are freely available from the Centers for Disease Control Natality website.^{56,57} The Supplementary Information includes the full code for data pre-processing and for the statistical analyses and their outputs.

References

1. Black SD. *Inequalities in Health: Report of a Research Working Group*. Department of Health and Social Security; 1980.
2. Wang E, Glazer KB, Howell EA, Janevic TM. Social Determinants of Pregnancy-Related Mortality and Morbidity in the United States: A Systematic Review. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2020;135(4):896-915. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000003762
3. Komro KA, Markowitz S, Livingston MD, Wagenaar AC. Effects of State-Level Earned Income Tax Credit Laws on Birth Outcomes by Race and Ethnicity. *Health Equity*. 2019;3(1):61-67. doi:10.1089/heq.2018.0061
4. Robinson DE, Pearlman J. State Policies, Racial Disparities, and Income Support: A Way to Address Infant Outcomes and the Persistent Black-White Gap? *J Health Polit Policy Law*. Published online September 9, 2021:9517205. doi:10.1215/03616878-9517205
5. Tewogbola P, Aung N. Identifying the insured and uninsured in rural America: an empirical discriminant analysis. *AIMS Public Health*. 2021;8(3):421-427. doi:10.3934/publichealth.2021032
6. Linde S, Egede LE. Association of County Race and Ethnicity Characteristics With Number of Insurance Carriers and Insurance Network Breadth. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022;5(4):e227404. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.7404
7. Tai-Seale M, LoSasso AT, Freund DA, Gerber SE. The long-term effects of Medicaid managed care on obstetrics care in three California counties. *Health Serv Res*. 2001;36(4):751-771.
8. Vesco KK, Ferrante S, Chen Y, Rhodes T, Black CM, Allen-Ramey F. Costs of Severe Maternal Morbidity During Pregnancy in US Commercially Insured and Medicaid Populations: An Observational Study. *Matern Child Health J*. 2020;24(1):30-38. doi:10.1007/s10995-019-02819-z
9. Black CM, Vesco KK, Mehta V, Ohman-Strickland P, Demissie K, Schneider D. Incidence of Severe Maternal Morbidity During Delivery Hospitalization in U.S. Commercially Insured and Medicaid Populations. *J Womens Health 2002*. Published online April 22, 2021. doi:10.1089/jwh.2020.8556
10. Headen A, Masia N. Exploring the Potential Link Between Medicaid Access Restrictions, Physician Location, and Health Disparities. *Am J Manag CARE*. 2005;11:6.
11. McGregor AJ, Hung P, Garman D, Amutah-Onukagha N, Cooper JA. Obstetrical unit closures and racial and ethnic differences in severe maternal morbidity in the state of New Jersey. *Am J Obstet Gynecol MFM*. 2021;3(6):100480. doi:10.1016/j.ajogmf.2021.100480
12. Greene J, Blustein J, Weitzman BC. Race, segregation, and physicians' participation in medicaid. *Milbank Q*. 2006;84(2):239-272. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0009.2006.00447.x
13. Kozhimannil KB, Casey MM, Hung P, Prasad S, Moscovice IS. Location of childbirth for rural women: implications for maternal levels of care. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2016;214(5):661.e1-661.e10. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2015.11.030
14. Shah LM, Varma B, Nasir K, et al. Reducing disparities in adverse pregnancy outcomes in the United States. *Am Heart J*. 2021;242:92-102. doi:10.1016/j.ahj.2021.08.019

15. Huang J, Zhu T, Qu Y, Mu D. Prenatal, Perinatal and Neonatal Risk Factors for Intellectual Disability: A Systemic Review and Meta-Analysis. *PLoS ONE*. 2016;11(4). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0153655
16. Neiger R. Long-Term Effects of Pregnancy Complications on Maternal Health: A Review. *J Clin Med*. 2017;6(8):E76. doi:10.3390/jcm6080076
17. Barrett PM, McCarthy FP, Kublickiene K, et al. Adverse Pregnancy Outcomes and Long-term Maternal Kidney Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(2):e1920964. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.20964
18. Dall'Asta A, D'Antonio F, Saccone G, et al. Cardiovascular events following pregnancy complicated by pre-eclampsia with emphasis on comparison between early- and late-onset forms: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol Off J Int Soc Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2021;57(5):698-709. doi:10.1002/uog.22107
19. Hallum S, Basit S, Kamper-Jørgensen M, Sehested TSG, Boyd HA. Risk and trajectory of premature ischaemic cardiovascular disease in women with a history of pre-eclampsia: a nationwide register-based study. *Eur J Prev Cardiol*. Published online January 26, 2023:zwad003. doi:10.1093/eurjpc/zwad003
20. Patel RR, Steer P, Doyle P, Little MP, Elliott P. Does gestation vary by ethnic group? A London-based study of over 122 000 pregnancies with spontaneous onset of labour. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2004;33(1):107-113. doi:10.1093/ije/dyg238
21. Kwate NOA, Meyer IH. The myth of meritocracy and African American health. *Am J Public Health*. 2010;100(10):1831-1834. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2009.186445
22. Ncube CN, Enquobahrie DA, Albert SM, Herrick AL, Burke JG. Association of neighborhood context with offspring risk of preterm birth and low birthweight: A systematic review and meta-analysis of population-based studies. *Soc Sci Med 1982*. 2016;153:156-164. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.02.014
23. Goldfarb SS, Houser K, Wells BA, Brown Speights JS, Beitsch L, Rust G. Pockets of progress amidst persistent racial disparities in low birthweight rates. *PloS One*. 2018;13(7):e0201658. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0201658
24. Schummers L, Hacker MR, Williams PL, et al. Variation in relationships between maternal age at first birth and pregnancy outcomes by maternal race: a population-based cohort study in the United States. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(12):e033697. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033697
25. Singh GK, Lee H. Trends and Racial/Ethnic, Socioeconomic, and Geographic Disparities in Maternal Mortality from Indirect Obstetric Causes in the United States, 1999-2017. *Int J MCH AIDS*. 2021;10(1):43-54. doi:10.21106/ijma.448
26. Palatnik A, Garacci E, Walker RJ, Ozieh MN, Williams JS, Egede LE. The Association of Paternal Race and Ethnicity with Adverse Pregnancy Outcomes in a Contemporary U.S. Cohort. *Am J Perinatol*. 2021;38(7):698-706. doi:10.1055/s-0039-3400995
27. Palatnik A, McGee P, Bailit J, et al. The association of race and ethnicity with severe maternal morbidity among individuals diagnosed with hypertensive disorders of pregnancy. *Am J Perinatol*. Published online June 28, 2022. doi:10.1055/a-1886-5404

