

1
2
3 **Expanding Risks: Medicaid Expansion and Data Security**

4
5 **Jeffrey Clement**
6 Augsburg University

7
8 **Brad N Greenwood[▲]**
9 George Mason University

10
11 **John D’Arcy**
12 University of Delaware

13
14 **Corey Angst**
15 University of Notre Dame

16
17
18 **Abstract**

19 The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 led to the largest expansion
20 of healthcare coverage since the instantiation of Medicare and Medicaid in 1965.
21 Yet, limited attention has been given to the security aftereffects of the statute,
22 specifically the potential for malfeasance in the form of consumer fraud and identity
23 theft resulting from the vast influx of new patient data residing in various and highly
24 dispersed sources. In this work, we fill this gap by exploiting the phased expansion
25 of Medicaid into different states at different times. Using a difference in difference
26 approach, we explore the data security-related aftereffects of the law. Results
27 indicate a significant *decrease* in claims of consumer fraud after the expansion of
28 Medicaid, with no robust effect on identity theft. In empirical extensions, we find
29 a material drop in data breaches and compromised records after the expansion of
30 Medicaid. Taken in sum, these findings suggest that the expansion of Medicaid had
31 a consequential effect on the security of consumer data and created significant
32 positive externalities for consumers.

33
34 *Key Words: Identity Theft, Fraud, Data Loss, Affordable Care Act, Medicaid*
35 *Expansion, Difference in Difference*
36

37

[▲] The authors thank Joshua Wright for his feedback during the development of this manuscript.

38 The management and provision of healthcare in the United States remains one of the most
39 divisive topics among its citizens. Emblematic of the heated debate is the continued battle over
40 former President Obama’s signature domestic policy program, the Patient Protection and
41 Affordable Care Act (ACA), also known as “Obamacare”, the constitutionality of which has
42 been argued in front of the Supreme Court four separate times and which holds the distinction of
43 being the most challenged statute in the nation’s history (1, 2).

44 Interestingly, despite the scrutiny afforded to the healthcare-related aspects of the statute, its
45 societal implications beyond healthcare have received circumspect empirical consideration (with
46 some notable exceptions (3, 4)). Indeed, while researchers point to increased vaccination rates,
47 improved medical coverage among the nation’s youth, and coverage in underserved communities
48 (5-7), as well as distinct differences in how young people care for themselves, little attention has
49 been paid to its wider implications. This is striking given the aftereffects that traditionally spill
50 from such a large injection of capital into dispersed and heterogeneous markets. In this work, we
51 begin to close this gap by investigating an outcome that often characterizes expansive
52 government spending: moral hazard and the fraud that accompanies it (8-11). We do so by
53 investigating the effect of Medicaid expansion on rates of consumer fraud and identity theft.

54 The theoretical relationship between Medicaid expansion, consumer fraud, and identity theft
55 is deeply murky. On the one hand, the conventional view would be that fraud and identity theft
56 will likely rise with the expansion. To the extent that the expansion of Medicaid brought with it
57 tremendous increases in coverage, the creation of individual health insurance markets, and an
58 intense digitization of records (12, 13), the value of the concentrated records that could be stolen
59 increases by construction. And when coupled with the ACA’s push to reform delivery systems
60 through digitization (viz. through EHRs and health information exchanges (HIEs)), the concern

61 is evident. Because a larger number of patients are being treated within the bounds of hospitals
62 (7), where the encounter typically generates a digital record (initially due to the HITECH Act
63 and further propelled by the ACA), there is more and richer data to steal. When discussing the
64 reach of the ACA and its digitization efforts, Fontenot (14) notes: “With an electronic record, the
65 patient’s entire transition through life and treatment becomes available far beyond that patient
66 and their encounters with the health care system” (p. 74).

