

1 **Socioeconomic Disparities for Healthcare Utilization of Senior Adult Falls in**  
2 **Southeast Wisconsin, 2020-2022**

3 Tong, Ling; M.S.; University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Department of Health Informatics and  
4 Administration

5 Khani, Masoud; M.S.; University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Department of Engineering and  
6 Applied Science, Milwaukee,

7 Taylor, Bradley; MBA; Medical College of Wisconsin, Clinical and Translational Science  
8 Institute of Southeastern Wisconsin

9 Osinski, Kristen; M.S; Medical College of Wisconsin, Clinical and Translational Science  
10 Institute of Southeastern Wisconsin

11 Jazzmyne A. Adams; MPH; Medical College of Wisconsin, Department of Otolaryngology and  
12 Communication Sciences

13 David R. Friedland; MD., PhD; Medical College of Wisconsin, Department of Otolaryngology  
14 and Communication Sciences

15 Luo, Jake; PhD; University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Department of Health Informatics and  
16 Administration

17 **Acknowledgement:**

18 Conflict of interest: All authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

19 **Ethical statement:**

20 The Medical College of Wisconsin and Froedtert Hospital Institutional Review Board  
21 (PRO00036649) approved the OTO Clinomics platform, the interrogation of the electronic  
22 medical record, and the retrospective chart review involved in this study.

23 **Corresponding Author:**

24 Jake Luo, PhD

25 Associate Professor

26 Director of Health Care Informatics Graduate Program

27 Department of Health Informatics and Administration

28 College of Health Sciences

29 University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

30 Email: [jakeluo@uwm.edu](mailto:jakeluo@uwm.edu)

31 Postal Address: 2025 E Newport Ave 6565, WI, 53211, Milwaukee, USA

32

33 **Summary:**

34 1) What is the current understanding of this subject?

35 Current healthcare outcome studies focus on risk factors of falls. However, there is a lack of  
36 studies on patient socioeconomic effects to the healthcare utilization.

37 2) What does this report add to the literature?

38 The study reveals the potential socioeconomic inequities and disparities in the healthcare  
39 adoption of the senior adult falls.

40 3) What are the implications for public health practice?

41 With the growing percentage of senior adult populations, specific strategies are needed to  
42 address the disparities to the adoption in underserved senior populations.

43

44 **Keywords:**

45 Social Determinant of Health; Health Disparities; Senior Adult Care.

46 **Abstract**

47 **Background:** To examine the social determinant factors of the healthcare utilizations for senior  
48 patients with history of falls.

49 **Methods:** We analyzed effects of socioeconomic factors on the utilization rate of healthcare in a  
50 tertiary care center including 495,041 senior adults. We included Zip Code Tabulation Areas to  
51 measure socioeconomic factors on a community level. Cohort group comparison and multiple  
52 linear regression models evaluated the association between healthcare services utilization and  
53 age, sex, education, race, insurance type, distance, and income levels.

54 **Results:** Patients with a history of falls were older than those without a history of falls ( $79.4 \pm$   
55  $12.1$  vs.  $75.4 \pm 11.6$  years old), predominantly female (odds ratio [OR]: 1.26, 95% confidence  
56 interval [95% CI]: 1.24–1.28), white (OR: 1.35, 95% CI: 1.32–1.38). Patients with a fall history  
57 were predominantly retired (OR: 2.53, 95% CI: 2.49–2.58), publicly insured (OR: 2.88, 95% CI:  
58 2.82–2.93), and more likely to require an interpreter during a hospital visit (OR: 2.40, 95% CI:  
59 2.35–2.44). Using a geospatial analysis, healthcare utilization was higher in areas close to the  
60 care center. A regression model showed that a community's median income, private insurance  
61 rate, and college education rate were positively associated with healthcare utilization.

62 **Conclusions:** Lower utilization of healthcare is associated with disadvantaged neighborhood  
63 social conditions, including under-insured status, residing far from a hospital, lower education,  
64 and lower income. We revealed the current inequities and disparities in the healthcare of senior  
65 adult fall patients in Southeast Wisconsin.