28. Goedhart G, van Eijsden M, van der Wal MF, Bonsel GJ. Ethnic differences in term birthweight: the role of constitutional and environmental factors. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol*. 2008;22(4):360-368. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3016.2008.00945.x
29. Vang ZM, Elo IT. Exploring the health consequences of majority–minority neighborhoods: Minority diversity and birthweight among native-born and foreign-born blacks. *Soc Sci Med*. 2013;97:56-65. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.07.013
30. Tekola-Ayele F, Workalemahu T, Amare AT. High burden of birthweight-lowering genetic variants in Africans and Asians. *BMC Med*. 2018;16(1):70. doi:10.1186/s12916-018-1061-3
31. Nongmaithem SS, Beaumont RN, Dedaniya A, et al. Babies of South Asian and European Ancestry Show Similar Associations With Genetic Risk Score for Birth Weight Despite the Smaller Size of South Asian Newborns. *Diabetes*. 2022;71(4):821-836. doi:10.2337/db21-0479
32. Janevic T, Egorova NN, Zeitlin J, Balbierz A, Hebert PL, Howell EA. Examining Trends in Obstetric Quality Measures for Monitoring Health Care Disparities. *Med Care*. 2018;56(6):470-476. doi:10.1097/MLR.0000000000000919
33. Howell EA, Egorova N, Balbierz A, Zeitlin J, Hebert PL. Black-white differences in severe maternal morbidity and site of care. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2016;214(1):122.e1-7. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2015.08.019
34. Jatta F, Sundby J, Vangen S, Lindskog BV, Sørbye IK, Owe KM. Association between Maternal Origin, Pre-Pregnancy Body Mass Index and Caesarean Section: A Nation-Wide Registry Study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(11):5938. doi:10.3390/ijerph18115938
35. Manuck TA. Racial and ethnic differences in preterm birth: A complex, multifactorial problem. *Semin Perinatol*. 2017;41(8):511-518. doi:10.1053/j.semperi.2017.08.010
36. Lima RJCP, Batista RFL, Ribeiro MRC, et al. Prepregnancy body mass index, gestational weight gain, and birth weight in the BRISA cohort. *Rev Saude Publica*. 2018;52:46. doi:10.11606/s1518-8787.2018052000125
37. Kramer MS, Goulet L, Lydon J, et al. Socio-economic disparities in preterm birth: causal pathways and mechanisms. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol*. 2001;15(s2):104-123. doi:10.1046/j.1365-3016.2001.00012.x
38. Kane JB. An integrative model of inter- and intragenerational preconception processes influencing birthweight in the United States. *J Health Soc Behav*. 2015;56(2):246-261. doi:10.1177/0022146515582043
39. Dolatian M, Mahmoodi Z, Alavi-Majd H, Moafi F, Ghorbani M, Mirabzadeh A. Psychosocial factors in pregnancy and birthweight: Path analysis: Psychosocial factors and birthweight. *J Obstet Gynaecol Res*. 2016;42(7):822-830. doi:10.1111/jog.12991
40. Dolatian M, Sharifi N, Mahmoodi Z, Fathnezhad-Kazemi A, Bahrami-Vazir E, Rashidian T. Weight gain during pregnancy and its associated factors: A Path analysis. *Nurs Open*. 2020;7(5):1568-1577. doi:10.1002/nop2.539

41. Kozhimannil KB, Shippee TP, Adegoke O, Vemig BA. Trends in hospital-based childbirth care: the role of health insurance. *Am J Manag Care*. 2013;19(4):e125-132.
42. Noursi S, Saluja B, Richey L. Using the Ecological Systems Theory to Understand Black/White Disparities in Maternal Morbidity and Mortality in the United States. *J Racial Ethn Health Disparities*. 2021;8(3):661-669. doi:10.1007/s40615-020-00825-4
43. Symum H, Zayas-Castro J. Impact of Statewide Mandatory Medicaid Managed Care (SMMC) Programs on Hospital Obstetric Outcomes. *Healthc Basel Switz*. 2022;10(5):874. doi:10.3390/healthcare10050874
44. Shrier I, Platt RW. Reducing bias through directed acyclic graphs. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2008;8:70. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-8-70
45. Pearl J. Linear Models: A Useful “Microscope” for Causal Analysis. *J Causal Inference*. 2013;1(1):155-170. doi:10.1515/jci-2013-0003
46. Elias D, Campaña H, Poletta FA, et al. Preterm birth etiological pathways: a Bayesian networks and mediation analysis approach. *Pediatr Res*. Published online July 19, 2021. doi:10.1038/s41390-021-01659-4
47. St-Laurent J, De Wals P, Moutquin JM, Niyonsenga T, Noiseux M, Czernis L. Biopsychosocial determinants of pregnancy length and fetal growth. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol*. 2008;22(3):240-248. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3016.2008.00926.x
48. Kroll LE, Schumann M, Hoebel J, Lampert T. Regional health differences - developing a socioeconomic deprivation index for Germany. *J Health Monit*. 2017;2(2):98-114. doi:10.17886/RKI-GBE-2017-048.2
49. Myck M, Najsztub M, Oczkowska M. Implications of Social and Material Deprivation for Changes in Health of Older People. *J Aging Health*. 2020;32(5-6):371-383. doi:10.1177/0898264319826417
50. Talukder A, Khan ZI, Khatun F, Tahmida S. Factors associated with age of mother at first birth in Albania: application of quantile regression model. *Heliyon*. 2021;7(3):e06547. doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06547
51. Johnson DE, Gunnar MR. IV. Growth Failure in Institutionalized Children. *Monogr Soc Res Child Dev*. 2011;76(4):92-126. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5834.2011.00629.x
52. Molina-García J, Queralt A, Adams MA, Conway TL, Sallis JF. Neighborhood built environment and socio-economic status in relation to multiple health outcomes in adolescents. *Prev Med*. 2017;105:88-94. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2017.08.026
53. Voorhees CC, Catellier DJ, Ashwood JS, et al. Neighborhood socioeconomic status and non school physical activity and body mass index in adolescent girls. *J Phys Act Health*. 2009;6(6):731-740. doi:10.1123/jpah.6.6.731
54. Korb KB, Nicholson AE. The Causal Interpretation of Bayesian Networks. In: Holmes DE, Jain LC, eds. *Innovations in Bayesian Networks: Theory and Applications*. Studies in Computational Intelligence. Springer; 2008:83-116. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-85066-3_4