67 On the other hand, this inference does not account for extant knowledge of digitization and
68 the efficacy of statutes designed to limit malfeasance. Numerous scholars have noted that while
69 digitization can result in negative externalities like insurance upcoding, it also streamlines the
70 auditing process, making it easier to detect and correct misconduct (15-17). Similar views have
71 been advanced regarding fraud detection in a digitized healthcare system (i.e., analytical
72 auditing) (14). Second, to the extent that the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act
73 of 1996 (HIPAA) mandates rigorous protections of personal health data to limit leakage, data
74 loss might also fall. Insofar as health care systems expanded to accommodate newly-covered
75 patients, it is likely that IT security investments were concomitantly made. If this were the case,
76 the total amount of consumer fraud and identity theft might drop due to the increased data
77 security and oversight of personal health information brought on by the expansion of Medicaid.
78 To explore these competing perspectives, we leverage the phased implementation of Medicaid
79 expansion after the passage of the ACA using a difference in difference approach (18, 19).

80 **Study Data and Methods**

81 ***Data and Sample***

82 To investigate the effect of Medicaid expansion on rates of consumer fraud and identity theft, we
83 construct a unique data set from three sources. First, we gather data on the expansion of
84 Medicaid from the Kaiser Family Foundation. These data are compiled in Appendix Exhibit A1

85 and indicate the year of Medicaid expansion for each state (if at all). Second, we draw data on
86 claims of fraud and identity theft from the FTC’s Consumer Sentinel Network Reports. These
87 data have been consistently used in empirical research to measure rates of fraud and identity theft
88 (20, 21). We first focus on instances of fraud and identity theft, as opposed to breaches, because
89 there are varying requirements for breach reporting, many breaches go undetected, and breaches
90 vary in the potential harm posed to the public. However, to ensure robustness we also investigate
91 the effect of Medicaid expansion on breached consumer data using the Privacy Rights
92 Clearinghouse (22, 23). Data are organized at the state-year level from 2005 to 2018. Consistent
93 with prior work, we treat the District of Columbia as an independent member of the panel.

94 *Analytical Approach*

95 To identify the effect, we estimate a two-way fixed effect difference in difference estimation
96 (19). As the dependent variable is a non-negative integer count, we use a Poisson Pseudo
97 Maximum Likelihood (PPML) estimator (24). Formally, we estimate Equation 1, expressed in
98 linear form:

$$99 \quad y_{jt} = \beta_1 treatment_{jt} + \vartheta'_j + \gamma'_t + \varepsilon$$

100 where y_{jt} first takes on the number of identity thefts and then the reported number of cases of
101 consumer fraud. ϑ is the vector of state fixed effects (j). γ is the vector of year fixed effects (t). ε
102 is the error term. The constant term is not estimated due to the inclusion of the two-way fixed
103 effect structure. Robust standard errors are clustered on the state (i.e. the unit of treatment) (25).
104 Results are in Table 1.

105 Before discussing our results, several items bear note. The chief concern with any difference
106 in difference estimation is the assessment of pre-treatment trends in the dependent variable (18,
107 26). The concern is that if heterogeneity exists across the treatment and control groups prior to
108 treatment, we might inappropriately attribute post-treatment difference to the treatment instead of

109 some pre-existing factor. In context, such a concern is not outlandish. If access to healthcare
110 markets influences changing rates of fraud and identity theft, the expansion of Medicaid might
111 be correlated with such factors *a priori*, resulting in a biased estimate, even if the expansion of
112 Medicaid by state legislators as a direct response to general fraud is implausible. To assess this
113 possibility, we estimate a variant of the Autor (27) leads and lags framework, which has become
114 popular in empirical work (28-30). In doing so, we create a series of relative time dummies that
115 capture the temporal distance between treatment in the current period t versus treatment in state j
116 (conditioned upon the absolute time fixed effects and the location fixed effects). By estimating
117 the effect semi-parametrically, we can visualize the effect over time both pre- and post-
118 treatment. To mitigate power issues in the tails, we collapse all indicators more than 5 years from
119 treatment into a single coefficient. The period immediately prior to treatment is omitted to avoid
120 the dummy variable trap. Results are in Table 2.