66

## 67 **Introduction**

68 Falls are a leading cause of injury and death in older adults. [1] Over 25% of senior adults fall  
69 each year. [2] Half of senior adults over 80 had a history of falling.[3] Additionally, 25 – 30% of  
70 patients with a history of falls suffer moderate to severe injuries, limiting their ability to live  
71 independently within their community. Hospitalization is usually needed after a major injury[4].  
72 In 2018, 2.4 million older adults were treated in emergency rooms for non-fatal fall injuries, with  
73 over 700,000 hospitalized,[5] and over 34,000 older adults died from unintentional fall  
74 injuries.[5]

75 The risk factor for falls has been comprehensively investigated. [7,8,9] The two major factors are  
76 person-specific and environmental factors. The latter include poor-fitting footwear, slippery  
77 floors, tripping hazards, loose rugs, a lack of stair railings, poor lighting.[10] Improving home  
78 environments can help to reduce the risk of falling. Personal factors include individual  
79 characteristics such as age, functional abilities, chronic medical conditions, and gait balance.[11]  
80 Most risk factors found in the literature were intrinsic and included a wide range of risk  
81 categories: demographic profile, lower extremity strength, vertigo and dizziness, vision,  
82 cognition deficiency, cardiovascular disease, medications, depression, gait, and balance caused  
83 by normal aging and pathological effects.[11,12] Each risk category had several risk factors that  
84 increased the likelihood of falling.

85 Compared with clinical risk factors, socioeconomic factors are less studied. Fall-related  
86 healthcare may be unavailable low-income seniors.[17] The seniors' socioeconomic status can be  
87 measured by education, occupation, income, and location.[18] Lower socioeconomic status is  
88 associated to poorer health conditions, making them more likely to fall. Despite the importance  
89 of socioeconomic variables, very few investigated the association between socioeconomic  
90 factors and elderly fall risk. It is unclear how socioeconomic factors affect fall patients'  
91 healthcare adoptions.

92 Many studies showed that health equity is preventing equal care for all populations. [19,20]  
93 Offering a more equitable healthcare services leads to more efficient healthcare systems overall.  
94 [21] Patients with lower socioeconomic status may receive poorer healthcare than the general

95 population. Investigating the fall health disparities can benefit a large population, especially for  
96 low-income and socially disadvantaged population. Discovering the health equity issues and  
97 providing guidelines ensures a better health outcome and recommendations for specific  
98 populations.

99 To understand the health equity challenges and close the gap for senior adult patients, this study  
100 examined how socioeconomic factors affect the healthcare access for seniors over 60 years old  
101 with or without a history of falls. This study results could provide resources and data for  
102 policymakers and providers to make guidelines and address the senior adult care inequities.

### 103 **Methodology**

104 The study was conducted in the Milwaukee metropolitan area. The population included all  
105 patients aged 60 or older who visited Froedtert Hospital and Medical College of Wisconsin  
106 between March 1, 2020, and March 1, 2022. Fall patient and non-fall patient cohorts were  
107 identified using diagnostic codes in electronic health records. Fall patients had at least one fall-  
108 related injury, and non-fall patients were not diagnosed with falls and related injuries during the  
109 study period.

110 We collected demographic and clinical data, including age, gender, race, insurance type, co-  
111 morbidities, and medication use. This study also collected zip-code tabulation area (ZCTA) data,  
112 including median household income, poverty rate, educational level, and unemployment rate.  
113 Multivariable logistic regression models were employed to examine the association between  
114 socioeconomic factors and healthcare utilization for fall patients compared to non-fall patients,  
115 together with determining odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) to quantify the  
116 strength and direction of the association. The Zip-Code area-based variables were from the  
117 United States Census Bureau's 2018 American Community Survey. The multiple regression  
118 model was adjusted by patients based on age, gender, race, insurance type, and co-morbidities to  
119 examine potential effects.

### 120 **Data Collection**

121 All in-person hospital visits by senior adults over 60 were included in the study. This study  
122 divided patients into two exclusive groups. Falls group patients had at least one fall-related ICD-  
123 10 diagnosis during the study period (Appendix 1). Non-fall patients had non-fall-related  
124 diagnoses in their electronic health records. We recorded age, gender, race, insurance, ethnicity,  
125 employment status, and interpreter assistance during visits for each group. The database's payer  
126 information classified insurance status as public, private, other, or uninsured.

127 This study collected socioeconomic variables from eight counties—Jefferson, Kenosha,  
128 Milwaukee, Ozaukee, Racine, Walworth, Washington, and Waukesha—with 126 zip codes. Zip  
129 code tabulation area-based variables include the following: (1) whites percentage, (2) college-  
130 educated percentage, (3) public and private insurance coverage percentage, (4) median  
131 household income, (5) Area Deprivation Index, and (6) Rural-Urban Continuum Codes.