55. Pearl J. *The Causal Foundations of Structural Equation Modeling*: Defense Technical Information Center; 2012. doi:10.21236/ADA557445
56. Natality Information. Vital Statistics Online Data Portal. Accessed May 24, 2019. https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data_access/VitalStatsOnline.htm#Births
57. User Guide to the 2019 Natality Public Use File. Published online 2019. https://ftp.cdc.gov/pub/Health_Statistics/NCHS/Dataset_Documentation/DVS/natality/UserGuide2019-508.pdf
58. Butwick AJ, Druzin ML, Shaw GM, Guo N. Evaluation of US State-Level Variation in Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(10):e2018741. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.18741
59. The Race question - UNESCO Digital Library. Accessed October 25, 2021. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000128291>
60. Kiserud T, Benachi A, Hecher K, et al. The World Health Organization fetal growth charts: concept, findings, interpretation, and application. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2018;218(2):S619-S629. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2017.12.010
61. Catalao R, Dorrington S, Pritchard M, et al. Ethnic inequalities in mental and physical multimorbidity in women of reproductive age: a data linkage cohort study. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(7):e059257. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2021-059257
62. Navarro-López B, Granizo-Rodríguez E, Palencia-Madrid L, Raffone C, Baeta M, de Pancorbo MM. Phylogeographic review of Y chromosome haplogroups in Europe. *Int J Legal Med*. 2021;135(5):1675-1684. doi:10.1007/s00414-021-02644-6
63. Guest O, Martin AE. How Computational Modeling Can Force Theory Building in Psychological Science. *Perspect Psychol Sci*. 2021;16(4):789-802. doi:10.1177/1745691620970585
64. Borsboom D, van der Maas HLJ, Dalege J, Kievit RA, Haig BD. Theory Construction Methodology: A Practical Framework for Building Theories in Psychology. *Perspect Psychol Sci*. 2021;16(4):756-766. doi:10.1177/1745691620969647
65. Muthén LK, Muthén BO. *Mplus User's Guide*. 8th ed. Muthén & Muthén; 1998.
66. McLaughlin KA, Sheridan MA, Humphreys KL, Belsky J, Ellis BJ. The Value of Dimensional Models of Early Experience: Thinking Clearly About Concepts and Categories. *Perspect Psychol Sci J Assoc Psychol Sci*. 2021;16(6):1463-1472. doi:10.1177/1745691621992346
67. Sinha K, Davillas A, Jones AM, Sharma A. Do socioeconomic health gradients persist over time and beyond income? A distributional analysis using UK biomarker data. *Econ Hum Biol*. 2021;43:101036. doi:10.1016/j.ehb.2021.101036
68. Nettle D. Dying young and living fast: variation in life history across English neighborhoods. *Behav Ecol*. 2010;21(2):387-395. doi:10.1093/beheco/arp202
69. Restrepo-Méndez MC, Lawlor DA, Horta BL, et al. The association of maternal age with birthweight and gestational age: a cross-cohort comparison. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol*. 2015;29(1):31-40. doi:10.1111/ppe.12162