121 ***Study Results***

122 In Columns 1-4 in Table 1, we observe a general decrease in rates of identity theft and fraud after
123 Medicaid expansion, although the effects cross beyond the traditional thresholds of significance
124 in Column 3 once controls are added. Still, most columns indicate a negative relationship.
125 Intuitively, this suggests that Medicaid expansion decreases rates of malfeasance, and propose
126 that the mechanisms might be the increased security associated with granting previously
127 uninsured persons access to healthcare markets, increased security through the digitization of
128 these records (a consistent occurrence after the expansion of Medicaid), and/or increased
129 oversight on the treatment of medical records which accords with federal intervention in the
130 market. Economically, estimates indicate a drop in identity theft between ~5.2% and ~7.1%.
131 Similarly, estimates indicate a decrease in fraud between ~9.6% and ~16.2%.

132 We turn next to the event study model (Table 2). As can be seen, there is a consistent

133 negative effect of treatment on fraud in Column 2, with negative and significant estimates
134 emerging. Further, as can be seen, there is little in the way of significant pre-treatment trends,
135 although there is a marginally significant difference five years prior to treatment. Further, and
136 consistent with Table 1, in Column 1 we observe no consistent pre- or post-treatment effect,
137 suggesting a *de minimis* relationship between Medicaid expansion and identity theft.

138 ***Data Breaches***

139 To ensure the robustness of the above results it is worth considering alternate measures of data
140 loss. As discussed previously, one popular measure in the empirical literature is to consider the
141 prevalence of reported data breaches and the number of the records stolen (20, 22, 23). While
142 this outcome is more distal from our measures of consumer harm, evaluating the number of
143 breaches offers a valuable check on a potential mechanism, i.e., decreased breaches overall.

144 To execute these tests, we draw data from the Privacy Rights Clearinghouse, a publicly
145 available repository of historical breaches. We then replicate Equation 1, replacing the number of
146 fraudulent claims and identities stolen with the total number of reported breaches and the total
147 number of breached records. In deference to the number of breaches and the number of records
148 compromised we log the DV and interpret the effect elastically. The estimator is OLS.

149 Results are in Table 3. As can be seen, the effects are consistent. There is a significant and
150 negative effect on both the number of breaches which have occurred and the total number of
151 compromised records. Two critical takeaways from these estimations are evident. First, these
152 estimations corroborate prior measures and suggests a beneficial effect of Medicaid expansion on
153 data security beyond claims of fraud. Second, and more importantly, they offer suggestive
154 evidence of the mechanism behind the effect, i.e., increased security. To the extent that the rate
155 of breaches and breached records are declining in Medicaid expanding states, it appears that this
156 expansion is slowing data loss by decreasing the number and extent of breaches.

157 In the interest of space, we refer the interested reader to the Supplemental Appendix for
158 further details on the robustness checks. These include, the implementation of placebo tests, a
159 Goodman-Bacon (31) decomposition, sample truncation, a Callaway and Sant’Anna (32)
160 estimation, and more.

161 **Discussion**

162 In this work, we investigate the relationship between the expansion of Medicaid provisions under
163 the ACA and data security in the form of fraud and identity theft. The relationship between these
164 concepts is theoretically murky. On the one hand, the injection of hundreds of billions of dollars
165 into the healthcare market materially raises the attractiveness of such targets to malicious actors,
166 notably as this period of time saw an increased rate of personal data digitization (12). As a result,
167 it is plausible that thefts might rise, with the personal information of millions of Americans
168 spilling into secondary markets for the sale of personal data like the dark web (33). On the other
169 hand, there are reasons to believe that cases of identity theft and fraud might fall. Numerous
170 scholars have highlighted the increased security and monitoring which accompanies the
171 digitization of records, and the expansions associated with ACA rollout may have stimulated
172 investments in IT security. Coupled with the fact that patients themselves are now formally
173 covered by insurance, there is an incentive for them to formally engage with the medical system
174 and not misrepresent themselves to physicians.

175 Upon exploring these competing perspectives, results are three-fold. First, we find that the
176 number of reported cases of fraud significantly declines after the expansion of Medicaid. Second,
177 we find no material or robust change in the number of identities stolen. Third, in deference to
178 traditional approaches to measuring population level data security, we also find a decline in the
179 number of data breaches and stolen or compromised records after the expansion of Medicaid.
180 Taken in sum, these findings suggest that the mechanism by which the effect manifests is

181 increased oversight, which comes with creating formal markets for underserved communities,
182 and results in increased data security and diminished rates of fraud.