132 The Area Deprivation Index was based on a measure created by the Health Resources and  
133 Services Administration. It allowed for rankings of neighborhoods by socioeconomic  
134 disadvantage in a region of interest. Area Deprivation Index ranged on a scale of 0 to 100, from  
135 the most affluent to the most disadvantaged, and according to mixed factors including income,  
136 education, employment, and housing quality. ADI was used to inform socioeconomic status,  
137 health delivery, and policy conditions, especially for the most disadvantaged neighborhood  
138 groups. The Rural-Urban Continuum Codes distinguishes metropolitan counties by the  
139 population size to metropolitan areas, and non-metropolitan counties. Appendix 2 shows the  
140 categorization of Rural-Urban Continuum Codes.

141 This study defined a utilization rate as a predictor variable, deemed to be the number of patients  
142 with a fall history divided by the total population within each zip code block area. The utilization  
143 rate for non-fall patients was deemed to be the number of patients without a fall history divided  
144 by the total population in each zip code block area. Consequently, this study can associate the  
145 utilization rate variable with socioeconomic variables to evaluate the effect of each  
146 socioeconomic factor.

## 147 **Statistical and Geographical Analysis**

148 All statistical analyses were performed using R programming language. Statistical tests were  
149 two-sided, and alpha was set at 0.05. This study calculated P-values using chi-square tests for  
150 categorical variables. Within table 1 of the comparison for two cohorts, this study used the odds  
151 ratio (OR) to measure the association with patient characteristics. ORs were calculated through a  
152 two-by-two contingency table. The table compared the size of the effect between the fall history  
153 group and the non-fall history group. Concerning each patient characteristic, an OR value larger  
154 than 1 indicated that patients with the corresponding characteristics were more likely to  
155 experience falls and visit the hospital, while an OR value smaller than 1 indicated that patients  
156 with the corresponding characteristics were less likely to experience falls. The 95% confidence  
157 interval demonstrated the 95% likelihood range of the OR, based upon a normal distribution. A  
158 P-value < 0.05 indicated the difference in patient characteristics between the two groups to be  
159 statistically significant.

160 To further quantify the association between socioeconomic variables and utilization rates, this  
161 study completed a multiple linear regression analysis. The multiple linear regression used the  
162 utilization rate of falls and the utilization rate of other care as predictor variables, employing  
163 socioeconomic analysis as an independent variable. This study plotted scatter plots and  
164 calculated the coefficient for each socioeconomic variable. Finally, multiple regression analysis  
165 examined how social determinant factors affect healthcare utilization.

166

## 167 **Results**

### 168 **Healthcare utilization gaps between two patient groups**

169 Table 1 shows that 495,041 patients between March 1st, 2020, and March 1st, 2022. 66,357  
170 (13.4%) had fall-related conditions. Patient with falls were older ( $79.4 \pm 12.1$  vs  $75.4 \pm 11.6$   
171 years old). Data shows falling risk increases with age. Employment variable also shows retired  
172 patients were 2.53 times more likely to experience falls and access healthcare facilities than other  
173 employed patients.

174 Demographic factors also affect the healthcare utilization. Females has a higher ratio of falling  
175 conditions, showing 1.26 times more than man in fall utilization. White patients used healthcare  
176 1.35 times more than other races. Asian and black had lower utilization. Hispanics are  
177 underserved in the healthcare system because non-Hispanics were 3.22 more likely to use such  
178 services.

179 Economic factors also affect healthcare utilization. Public insurance patients used the services  
180 2.88-fold more than other insurers. Uninsured patients used healthcare less frequently, with a OR  
181 value of 0.51 demonstrated that healthcare underserves uninsured patients. There was no  
182 association between Area deprivation index and the healthcare utilization.

183 Location also affected health care access. The hospital is in Wauwatosa, Wisconsin, a  
184 Milwaukee suburb. Over 90% of study patients live in Milwaukee. Rural patients were 1.33-fold  
185 less likely to use the services than those in metropolitan Milwaukee, indicating that rural patients  
186 may not have equal access to healthcare.

### 187 **Geographic Map-based Analysis**

188 The utilization rate map in Figure 1 shows higher utilization around the hospital. Suburban and  
189 rural areas far from the hospital have significantly less utilizations. We further  
190 showed socioeconomic variables, including college education, white rate, income, and private  
191 insurance rate in Figure 2. From the map distribution, we found significant differences in college  
192 education rates, racial distribution, and median household income. The map analysis showed that  
193 the Northwest had a high utilization rate and private insurance rate, suggesting a correlation.