70. Morris JN, Blane DB, White IR. Levels of mortality, education, and social conditions in the 107 local education authority areas of England. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 1996;50(1):15-17. doi:10.1136/jech.50.1.15
71. Harrison S, Davies AR, Dickson M, et al. The causal effects of health conditions and risk factors on social and socioeconomic outcomes: Mendelian randomization in UK Biobank. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2020;49(5):1661-1681. doi:10.1093/ije/dyaa114
72. Crampton P, Salmond C, Woodward A, Reid P. Socioeconomic deprivation and ethnicity are both important for anti-tobacco health promotion. *Health Educ Behav Off Publ Soc Public Health Educ*. 2000;27(3):317-327. doi:10.1177/109019810002700306
73. Love-Koh J, Pennington B, Owen L, Taylor M, Griffin S. How health inequalities accumulate and combine to affect treatment value: A distributional cost-effectiveness analysis of smoking cessation interventions. *Soc Sci Med* 1982. 2020;265:113339. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113339
74. Cunningham JK, Ritchey J, Arambula Solomon TG. With socioeconomic status controlled, cigarette use is lower among American Indians/Alaska Natives than whites. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2020;211:107836. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2020.107836
75. Hancock C, Bettiol S, Smith L. Socioeconomic variation in height: analysis of National Child Measurement Programme data for England. *Arch Dis Child*. 2016;101(5):422-426. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2015-308431
76. Davallow Ghajar L, DeBoer MD. Environmental and birth characteristics as predictors of short stature in early childhood. *Acta Paediatr Oslo Nor 1992*. 2019;108(5):954-960. doi:10.1111/apa.14617
77. Orr J, Freer J, Morris JK, et al. Regional differences in short stature in England between 2006 and 2019: A cross-sectional analysis from the National Child Measurement Programme. *PLOS Med*. 2021;18(9):e1003760. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1003760
78. Tyrrell J, Wood AR, Ames RM, et al. Gene-obesogenic environment interactions in the UK Biobank study. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2017;46(2):559-575. doi:10.1093/ije/dyw337
79. Katsoulis M, Lai AG, Diaz-Ordaz K, et al. Identifying adults at high-risk for change in weight and BMI in England: a longitudinal, large-scale, population-based cohort study using electronic health records. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. 2021;9(10):681-694. doi:10.1016/S2213-8587(21)00207-2
80. Amjad S, MacDonald I, Chambers T, et al. Social determinants of health and adverse maternal and birth outcomes in adolescent pregnancies: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol*. 2019;33(1):88-99. doi:10.1111/ppe.12529
81. Johnson JD, Louis JM. Does race or ethnicity play a role in the origin, pathophysiology, and outcomes of preeclampsia? An expert review of the literature. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. Published online July 24, 2020:S0002-9378(20)30769-9. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2020.07.038
82. Wami W, Walsh D, Hennig BD, et al. Spatial and temporal inequalities in mortality in the USA, 1968-2016. *Health Place*. 2021;70:102586. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2021.102586

83. Boen C, Keister L, Aronson B. Beyond Net Worth: Racial Differences in Wealth Portfolios and Black-White Health Inequality across the Life Course. *J Health Soc Behav.* 2020;61(2):153-169. doi:10.1177/0022146520924811
84. Local independence. In: *Wikipedia.* ; 2022. Accessed July 9, 2024. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Local_independence&oldid=1072083012
85. Koval JJ, Pederson LL, Zhang X, Mowery P, McKenna M. Can young adult smoking status be predicted from concern about body weight and self-reported BMI among adolescents? Results from a ten-year cohort study. *Nicotine Tob Res Off J Soc Res Nicotine Tob.* 2008;10(9):1449-1455. doi:10.1080/14622200802239140
86. Jacobs M. Adolescent smoking: The relationship between cigarette consumption and BMI. *Addict Behav Rep.* 2019;9:100153. doi:10.1016/j.abrep.2018.100153
87. Marshall L, Schooley M, Ryan H, et al. Youth tobacco surveillance--United States, 2001-2002. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep Surveill Summ Wash DC 2002.* 2006;55(3):1-56.
88. Edelen MO, Tucker JS, Ellickson PL. A discrete time hazards model of smoking initiation among West Coast youth from age 5 to 23. *Prev Med.* 2007;44(1):52-54. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2006.09.004
89. Ford WCL, North K, Taylor H, et al. Increasing paternal age is associated with delayed conception in a large population of fertile couples: evidence for declining fecundity in older men. *Hum Reprod.* 2000;15(8):1703-1708. doi:10.1093/humrep/15.8.1703
90. Khandwala YS, Baker VL, Shaw GM, Stevenson DK, Lu Y, Eisenberg ML. Association of paternal age with perinatal outcomes between 2007 and 2016 in the United States: population based cohort study. *BMJ.* 2018;363:k4372. doi:10.1136/bmj.k4372
91. Rauscher E. Why Who Marries Whom Matters: Effects of Educational Assortative Mating on Infant Health in the U.S. 1969-1994. *Soc Forces Sci Medium Soc Study Interpret.* 2020;98(3):1143-1173. doi:10.1093/sf/soz051
92. Trimarchi A, Van Bavel J. Partners' Educational Characteristics and Fertility: Disentangling the Effects of Earning Potential and Unemployment Risk on Second Births. *Eur J Popul Rev Eur Demogr.* 2020;36(3):439-464. doi:10.1007/s10680-019-09537-w
93. Martin MA, Lippert AM. Feeding her children, but risking her health: the intersection of gender, household food insecurity and obesity. *Soc Sci Med 1982.* 2012;74(11):1754-1764. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.11.013
94. Akinyemi OA, Tanna R, Adetokunbo S, et al. Increasing Pre-pregnancy Body Mass Index and Pregnancy Outcomes in the United States. *Cureus.* 2022;14(9):e28695. doi:10.7759/cureus.28695
95. Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) | Food and Nutrition Service. Accessed November 7, 2021. <https://www.fns.usda.gov/wic>
96. Berkowitz SA, Seligman HK, Rigdon J, Meigs JB, Basu S. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Participation and Health Care Expenditures Among Low-Income Adults. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2017;177(11):1642-1649. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2017.4841