183 ***Policy Implications***

184 While the injection of capital into markets has historically raised the specter of fraud and
185 malfeasance, these concerns appear to be limited when appropriate technological safeguards are
186 implemented. Put simply, risks of moral hazard and fraud have near universally accompanied
187 large infusions of capital into markets (8-11) for obvious reasons. Not only are targets more
188 attractive, because there are more consumers tracked by them (7), but the richness of healthcare
189 data and the interconnected nature of the emergent exchanges has long been thought to lead to
190 data security vulnerabilities (34, 35). Yet, this simplistic view ignores the effect of proactive
191 steps organizations can take (36, 37), and the benefits of direct guidance from federal entities
192 when it comes to safeguarding data (i.e., HIPPA). As a result, to the extent that these
193 organizations appear to be integrating security with organizational and institutional practices
194 (22), they are able to better safeguard consumer data than pre-digitized organizations.

195 Further, to the extent that any federal program which bluntly injects large amount of capital
196 has been met with skepticism, and raises reasonable concerns of downstream fraud, our findings
197 underscore the importance of coupling capital injection with appropriate controls. Contrast, for
198 example, Medicaid expansion (where tight controls existed) with the Trump Administration's
199 injections of capital into the economy during the Covid-19 pandemic (e.g., the Paycheck
200 Protection Program (PPP)). To date, the Government Accountability office (38) and NGOs (39)
201 have associated these programs with tens of billions of dollars of fraud against U.S. taxpayers.
202 As a result, numerous federal agencies (ranging from Treasury, to HHS, to the Department of
203 Justice) have been compelled to initiate massive *ex post* efforts to recover these dollars (each of
204 which is also expensive). And while it is beyond the scope of this work to second guess the

205 necessity of capital injections during a global public health emergency, the absence of such
206 controls only bolsters the importance of our findings for policy markets.

207 Our work also underscores the importance of technological safeguards and regulating
208 inappropriate access. One concern following the digitization of patient records has been that the
209 proliferation of data sharing across organizations could lead to inappropriate use. This is a
210 consistent concern when balancing the size of digital security programs at the local vs. state and
211 federal level. Examples are easy to come by, ranging from the inappropriate search of celebrity
212 health records by medical practitioners (40) to the illegal search of Barack Obama's records by
213 Philadelphia police officers (41). On the one hand, permitting smaller jurisdictions to manage
214 data is intuitively appealing, because the attractiveness of the target is lower (viz., because fewer
215 records are tracked). However, these entities may not have the resources or technical knowhow
216 to properly safeguard data and limit access, and decentralization may require an unpalatably high
217 ratio of IT investment to overall expenses within each jurisdiction. This once again pushes back
218 on the longstanding assumption that a larger aggregation will lead to an increased likelihood of
219 data loss, notably when aggregation is coupled with superior data controls. We further hope this
220 work serves as a call for future scholarship that investigates the conditions under which greater
221 data aggregation can materially benefit consumer security.

222 ***Limitations***

223 These findings are not without limitation. First, due to the secondary nature of the empirical
224 investigation, we are unable to uncover the exact mechanism by which the decline in fraud
225 manifests. Although our evidence suggests that the number of breaches is declining, it could also
226 be that malicious actors may not be targeting the particular hospitals or physicians' offices which
227 tend to treat a larger number of Medicaid patients for fear of federal enforcement. It is also
228 possible that formal participation in insurance markets results in fewer cases of fraud on the part

229 of patients (uninsured patients traditionally being without a general practitioner and therefore
230 being less incentivized to engage truthfully with healthcare providers). A third possibility is that
231 physician prevalence for upcoding under digital regimes is declining under Medicaid expansion,
232 again suggesting an enforcement mechanism. We leave further determination of the mechanism
233 to future scholars.