## 194 **Zip Code Tabulation Area-based Analysis: Linear Regression Assessment**

195 Figure 3 shows scatter plots and regression analyses of socioeconomic factors and fall and non-  
196 fall patient cohort utilization rates. The linear regression analysis shows private insurance rate  
197 was the most robust predictor of healthcare utilization rates for both fall-based and non-fall-  
198 based healthcare, with R-squared values of 0.68 and 0.79, respectively. College educated rate  
199 and median household income also showed a positive association with healthcare utilization rates.

200 In the multiple regression analysis in Table 2, the white ratio, college education rate, and private  
201 insurance rate were associated with healthcare utilization for fallers. College education and  
202 private insurance were positively associated with healthcare utilization in non-fallers. Table 2  
203 suggests that socioeconomic status affects healthcare utilization, particularly fall-related care.  
204 Patients with private insurance and higher education levels have better access to healthcare  
205 services than those from racial and ethnic minority groups, lower income households, and  
206 uninsured individuals.

## 207 **Discussion**

208 We examined socioeconomic factors and health utilization rates in 495,041 senior adults from a  
209 Milwaukee tertiary care center. This study showed that lower socioeconomic status is associated  
210 with lower general healthcare and fall-based care utilization. Data showed that low-income  
211 patients were underserved by healthcare. Uninsured people, low-income and low-education  
212 communities, and rural residents were included. The study confirms previous findings on  
213 socioeconomic factors and healthcare use. This study supports previous research [13, 17, 18] that  
214 older people, women, and certain racial and ethnic groups are more likely to use healthcare. This  
215 study also supports previous findings that uninsured and low-income people use healthcare less.  
216 Previous research has also examined the geographical distribution of healthcare utilization,  
217 finding that urban areas have higher utilization rates than rural areas [29]. Regression analysis  
218 showed that median household income, college education, and private insurance rates were  
219 positively correlated with healthcare utilization in each zip code tabulation area. These results  
220 indicate that economic conditions affect healthcare access and use.

221 The US Census Bureau reports a fast aging trend [22]. The baby boomers had 76 million US  
222 births from 1946 to 1964 [23]. Approximately 16.5% (54.1 million) of the total population  
223 reaches 65 years of age or older [24], most are at risk for falling. It is imperative to manage the  
224 risk of falls for the elderly. On the one hand, patient falls are associated with other ongoing  
225 clinical conditions, such as hypertension [25], physical or cognitive impairments [26],  
226 medication [27], and environmental hazards [28]. More clinical analysis of elderly falls may  
227 reveal key clinical risk factor correlations. Clinical factors and falls can be studied further.  
228 Utilizing these clinical factors can reduce fall risk.

229 Clinical factors are the focus of care [30], but equitable healthcare is neglected. Few studies have  
230 examined the relationship between fall risks and socioeconomic status, which may widen the gap  
231 between patients. According to this study, social determinants of health can affect senior adults'  
232 healthcare access. This study focused on Southeastern Wisconsin patients' socioeconomic  
233 disparities. Census data contains social determinant variables, making such analysis easy to  
234 replicate in other US cities and counties. This study also quantified how social gaps affect  
235 healthcare use. Close socioeconomic gaps to achieve equal healthcare, according to quantitative  
236 results.

237 This study found that socially marginalized senior adults underuse healthcare (Table 1). This  
238 study found that many socioeconomic determinants are linked to the healthcare utilization gap  
239 (Table 2, Figures 2-4). Healthcare professionals are needed to close the utilization gap. Equitable  
240 healthcare improves health outcomes and healthcare systems, so policies and practices must  
241 balance equity and efficiency for equal care. Socioeconomic factors are discussed below:

242 **Gender Differences:** Female patients are 1.23-fold more likely to fall than male patients, which  
243 is consistent with other studies. These studies suggest that increased gait variability during dual-  
244 tasking may increase women's fall risk.[31] Environmental hazards that cause falls can differ  
245 between men and women, but clinical risk factors must be identified. Gait variability increased  
246 risk in other studies [32]. Multi-tasking increases women's gait variability, which increases their  
247 risk of falling and fractures. Other studies found that environmental hazards that cause falls in  
248 men and women vary. Men fell when their feet or chairs lost support. Berg [33] found that  
249 women tripped and fell more. No research has examined clinical factors that differ between men

250 and women that cause such falls. Men and women may have different clinical fall factor risks.  
251 This study suggests more research on clinical factors that cause falls by gender.