97. Brantley E, Pillai D, Ku L. Association of Work Requirements With Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Participation by Race/Ethnicity and Disability Status, 2013-2017. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(6):e205824. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.5824
98. De Lew N, Greenberg G, Kinchen K. A layman's guide to the U.S. health care system. *Health Care Financ Rev*. 1992;14(1):151-169.
99. Collin DF, Guan A, Hamad R. Predictors of WIC uptake among low-income pregnant individuals: a longitudinal nationwide analysis. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2023;117(6):1331-1341. doi:10.1016/j.ajcnut.2023.04.023
100. Macías Sánchez A, García Gómez A. Crowding out and impoverishing effect of tobacco in Mexico. *Tob Control*. 2024;33(Suppl 2):s68-s74. doi:10.1136/tc-2022-057791
101. Raftery AE. Bayesian model selection in social research. *Sociol Methodol*. 1995;25:111-163.
102. Why do physicists mention “five sigma” in their results? | CERN. Accessed April 24, 2024. <https://home.cern/resources/faqs/five-sigma>
103. Hoijtink H, van de Schoot R. Testing small variance priors using prior-posterior predictive p values. *Psychol Methods*. 2018;23(3):561-569. doi:10.1037/met0000131
104. SEM: Fit (David A. Kenny). Accessed July 3, 2022. <https://davidakenny.net/cm/fit.htm>
105. Vos AA, Posthumus AG, Bonsel GJ, Steegers EAP, Denktaş S. Deprived neighborhoods and adverse perinatal outcome: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 2014;93(8):727-740. doi:10.1111/aogs.12430
106. Vathesatogkit P, Batty GD, Woodward M. Socioeconomic disadvantage and disease-specific mortality in Asia: systematic review with meta-analysis of population-based cohort studies. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2014;68(4):375-383. doi:10.1136/jech-2013-203053
107. Chaparro MP, Benzeval M, Richardson E, Mitchell R. Neighborhood deprivation and biomarkers of health in Britain: the mediating role of the physical environment. *BMC Public Health*. 2018;18. doi:10.1186/s12889-018-5667-3
108. Odd DE, Stoianova S, Williams T, et al. Race and Ethnicity, Deprivation, and Infant Mortality in England, 2019-2022. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2024;7(2):e2355403. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.55403
109. Amato PR, Landale NS, Havasevich-Brooks TC, et al. Precursors of Young Women's Family Formation Pathways. *J Marriage Fam*. 2008;70(5):1271-1286. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00565.x
110. Sayers G, Donohue F, McKeown D, et al. Analysis of low birth weight first-born babies by geography and deprivation as an aid to policy and service targeting. *J Public Health*. 2020;42(1):e66-e73. doi:10.1093/pubmed/fdz035
111. Lisonkova S, Bone JN, Muraca GM, et al. Incidence and risk factors for severe preeclampsia, hemolysis, elevated liver enzymes, and low platelet count syndrome, and eclampsia at preterm and term gestation: a population-based study. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. Published online May 8, 2021:S0002-9378(21)00549-4. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2021.04.261

112. Wickrama KAS, O'Neal CW, Lee TK, Lee S. Early life course processes leading to educational and economic attainment in young adulthood: Contributions of early socioeconomic adversity and education polygenic score. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(10):e0256967. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0256967
113. Jarman B. Identification of underprivileged areas. *Br Med J Clin Res Ed*. 1983;287(6385):130-131. doi:10.1136/bmj.287.6385.130-c
114. Pampalon R, Hamel D, Gamache P, Philibert MD, Raymond G, Simpson A. An area-based material and social deprivation index for public health in Québec and Canada. *Can J Public Health Rev Can Sante Publique*. 2012;103(8 Suppl 2):S17-22.
115. Kind AJH, Buckingham WR. Making Neighborhood-Disadvantage Metrics Accessible — The Neighborhood Atlas. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;378(26):2456-2458. doi:10.1056/NEJMp1802313
116. de Angelis C, Nardone A, Garifalos F, et al. Smoke, alcohol and drug addiction and female fertility. *Reprod Biol Endocrinol RBE*. 2020;18(1):21. doi:10.1186/s12958-020-0567-7
117. Konstantinidou F, Stuppia L, Gatta V. Looking Inside the World of Granulosa Cells: The Noxious Effects of Cigarette Smoke. *Biomedicines*. 2020;8(9):E309. doi:10.3390/biomedicines8090309
118. Hawkins SS, Baum CF, Oken E, Gillman MW. Associations of tobacco control policies with birth outcomes. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2014;168(11):e142365. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2014.2365
119. Götz FM, Gosling SD, Rentfrow PJ. Small Effects: The Indispensable Foundation for a Cumulative Psychological Science. :11.
120. Hu H, Zhao J, Savitz DA, Prosperi M, Zheng Y, Pearson TA. An external exposome-wide association study of hypertensive disorders of pregnancy. *Environ Int*. 2020;141:105797. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2020.105797
121. Liu B, Xu G, Sun Y, et al. Maternal cigarette smoking before and during pregnancy and the risk of preterm birth: A dose–response analysis of 25 million mother–infant pairs. *PLOS Med*. 2020;17(8):e1003158. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1003158
122. Günther V, Alkatout I, Vollmer C, Maass N, Strauss A, Voigt M. Impact of nicotine and maternal BMI on fetal birth weight. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2021;21(1):127. doi:10.1186/s12884-021-03593-z
123. Shachar BZ, Mayo JA, Lee HC, et al. Effects of race/ethnicity and BMI on the association between height and risk for spontaneous preterm birth. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2015;213(5):700.e1-9. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2015.07.005
124. Tong VT, Dietz PM, England LJ, et al. Age and Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Prepregnancy Smoking Among Women Who Delivered Live Births. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2011;8(6):A121.
125. Hoshiko S, Pearl M, Yang J, et al. Differences in Prenatal Tobacco Exposure Patterns among 13 Race/Ethnic Groups in California. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2019;16(3):E458. doi:10.3390/ijerph16030458