234 Second, we are reliant on diagnostic methods to ensure the validity of the difference in
235 difference. While the absence of pre-treatment trends and the success of the various falsification
236 tests suggest that the exogeneity assumptions of the DID are met (i.e., treatment can be
237 considered exogenous once conditioned upon controls), this cannot be assured in the absence of
238 laboratory conditions. Bearing this in mind, legislative histories are, to the best of our
239 understanding, devoid of references to data security when state legislatures were debating the
240 expansion of Medicaid. Third, the ACA was expanding coverage in an aggressively changing
241 market, making it difficult to ignore the possibility of an omitted variable bias, despite the
242 successful robustness checks. While the fixed effect structure should minimize the effect of other
243 federal laws (such as the HITECH Act which was implemented universally across the country),
244 the possibility of other state level initiatives remains a possibility.

245 **Conclusion**

246 This work addresses the possibility that the expansion of Medicaid under the ACA had a material
247 effect on the security of citizen's personal data. We find no evidence of increased fraud. Instead,
248 we observed rates of fraud declining in Medicaid expanding states, with breaches and breached
249 records declining as well. We hope this work serves as a call to action for researchers on two
250 fronts. First, to consider the effect of Medicaid expansion on broader social issues besides
251 healthcare. While some scholars are beginning to take this approach (3, 4, 42), it remains an
252 underserved area of research for one of the largest federal programs in U.S. history. Second, we

253 hope this work pushes scholars to break the mold of focusing solely on data breaches in favor of
254 investigating instances of fraud and identity theft (i.e., materialized harm to consumers). While
255 the focus on breaches is appealing, it is potentially problematic because breach discovery is not
256 100%, and not all breaches result in material harm, which can result in inconsistent reporting.
257 Pivoting away from this approach, and towards observable instances of harm, offers the
258 opportunity for researchers to begin resolving this discrepancy between measures and constructs.

259 **References**

- 260 1. Jost T. The Supreme Court throws out the ACA lawsuit, not the ACA. Commonwealth
261 Fund Blog, June; 2021.
- 262 2. Gluck AR, Scott-Railton T. Affordable Care Act Entrenchment. *Geo LJ*. 2019;108:495.
- 263 3. Bailey J. Health insurance and the supply of entrepreneurs: New evidence from the
264 Affordable Care Act. *Small Business Economics*. 2017;49(3):627-46.
- 265 4. Willage B. Unintended consequences of health insurance: Affordable Care Act's free
266 contraception mandate and risky sex. *Health economics*. 2020;29(1):30-45.
- 267 5. Aris E, Montourcy M, Esterberg E, Kurosky SK, Poston S, Hoge C. The adult
268 vaccination landscape in the United States during the Affordable Care Act era: Results from a
269 large retrospective database analysis. *Vaccine*. 2020;38(14):2984-94.
- 270 6. Barbaresco S, Courtemanche CJ, Qi Y. Impacts of the Affordable Care Act dependent
271 coverage provision on health-related outcomes of young adults. *Journal of health economics*.
272 2015;40:54-68.
- 273 7. Sommers BD, Gunja MZ, Finegold K, Musco T. Changes in self-reported insurance
274 coverage, access to care, and health under the Affordable Care Act. *Jama*. 2015;314(4):366-74.
- 275 8. Ferraz C, Finan F. Electoral accountability and corruption: Evidence from the audits of
276 local governments. *American Economic Review*. 2011;101(4):1274-311.
- 277 9. Einav L, Finkelstein A, Ryan SP, Schrimpf P, Cullen MR. Selection on moral hazard in
278 health insurance. *American Economic Review*. 2013;103(1):178-219.
- 279 10. Bourgeon J-M, Picard P. Fraudulent claims and nitpicky insurers. *American Economic*
280 *Review*. 2014;104(9):2900-17.
- 281 11. Okura M. The relationship between moral hazard and insurance fraud. *Economic Review*.
282 2012;53(5):941-73.
- 283 12. Adler-Milstein J, DesRoches CM, Kralovec P, Foster G, Worzala C, Charles D, et al.
284 Electronic health record adoption in US hospitals: progress continues, but challenges persist.
285 *Health affairs*. 2015;34(12):2174-80.
- 286 13. Atasoy H, Greenwood BN, McCullough J. The Digitization of Patient Care: A Review
287 and Paths Forward on Electronic Health Records Research. *Annual Review of Public Health*.
288 2019(40:1):487-500.
- 289 14. Fontenot SF. The Affordable Care Act and electronic health care records. *Physician*
290 *executive*. 2013;39(6):72-6.