252 **Insurance Disparities:** Insurance Disparities: Public insurance patients have a 2.64-fold higher  
253 risk of falling than private insurance patients, showing how unequal healthcare access affects  
254 falls risk. The utilization rate shows that distance to the care center greatly affects healthcare  
255 access for elderly patients without private insurance, who are more likely to fall. Economic  
256 factors exacerbate healthcare disparities. The adjusted OR is higher than 2.64 because private  
257 insurers use more healthcare services, indicating that public insurance may be a risk factor for  
258 falls.

259 **Geographic Distribution Disparities:** Patients who live in the Northeast and near the care  
260 center use more. Despite fall history, distance to the care center greatly affects utilization. The  
261 utilization rate also shows that approximately 5–10% of the total population has visited the care  
262 center for the purpose of diagnosing or treating falls, while 20–50% of the total population  
263 previously visited the care center for a non-fall-related diagnosis. Patients from outside the  
264 hospital's neighborhood have less access. Metropolitan residents are 1.36-fold more likely to  
265 receive care.

266 **Statistics:** This study hypothesized that economic conditions affect healthcare access and use.  
267 Privacy concerns prevented this study from using patient income data. Thus, regression analysis  
268 used zip code tabulation area factors. Median household income, college education, and private  
269 insurance rates were positively correlated with community healthcare utilization. This study  
270 concludes that economic conditions affect healthcare because they are highly correlated with  
271 patient income. College graduates earn more and understand routine care better, which leads to  
272 more hospital visits and better health outcomes.

273 Socioeconomic variables affected healthcare utilization in the multiple regression analysis. For  
274 example, 1% increases in college education and private insurance rates were associated with  
275 0.017% and 0.113% increases in falls care utilization, respectively (Table 2). It is worth noting  
276 that cities have varying socioeconomic conditions and healthcare services, so our interpretations

277 cannot apply to all areas. However, this method can be used in other cities or states to examine  
278 healthcare service utilization and socioeconomic variables and the social determinants of health.

279 This study showed how socioeconomic factors and social determinant factors are associated with  
280 healthcare adoption and inequalities. This analysis can reveal how social and economic factors  
281 affect healthcare visits for a patient cohort in a specific area. This analysis suggests that  
282 economic factors have a significant impact on access to healthcare and falls care, and that policy  
283 should facilitate more equal care for all patients, regardless of social position.

## 284 **Limitations**

285 Several limitations should be considered. As with many social determinant studies, patient  
286 income was not collected, and the median income in each zip code was used as a proxy, which  
287 may introduce potential bias. Secondly, this study includes patient from regional hospital system  
288 in Milwaukee with one of the highest racial segregation scores in the US [34]. Therefore, the  
289 patient characteristics may not apply to other healthcare systems and areas. Thirdly, this study  
290 only examined a few key social determinant factors. Other potential factors, such as  
291 environmental and cultural factors, that could be considered in future studies. Fourthly, the  
292 COVID-19 pandemic may have a significant effect on different types of health services. Other  
293 health services such as cancer treatment, chronic condition management, laboratory services, and  
294 pharmacy services were not included in this study, which could potentially distort results. Finally,  
295 this study did not include clinical conditions or issues, suggesting that older patients may have  
296 used more healthcare services simply since they had a higher frequency of diagnosis and  
297 required additional services. Future studies need to investigate how to analyze and integrate  
298 cultural-based variables to achieve equal access to healthcare services from a variety of  
299 perspectives.

## 300 **Conclusion**

301 This study examined socioeconomic factors in senior adults' falls diagnosis healthcare utilization.  
302 Fallers were more likely to have clinical conditions and socioeconomic factors, according to this  
303 study. Gender, race, income, education, location, and insurance type affect senior adults' fall  
304 healthcare use. Further investigation is necessary to determine the causal relationships between

305 these factors and the risk of falling. While the elderly population grows, it is imperative to  
306 examine the collective impact of potential socioeconomic variables to ensure equitable  
307 healthcare for all individuals.