126. Kulik MC, Glantz SA. Similar softening across different racial and ethnic groups of smokers in California as smoking prevalence declined. *Prev Med*. 2019;120:144-149. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2019.01.020
127. Keeler C, Wang Y, Max W, Yao T, Gu D, Sung HY. The Association of California's Proposition 56 Tobacco Tax Increase With Smoking Behavior Across Racial and Ethnic Groups and by Income. *Nicotine Tob Res Off J Soc Res Nicotine Tob*. 2021;23(12):2091-2101. doi:10.1093/ntr/ntab130
128. Crawford A, Cleveland L, McGrath J, Berndt A. Systemic inequities and depressive symptomology in Hispanic mothers: A path analysis model. *Public Health Nurs Boston Mass*. Published online September 16, 2021. doi:10.1111/phn.12968
129. Janevic T, Piverger N, Afzal O, Howell EA. "Just Because You Have Ears Doesn't Mean You Can Hear"-Perception of Racial-Ethnic Discrimination During Childbirth. *Ethn Dis*. 2020;30(4):533-542. doi:10.18865/ed.30.4.533
130. Gibson-Davis C, Keister LA, Gennetian LA. Net Worth Poverty in Child Households by Race and Ethnicity, 1989-2019. *J Marriage Fam*. 2021;83(3):667-682. doi:10.1111/jomf.12742
131. O'Brien R, Neman T, Seltzer N, Evans L, Venkataramani A. Structural racism, economic opportunity and racial health disparities: Evidence from U.S. counties. *SSM - Popul Health*. 2020;11:100564. doi:10.1016/j.ssmph.2020.100564
132. The White House. Racial Discrimination in Contemporary America | CEA. The White House. July 3, 2024. Accessed August 11, 2024. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/cea/written-materials/2024/07/03/racial-discrimination-in-contemporary-america/>
133. Cresswell JA, Yu G, Hatherall B, et al. Predictors of the timing of initiation of antenatal care in an ethnically diverse urban cohort in the UK. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2013;13:103. doi:10.1186/1471-2393-13-103
134. Gonthier C, Estellat C, Deneux-Tharoux C, et al. Association between maternal social deprivation and prenatal care utilization: the PreCARE cohort study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2017;17(1):126. doi:10.1186/s12884-017-1310-z
135. Puthussery S, Tseng PC, Sharma E, et al. Disparities in the timing of antenatal care initiation and associated factors in an ethnically dense maternal cohort with high levels of area deprivation. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2022;22(1):713. doi:10.1186/s12884-022-04984-6
136. Liu B, Lamerato LE, Misra DP. A retrospective analysis of the relationship between race/ethnicity, age at delivery and the risk of gestational diabetes mellitus. *J Matern-Fetal Neonatal Med Off J Eur Assoc Perinat Med Fed Asia Ocean Perinat Soc Int Soc Perinat Obstet*. Published online January 22, 2019:1-9. doi:10.1080/14767058.2019.1566310
137. Rifas-Shiman SL, Rich-Edwards JW, Kleinman KP, Oken E, Gillman MW. Dietary quality during pregnancy varies by maternal characteristics in Project Viva: a US cohort. *J Am Diet Assoc*. 2009;109(6):1004-1011. doi:10.1016/j.jada.2009.03.001
138. Parker HW, Tovar A, McCurdy K, Vadiveloo M. Socio-economic and racial prenatal diet quality disparities in a national US sample. *Public Health Nutr*. 2020;23(5):894-903. doi:10.1017/S1368980019003240

139. Hoh BP, Abdul Rahman T, Yusoff K. Natural selection and local adaptation of blood pressure regulation and their perspectives on precision medicine in hypertension. *Hereditas*. 2019;156:1. doi:10.1186/s41065-019-0080-1
140. Grant ID, Giussani DA, Aiken CE. Blood pressure and hypertensive disorders of pregnancy at high altitude: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol MFM*. 2021;3(5):100400. doi:10.1016/j.ajogmf.2021.100400
141. Troe EJWM, Raat H, Jaddoe VWV, et al. Explaining differences in birthweight between ethnic populations. The Generation R Study. *BJOG Int J Obstet Gynaecol*. 2007;114(12):1557-1565. doi:10.1111/j.1471-0528.2007.01508.x
142. Johnson JD, Green CA, Vladutiu CJ, Manuck TA. Racial Disparities in Prematurity Persist among Women of High Socioeconomic Status. *Am J Obstet Gynecol MFM*. 2020;2(3):100104. doi:10.1016/j.ajogmf.2020.100104
143. Opondo C, Jayaweera H, Hollowell J, Li Y, Kurinczuk JJ, Quigley MA. Variations in neonatal mortality, infant mortality, preterm birth and birth weight in England and Wales according to ethnicity and maternal country or region of birth: an analysis of linked national data from 2006 to 2012. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2020;74(4):336-345. doi:10.1136/jech-2019-213093
144. Chen Y, Zhu B, Wu X, Li S, Tao F. Association between maternal vitamin D deficiency and small for gestational age: evidence from a meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7(8):e016404. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-016404
145. David R, Collins J. Disparities in Infant Mortality: What's Genetics Got to Do With It? *Am J Public Health*. 2007;97(7):1191-1197. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2005.068387
146. Bell JF, Zimmerman FJ, Almgren GR, Mayer JD, Huebner CE. Birth outcomes among urban African-American women: a multilevel analysis of the role of racial residential segregation. *Soc Sci Med* 1982. 2006;63(12):3030-3045. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2006.08.011
147. Duru OK, Harawa NT, Kermah D, Norris KC. Allostatic load burden and racial disparities in mortality. *J Natl Med Assoc*. 2012;104(1-2):89-95. doi:10.1016/s0027-9684(15)30120-6
148. Mayne SL, Yellayi D, Pool LR, Grobman WA, Kershaw KN. Racial Residential Segregation and Hypertensive Disorder of Pregnancy Among Women in Chicago: Analysis of Electronic Health Record Data. *Am J Hypertens*. 2018;31(11):1221-1227. doi:10.1093/ajh/hpy112
149. Teitler J, Wood BM, Zeng W, Martinson ML, Plaza R, Reichman NE. Racial-ethnic inequality in cardiovascular health in the United States: Does it mirror socioeconomic inequality? *Ann Epidemiol*. 2021;62:84-91. doi:10.1016/j.annepidem.2021.04.019
150. Beech BM, Ford C, Thorpe RJ, Bruce MA, Norris KC. Poverty, Racism, and the Public Health Crisis in America. *Front Public Health*. 2021;9:699049. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2021.699049
151. Riggan KA, Gilbert A, Allyse MA. Acknowledging and Addressing Allostatic Load in Pregnancy Care. *J Racial Ethn Health Disparities*. 2021;8(1):69-79. doi:10.1007/s40615-020-00757-z
152. Knight M, Bunch K, Tuffnell D, et al. *Saving Lives, Improving Mothers' Care Core Report: Lessons Learned to Inform Maternity Care from the UK and Ireland Confidential Enquiries*

into *Maternal Deaths and Morbidity 2017-19*. NPEU; 2021.