- 291 15. Ransbotham S, Overby EM, Jernigan MC. Electronic Trace Data and Legal Outcomes:
292 The Effect of Electronic Medical Records on Malpractice Claim Resolution Time. *Management*
293 *Science*. 2021;67(7), pp.4341-4361.
- 294 16. Ganju KK, Atasoy H, Pavlou PA. Do electronic medical record systems inflate Medicare
295 reimbursements? The Moderating Effect of the Recovery Audit Program. *Management Science*.
296 2022;68.4 2889-913.
- 297 17. Greenwood BN, Funk R. The Doctor will See You Elsewhere: Enterprise Information
298 Systems and the Changing Control of Firm Activities. Available at SSRN 3481443. 2019.
- 299 18. Bertrand M, Duflo E, Mullainathan S. How Much Should We Trust Differences-in-
300 Differences Estimates? *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 2004:249-75.
- 301 19. Wooldridge J, Imbens G. Difference-in-differences estimation. Lecture notes. 2007;10.
- 302 20. Greenwood BN, Vaaler P. All For Naught: An Empirical Examination of the Impact of
303 Breach Notification Laws. Available at SSRN. 2022.
- 304 21. Romanosky S, Telang R, Acquisti A. Do data breach disclosure laws reduce identity
305 theft? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. 2011;30(2):256-86.
- 306 22. Angst CM, Block ES, D'arcy J, Kelley K. When do IT security investments matter?
307 Accounting for the influence of institutional factors in the context of healthcare data breaches. .
308 *MIS Quarterly*. 2017;41 (3):893-916.
- 309 23. D'Arcy J, Adjerid I, Angst CM, Glavas A. Too good to be true: Firm social performance
310 and the risk of data breach. *Information Systems Research*. 2020;31(4):1200-23.
- 311 24. Silva JS, Tenreyro S. Further simulation evidence on the performance of the Poisson
312 pseudo-maximum likelihood estimator. *Economics Letters*. 2011;112(2):220-2.
- 313 25. Cameron AC, Miller DL. A Practitioner s Guide to Cluster-Robust Inference. *Journal of*
314 *Human Resources*. 2015;50(2):317--72.
- 315 26. Angrist JD, Pischke J-S. Mostly harmless econometrics: An empiricist's companion:
316 Princeton university press; 2008.
- 317 27. Autor DH. Outsourcing at will: The contribution of unjust dismissal doctrine to the
318 growth of employment outsourcing. *Journal of labor economics*. 2003;21(1):1-42.
- 319 28. Wolfers J. Did Unilateral Divorce Laws Raise Divorce Rates? A Reconciliation and New
320 Results. *American Economic Review*. 2006;96(5):1802-20.
- 321 29. Burtch G, Carnahan S, Greenwood BN. Can You Gig it? An Empirical Examination of
322 the Gig-Economy and Entrepreneurial Activity. *Management Science*. 2018;64(12):5497-520.
- 323 30. Azoulay P, Zivin JSG, Wang J. Superstar Extinction. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*.
324 2010;125(2):549-89.
- 325 31. Goodman-Bacon A. Difference-in-differences with variation in treatment timing.
326 National Bureau of Economic Research; 2018. Report No.: 0898-2937.
- 327 32. Callaway B, Sant'Anna PH. Difference-in-differences with multiple time periods. *Journal*
328 *of Econometrics*. 2020.
- 329 33. Steel CM. Stolen identity valuation and market evolution on the dark web. *International*
330 *Journal of Cyber Criminology*. 2019;13(1):70-83.
- 331 34. Li H, Yoo S, Kettinger WJ. The roles of IT strategies and security investments in
332 reducing organizational security breaches. *Journal of Management Information Systems*.
333 2021;38(1):222-45.
- 334 35. Tanriverdi H, Du K. Corporate Strategy Changes and Information Technology Control
335 Effectiveness in Multibusiness Firms. *MIS Quarterly*. 2020;44(4).