308

## 309 References

3101. Ambrose AF, Paul G, Hausdorff JM. Risk factors for falls among older adults: A review of the literature. *Maturitas*.  
311 2013;75(1):51-61. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.maturitas.2013.02.009>
3122. Bergen G, Stevens MR, Burns ER. Falls and Fall Injuries Among Adults Aged  $\geq 65$  Years — United States, 2014.  
313 *MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2016;65(37):993-998.  
314 doi:<https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6537a2>
3153. Inouye SK, Brown CJ, Tinetti ME. Medicare Nonpayment, Hospital Falls, and Unintended Consequences. *New*  
316 *England Journal of Medicine*. 2009;360(23):2390-2393. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmp0900963>
3174. Alexander BH, Rivara FP, Wolf ME. The cost and frequency of hospitalization for fall-related injuries in older  
318 adults. *American Journal of Public Health*. 1992;82(7):1020-1023. doi:<https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.82.7.1020>
3195. Moreland B, Lee R. Emergency Department Visits and Hospitalizations for Selected Nonfatal Injuries Among  
320 Adults Aged  $\geq 65$  Years — United States, 2018. *MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2021;70(18):661-  
321 666. doi:<https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm7018a1>
3226. Advanced trauma life support (ATLS®). *Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery*. 2013;74(5):1363-1366.  
323 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1097/ta.0b013e31828b82f5>
3247. Dionyssiotis Y. Analyzing the problem of falls among older people. *International Journal of General Medicine*.  
325 Published online September 2012:805. doi:<https://doi.org/10.2147/ijgm.s32651>
3268. Al-Aama T. Falls in the elderly: spectrum and prevention. *Canadian family physician Medecin de famille canadien*.  
327 2014;57(7). Accessed February 23, 2023. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21753098/>
3289. Sattin RW. Falls Among Older Persons: A Public Health Perspective. *Annual Review of Public Health*.  
329 1992;13(1):489-508. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.pu.13.050192.002421>
33010. Environmental risk factors for falls. *Falls in Older People*. Published online March 1, 2007:151-160.  
331 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511722233.009>
33211. Ambrose AF, Paul G, Hausdorff JM. Risk factors for falls among older adults: A review of the literature. *Maturitas*.  
333 2013;75(1):51-61. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.maturitas.2013.02.009>
33412. Gillespie LD, Robertson MC, Gillespie WJ, et al. Interventions for preventing falls in older people living in the  
335 community. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2012;2021(6).  
336 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.cd007146.pub3>
33713. Gangavati A, Hajjar I, Quach L, et al. Hypertension, Orthostatic Hypotension, and the Risk of Falls in a  
338 Community-Dwelling Elderly Population: The Maintenance of Balance, Independent Living, Intellect, and Zest in  
339 the Elderly of Boston Study. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2011;59(3):383-389.  
340 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2011.03317.x>
34114. Liu L, Stroulia E, Nikolaidis I, Miguel-Cruz A, Rios Rincon A. Smart homes and home health monitoring  
342 technologies for older adults: A systematic review. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*. 2016;91:44-59.  
343 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2016.04.007>
34415. Lord. A physiological profile approach to falls risk assessment and prevention. *Physical therapy*. 2022;83(3).  
345 Accessed February 23, 2023. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12620088/>
34616. Chaudhuri S, Thompson H, Demiris G. Fall Detection Devices and Their Use With Older Adults. *Journal of*  
347 *Geriatric Physical Therapy*. 2014;37(4):178-196. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1519/jpt.0b013e3182abe779>
34817. Steptoe A, Zaninotto P. Lower socioeconomic status and the acceleration of aging: An outcome-wide analysis.  
349 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2020;117(26):14911-14917.  
350 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1915741117>
35118. Pampel FC, Krueger PM, Denney JT. Socioeconomic Disparities in Health Behaviors. *Annual Review of Sociology*.  
352 2010;36(1):349-370. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.012809.102529>