www.npeu.ox.ac.uk/mbrance-uk/reports

153. Chu QD, Smith MH, Williams M, et al. Race/Ethnicity Has No Effect on Outcome for Breast Cancer Patients Treated at an Academic Center with a Public Hospital. *Cancer Epidemiol Prev Biomark*. 2009;18(8):2157-2161. doi:10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-09-0232
154. Roseland ME, Schwartz K, Ruterbusch JJ, et al. Influence of clinical, societal, and treatment variables on racial differences in ER-/PR- breast cancer survival. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. 2017;165(1):163-168. doi:10.1007/s10549-017-4300-y
155. Sohn H. Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Insurance Coverage: Dynamics of Gaining and Losing Coverage over the Life-Course. *Popul Res Policy Rev*. 2017;36(2):181-201. doi:10.1007/s11113-016-9416-y
156. Vinikoor-Imler LC, Gray SC, Edwards SE, Miranda ML. The effects of exposure to particulate matter and neighbourhood deprivation on gestational hypertension. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol*. 2012;26(2):91-100. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3016.2011.01245.x
157. Li Y, Quigley MA, Dattani N, et al. The contribution of gestational age, area deprivation and mother's country of birth to ethnic variations in infant mortality in England and Wales: A national cohort study using routinely collected data. *PloS One*. 2018;13(4):e0195146. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0195146
158. Nobles CJ, Williams A, Ouidir M, Sherman S, Mendola P. Differential Effect of Ambient Air Pollution Exposure on Risk of Gestational Hypertension and Preeclampsia. *Hypertens Dallas Tex* 1979. 2019;74(2):384-390. doi:10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.119.12731
159. Mitchell AM, Christian LM. Financial strain and birth weight: The mediating role of psychological distress. *Arch Womens Ment Health*. 2017;20(1):201-208. doi:10.1007/s00737-016-0696-3
160. Taylor K, Compton S, Kolenic GE, et al. Financial Hardship Among Pregnant and Postpartum Women in the United States, 2013 to 2018. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(10):e2132103. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.32103
161. Arrieta A, Woods J, Wozniak G, Tsipas S, Rakotz M, Jay S. Return on investment of self-measured blood pressure is associated with its use in preventing false diagnoses, not monitoring hypertension. *PloS One*. 2021;16(6):e0252701. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0252701
162. Magee LA, Singer J, Lee T, et al. The impact of pre-eclampsia definitions on the identification of adverse outcome risk in hypertensive pregnancy - analyses from the CHIPS trial (Control of Hypertension in Pregnancy Study). *BJOG Int J Obstet Gynaecol*. 2021;128(8):1373-1382. doi:10.1111/1471-0528.16602
163. Szoke D, Borille S, Cardellicchio M, et al. Impact of optimizing pre-analytical phase on the diagnosis of gestational diabetes and related outcomes. *Clin Chem Lab Med*. 2021;59(12):1981-1987. doi:10.1515/cclm-2021-0706
164. Greiner KS, Speranza RJ, Rincón M, Beeraka SS, Burwick RM. Association between insurance type and pregnancy outcomes in women diagnosed with hypertensive disorders of pregnancy. *J Matern-Fetal Neonatal Med Off J Eur Assoc Perinat Med Fed Asia Ocean*

Perinat Soc Int Soc Perinat Obstet. 2020;33(8):1427-1433.
doi:10.1080/14767058.2018.1519544

165. Levinson W, Kallewaard M, Bhatia RS, Wolfson D, Shortt S, Kerr EA. ‘Choosing Wisely’: a growing international campaign. *BMJ Qual Saf.* 2015;24(2):167-174. doi:10.1136/bmjqs-2014-003821
166. Pollock A, Jones DS. Coronary artery disease and the contours of pharmaceuticalization. *Soc Sci Med* 1982. 2015;131:221-227. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.06.035
167. D’Angelo DV, Le B, O’Neil ME, et al. Patterns of Health Insurance Coverage Around the Time of Pregnancy Among Women with Live-Born Infants--Pregnancy Risk Assessment Monitoring System, 29 States, 2009. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep Surveill Summ Wash DC* 2002. 2015;64(4):1-19.
168. Holzman CB, Senagore P, Xu J, et al. Maternal risk of hypertension 7-15 years after pregnancy: clues from the placenta. *BJOG Int J Obstet Gynaecol.* 2021;128(5):827-836. doi:10.1111/1471-0528.16498
169. Garovic VD, Dechend R, Easterling T, et al. Hypertension in Pregnancy: Diagnosis, Blood Pressure Goals, and Pharmacotherapy: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Hypertension.* 0(0):HYP.0000000000000208. doi:10.1161/HYP.0000000000000208
170. Blakeney EL, Herting JR, Zierler BK, Bekemeier B. The effect of women, infant, and children (WIC) services on birth weight before and during the 2007-2009 great recession in Washington state and Florida: a pooled cross-sectional time series analysis. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2020;20(1):252. doi:10.1186/s12884-020-02937-5
171. Alves FJO, Ramos D, Paixão ES, et al. Association of Conditional Cash Transfers With Maternal Mortality Using the 100 Million Brazilian Cohort. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2023;6(2):e230070. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.0070
172. Hill HD, Rowhani-Rahbar A. Income Support as a Health Intervention. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2022;5(1):e2143363. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.43363
173. Rauchfuss M, Fischer T, Bogner G, Maier B. Influence of so far neglected psychosomatic factors, BMI and smoking on pregnancy-induced hypertension (PIH). *Pregnancy Hypertens.* 2012;2(2):93-100. doi:10.1016/j.preghy.2011.11.003
174. Avin C, Shpitser I, Pearl J. Identifiability of Path-Specific Effects.
175. Pearl J. On measurement bias in causal inference. *ArXiv Prepr ArXiv12033504*. Published online 2012.
176. Liu R, Williams NT, Rudolph KE, Díaz I. General targeted machine learning for modern causal mediation analysis. Published online August 26, 2024. Accessed September 18, 2024. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2408.14620>
177. Whitcomb BW, Schisterman EF, Perkins NJ, Platt RW. Quantification of collider-stratification bias and the birthweight paradox. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol.* 2009;23(5):394-402. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3016.2009.01053.x