- 336 36. Kim SH, Kwon J. How do EHRs and a meaningful use initiative affect breaches of
337 patient information? *Information Systems Research*. 2019;30(4):1184-202.
- 338 37. Kwon J, Johnson ME. Meaningful healthcare security: Does meaningful-use attestation
339 improve information security performance? *MIS Quarterly*. 2018;42(4):1043-68.
- 340 38. GAO. Unemployment Insurance: DOL Needs to Address Substantial Pandemic UI Fraud
341 and Reduce Persistent Risks. In: GAO-23-106586 GAO, editor.
342 <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-23-1065862023>.
- 343 39. Fine G. Fighting fraud, waste, and abuse—COVID-19 pandemic relief expenditures. In:
344 Institute TB, editor. [https://www.brookings.edu/articles/fighting-fraud-waste-and-abuse-covid-](https://www.brookings.edu/articles/fighting-fraud-waste-and-abuse-covid-19-pandemic-relief-expenditures/2022)
345 [19-pandemic-relief-expenditures/2022](https://www.brookings.edu/articles/fighting-fraud-waste-and-abuse-covid-19-pandemic-relief-expenditures/2022).
- 346 40. Ornstein C. Celebrities' Medical Records Tempt Hospital Workers To Snoop. *National*
347 *Public Radio*. 2015.
- 348 41. News a. Cop in trouble for running check on Obama. *ABC Action News*. 2009.
- 349 42. Courtemanche C, Marton J, Yelowitz A. The Full Impact of the Affordable Care Act on
350 Political Participation. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*.
351 2020;6(2):179-204.

Table 1: Effect of Medicaid Expansion on Identity Theft and Fraud

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Dependent Variable	PPML Poisson Identity Theft	PPML Poisson Fraud	PPML Poisson Identity Theft	PPML Poisson Fraud
Treatment	-0.0747* (0.0448)	-0.177*** (0.0599)	-0.0541 (0.0774)	-0.102** (0.0470)
State Population			6.97e-09 (1.24e-08)	4.28e-08*** (1.57e-08)
Per capita Income			-3.07e-06 (1.55e-05)	-1.69e-05* (9.33e-06)
Black Population			-3.770 (3.436)	4.240 (2.983)
Latino Population			6.97e-09 (1.24e-08)	4.28e-08*** (1.57e-08)
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	765	765	343	343
Number of Groups	51	51	49	49

Robust standard errors in parentheses (clustered on state). *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 2: Effect of Medicaid Expansion on Identity Theft and Fraud in Relative Time

Estimator	(1)	(2)
Dependent Variable	PPML Identity Theft	PPML Fraud
Rel Time t_{-5+}	0.197** (0.0853)	0.183* (0.0984)
Rel Time t_{-4}	0.127** (0.0524)	0.0894 (0.0873)
Rel Time t_{-3}	0.0267 (0.0717)	0.0564 (0.0831)
Rel Time t_{-2}	-0.125 (0.138)	0.0315 (0.0250)
Rel Time t_{-1}	-0.00670 (0.0561)	0.0232 (0.0226)
	Omitted Period	
Rel Time t_{+1}	-0.00924 (0.0652)	-0.149** (0.0601)
Rel Time t_{+2}	0.128*** (0.0480)	-0.144*** (0.0453)
Rel Time t_{+3}	0.162** (0.0721)	-0.0366 (0.0659)
Rel Time t_{+4}	0.0394 (0.102)	-0.0653 (0.0487)
Rel Time t_{+5+}	-0.131 (0.129)	0.00886 (0.0650)
State FE	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes
Observations	765	765
Number of Groups	51	51

Robust standard errors in parentheses (clustered on state).
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 3: Effect of Medicaid Expansion on Breaches and Record Theft as Defined by the Privacy Rights Clearinghouse

Estimator	(1)	(2)
Dependent Variable	OLS ln(Breaches)	OLS ln(Records)
Treatment	-0.144* (0.0854)	-1.203* (0.613)
State FE	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes
Observations	765	765
R-squared	0.537	0.205
Number of Groups	51	51

Robust standard errors in parentheses (clustered on state)
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1