35319. Braveman P. What are Health Disparities and Health Equity? We Need to Be Clear. *Public Health Reports*.  
354 2014;129(1\_suppl2):5-8. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/00333549141291s203>
35520. Braveman P. What are Health Disparities and Health Equity? We Need to Be Clear - Paula Braveman, 2014. *Public*  
356 *Health Reports*. Published 2014. Accessed February 23, 2023.  
357 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00333549141291S203>
35821. Paula A. Braveman, Catherine Cubbin, Susan Egerter, David R. Williams, and Elsie Pamuk, 2010. Socioeconomic  
359 Disparities in Health in the United States: What the Patterns Tell Us. *American Journal of Public Health* 100,  
360 S186\_S196, <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.166082>
36122. Trends G. Public health and aging: trends in aging—United States and worldwide. *Public Health*. 2003;347:921-5.
36223. Colby S, Ortman JM. The baby boom cohort in the United States: 2012 to 2060. US Department of Commerce,  
363 Economics and Statistics Administration, US Census Bureau; 2014 May.
36424. Carpenter, C. R. "Falls and fall prevention in the elderly." *Geriatric emergency medicine principles and practice*.  
365 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (United Kingdom), (2014). 343-350.
36625. Bromfield, Samantha G., et al. "Blood pressure, antihypertensive polypharmacy, frailty, and risk for serious fall  
367 injuries among older treated adults with hypertension." *Hypertension* 70.2 (2017): 259-266.
36826. Camicioli, Richard, and Sumit R. Majumdar. "Relationship between mild cognitive impairment and falls in older  
369 people with and without Parkinson's disease: 1-Year Prospective Cohort Study." *Gait & posture* 32.1 (2010): 87-91.
37027. Lawlor, Debbie A., Rita Patel, and Shah Ebrahim. "Association between falls in elderly women and chronic diseases  
371 and drug use: cross sectional study." *Bmj* 327.7417 (2003): 712-717.
37228. Tinetti, Mary E., Mark Speechley, and Sandra F. Ginter. "Risk factors for falls among elderly persons living in the  
373 community." *New England journal of medicine* 319.26 (1988): 1701-1707.
37429. López-Cevallos DF, Chi C. Assessing the context of health care utilization in Ecuador: A spatial and multilevel  
375 analysis. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2010 Dec;10(1):1-0.
37630. Cooper LA, Hill MN, Powe NR. Designing and evaluating interventions to eliminate racial and ethnic disparities in  
377 health care. *Journal of general internal medicine*. 2002 Jun;17(6):477-86.
37831. Johansson J, Nordström A, Nordström P. Greater fall risk in elderly women than in men is associated with increased  
379 gait variability during multitasking. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*. 2016 Jun 1;17(6):535-  
380 40.
38132. Callisaya ML, Blizzard L, Schmidt MD, Martin KL, McGinley JL, Sanders LM, Srikanth VK. Gait, gait variability  
382 and the risk of multiple incident falls in older people: a population-based study. *Age and ageing*. 2011 Jul  
383 1;40(4):481-7.
38433. Berg, Robert L., and Joseph S. Cassells. "Falls in older persons: risk factors and prevention." *The second fifty years:*  
385 *Promoting health and preventing disability*. National Academies Press (US), 1992.
38634. Frey, William H., and Dowell Myers. "Racial segregation in US metropolitan areas and cities, 1990–2000: Patterns,  
387 trends, and explanations." *Population studies center research report* 5 (2005): 573.
- 388

389 Table 1: Overall patient characteristics, socioeconomic, and demographic variable comparisons for  
 390 patients with or without fall history.