178. Ananth CV, Schisterman EF. Confounding, causality, and confusion: the role of intermediate variables in interpreting observational studies in obstetrics. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2017;217(2):167-175. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2017.04.016
179. Ding P, Miratrix LW. To adjust or not to adjust? Sensitivity analysis of M-bias and butterfly-bias. *J Causal Inference*. 2015;3(1):41-57.
180. Cheng ER, Hawkins SS, Rifas-Shiman SL, Gillman MW, Taveras EM. Association of missing paternal demographics on infant birth certificates with perinatal risk factors for childhood obesity. *BMC Public Health*. 2016;16:453. doi:10.1186/s12889-016-3110-1
181. Gregory ECW, Martin JA, Argov EL, Osterman MJK. Assessing the Quality of Medical and Health Data From the 2003 Birth Certificate Revision: Results From New York City. *Natl Vital Stat Rep Cent Dis Control Prev Natl Cent Health Stat Natl Vital Stat Syst*. 2019;68(8):1-20.
182. Haghghat N, Hu M, Laurent O, Chung J, Nguyen P, Wu J. Comparison of birth certificates and hospital-based birth data on pregnancy complications in Los Angeles and Orange County, California. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2016;16:93. doi:10.1186/s12884-016-0885-0
183. Wong MS, Steers WN, Hoggatt KJ, Ziaieian B, Washington DL. Relationship of neighborhood social determinants of health on racial/ethnic mortality disparities in US veterans-Mediation and moderating effects. *Health Serv Res*. 2020;55 Suppl 2:851-862. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.13547
184. Williams A, Nolan TS, Brock G, et al. Association of Socioeconomic Status With Life's Essential 8 Varies by Race and Ethnicity. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2023;12(18):e029254. doi:10.1161/JAHA.122.029254
185. Dibben C, Sigala M, Macfarlane A. Area deprivation, individual factors and low birth weight in England: is there evidence of an "area effect"? *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2006;60(12):1053-1059. doi:10.1136/jech.2005.042853
186. Miranda ML, Swamy GK, Edwards S, Maxson P, Gelfand A, James S. Disparities in maternal hypertension and pregnancy outcomes: evidence from North Carolina, 1994-2003. *Public Health Rep Wash DC 1974*. 2010;125(4):579-587. doi:10.1177/003335491012500413
187. Bonnell LN, Troy AR, Littenberg B. Exploring non-linear relationships between neighbourhood walkability and health: a cross-sectional study among US primary care patients with chronic conditions. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(8):e061086. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2022-061086
188. Allotey J, Archer L, Snell KIE, et al. Development and validation of a prognostic model to predict birth weight: individual participant data meta-analysis. *BMJ Med*. 2024;3(1):e000784. doi:10.1136/bmjmed-2023-000784
189. Boone-Heinonen J, Lyon-Scott K, Springer R, et al. Pregnancy health in a multi-state U.S. population of systemically underserved patients and their children: PROMISE cohort design and baseline characteristics. *BMC Public Health*. 2024;24(1):886. doi:10.1186/s12889-024-18257-8
190. Florian S, Ichou M, Panico L. Parental migrant status and health inequalities at birth: The role of immigrant educational selectivity. *Soc Sci Med 1982*. 2021;278:113915. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.113915

191. Abreu LRS, Shirley MK, Castro NP, et al. Gestational diabetes mellitus, pre-pregnancy body mass index, and gestational weight gain as risk factors for increased fat mass in Brazilian newborns. *PloS One*. 2019;14(8):e0221971. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0221971
192. Whyte MB, Kelly P. The normal range: it is not normal and it is not a range. *Postgrad Med J*. 2018;94(1117):613-616. doi:10.1136/postgradmedj-2018-135983
193. Hernán MA. A definition of causal effect for epidemiological research. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2004;58(4):265-271. doi:10.1136/jech.2002.006361
194. Hernán MA, Robins JM. Estimating causal effects from epidemiological data. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2006;60(7):578-586. doi:10.1136/jech.2004.029496
195. Hernán MA. The C-Word: Scientific Euphemisms Do Not Improve Causal Inference From Observational Data. *Am J Public Health*. 2018;108(5):616-619. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2018.304337
196. Keijzers G, Cullen L, Egerton-Warburton D, Fatovich DM. Don't just do something, stand there! The value and art of deliberate clinical inertia. *Emerg Med Australas EMA*. 2018;30(2):273-278. doi:10.1111/1742-6723.12922
197. Craven S, Byrne F, Mahony R, Walsh JM. Do you pay to go private?: a single centre comparison of induction of labour and caesarean section rates in private versus public patients. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2020;20(1):746. doi:10.1186/s12884-020-03443-4
198. Schwartz GL, Leifheit KM, Berkman LF, Chen JT, Arcaya MC. Health Selection Into Eviction: Adverse Birth Outcomes and Children's Risk of Eviction Through Age 5 Years. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2021;190(7):1260-1269. doi:10.1093/aje/kwab007
199. Bradley EH, Sipsma H, Taylor LA. American health care paradox—high spending on health care and poor health. *QJM Int J Med*. 2017;110(2):61-65. doi:10.1093/qjmed/hcw187