	Patient with History of Falls 66357		Patient without History of Falls 428684		OR	95% CI	p-value
<b>Number of Patients</b>							
<b>Age</b>							
Median, SD	79.4 ± 12.1		75.4 ± 11.6				
60 - 64 years old	7626	11.5%	78797	18.4%	0.58	(0.56, 0.59)	<0.001
65 - 69 years old	9879	14.9%	88288	20.6%	0.67	(0.66, 0.69)	<0.001
70 - 74 years old	9686	14.6%	74970	17.5%	0.81	(0.79, 0.83)	<0.001
75 - 79 years old	8255	12.4%	53008	12.4%	1.01	(0.98, 1.03)	0.585
80 - 84 years old	7556	11.4%	39304	9.2%	1.27	(1.24, 1.31)	<0.001
>85 years old	23355	35.2%	94317	22.0%	1.93	(1.89, 1.96)	<0.001
<b>Sex</b>							
Female	38739	58.4%	225518	52.6%	1.26	(1.24, 1.28)	<0.001
Male	27617	41.6%	203086	47.4%	0.79	(0.78, 0.81)	<0.001
<b>Race</b>							
White	54755	82.5%	333216	77.7%	1.35	(1.32, 1.38)	<0.001
Black	8219	12.4%	59619	13.9%	0.88	(0.85, 0.9)	<0.001
Asian	465	0.7%	4079	1.0%	0.73	(0.67, 0.81)	<0.001
Other	1301	2.0%	8396	2.0%	1.00	(0.94, 1.06)	0.972
Unknown	1617	2.4%	23374	5.5%	0.43	(0.41, 0.46)	<0.001
<b>Ethnicity</b>							
Hispanic	1196	1.8%	9148	2.1%	0.84	(0.79, 0.89)	<0.001
Non-Hispanic	63680	96.0%	377610	88.1%	3.22	(3.09, 3.35)	<0.001
Unknown	1481	2.2%	41926	9.8%	0.21	(0.2, 0.22)	<0.001
<b>Type of Insurance</b>							
Private	11317	17.1%	143964	34.8%	0.41	(0.4, 0.42)	<0.001
Public	53455	80.8%	253031	61.2%	2.88	(2.82, 2.93)	<0.001
Other	532	0.8%	5639	1.4%	0.61	(0.55, 0.66)	<0.001
Uninsured	871	1.3%	10955	2.6%	0.51	(0.47, 0.54)	<0.001
<b>Employment Status</b>							
Retired	42474	77.6%	176855	59.7%	2.53	(2.49, 2.58)	<0.001
Full Time	3937	7.2%	68125	23.0%	0.33	(0.32, 0.35)	<0.001
Part Time	1157	2.1%	12331	4.2%	0.60	(0.56, 0.64)	<0.001
Self Employed	953	1.7%	11443	3.9%	0.53	(0.5, 0.57)	<0.001
Not Employed	2757	5.0%	17223	5.8%	1.04	(0.99, 1.08)	0.095
Disabled	3446	6.3%	10493	3.5%	2.18	(2.1, 2.27)	<0.001
<b>Interpreter Needed?</b>							
N	52935	98.7%	266673	98.4%	2.40	(2.35, 2.44)	<0.001
Y	679	1.3%	4374	1.6%	1.00	(0.92, 1.09)	0.944
<b>Area Deprivation Index (Most Affluent) 0 - 25</b>							
25 - 50	4487	9.5%	31705	10.6%	0.91	(0.88, 0.94)	<0.001
50 - 75	18256	38.6%	110056	36.6%	1.10	(1.08, 1.12)	<0.001
75 - 100	14340	30.3%	95220	31.7%	0.97	(0.95, 0.98)	<0.001
	10215	21.6%	63511	21.1%	1.05	(1.02, 1.07)	<0.001
<b>Rural-Urban Continuum Codes</b>							
Metropolitan Area (> 1m)	45483	90.7%	264089	83.4%	1.36	(1.33, 1.38)	<0.001
Metropolitan Area (250k - 1m)	2321	4.6%	21061	6.6%	0.70	(0.67, 0.73)	<0.001
Metropolitan Area (< 250k)	210	0.4%	1905	0.6%	0.71	(0.62, 0.82)	<0.001
Micropolitan Area (>20k)	1022	2.0%	15270	4.8%	0.42	(0.4, 0.45)	<0.001
Small Town area (2.5k - 20k)	533	1.1%	7317	2.3%	0.47	(0.43, 0.51)	<0.001
Rural area (< 2.5k)	576	1.1%	7093	2.2%	0.52	(0.48, 0.57)	<0.001

391

392




393 Table 2: Multiple regression modelling of the impact of socioeconomic variables for falls / non-fall  
394 patients within Southeastern Wisconsin area.

Social Determinant factors	Coefficient Estimate	Standard Error	P-value
Patient of Fall History:			
Income	2.948E-07	9.138E-08	0.0016
<b>White Ratio</b>	<b>-0.01411</b>	<b>0.006768</b>	<b>0.0492</b>
<b>College educated rate</b>	<b>0.01748</b>	<b>0.007898</b>	<b>0.0399</b>
<b>Private insurance rate</b>	<b>0.1132</b>	<b>0.006331</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Patients of general care			
Income	7.883E-07	6.525E-07	0.2294
White Ratio	-0.1075	0.04836	0.0281
<b>College educated Rate</b>	<b>0.1597</b>	<b>0.07073</b>	<b>0.0257</b>
<b>Private insurance rate</b>	<b>0.5448</b>	<b>0.04524</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>

395


396

397 Figure 1: Utilization rate of general and fall-based care in Southeastern Wisconsin (SE: Southeast; UR:  
398 Utilization Rate)




399

400 Figure 2: Visualization of four socioeconomic variables in Southeast Wisconsin area in a Zip code  
401 tabulated map.



402


403 Figure 3: Scatter plot and regression analysis for utilization rate and socioeconomic variables across 126  
 404 zip code tabulation areas of the Southeast Wisconsin area.



405

## SE Wisconsin Falls UR


fall history 0% 13%



Powered by Bing  
© TomTom

## SE Wisconsin General UR


General care history 1% 49%



Powered by Bing  
© TomTom

# College Educated Rate


college\_educated\_rate 0% 71%



Powered by Bing © TomTom

# White Rate


white 2% 100%



Powered by Bing © TomTom

# Private Insured Rate


Private\_insured\_rate 1% 74%



Powered by Bing © TomTom

# Medium Household Income

income 14920 115568



Powered by Bing © TomTom

