

**TITLE:**

Postpartum Tubal Sterilization in Sickle Cell Disease in the 2012-2019 National Inpatient Sample

**SHORT TITLE:** Tubal Sterilization Rates in Sickle Cell Disease

**AUTHORS:**

Amy Luo<sup>1,2</sup>

Alison Gemmill<sup>1</sup>

Jayla L Scott<sup>2</sup>

Anne E. Burke<sup>1,3</sup>

Lydia H. Pecker<sup>2,3</sup>

**Author Affiliations**

<sup>1</sup> Department of Population, Family and Reproductive Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, US

<sup>2</sup> Division of Hematology, Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, US

<sup>3</sup> Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Johns Hopkins Bayview Hospital, Baltimore, MD, USA

**Corresponding Author:**

Amy Luo, MS, Department of Population, Family and Reproductive Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, 720 Rutland Ave. Ross Research Building, Room 1025, Baltimore, MD 21205 (aluo9@jh.edu)

**KEYWORDS:** Pregnancy \* Sickle Cell Disease \* Female Sterilization \* Tubal Sterilization \* Fertility \* Infertility

**Word Count**

**Abstract:** 330 of 350

**Manuscript:** ~2,850 including citations (limit 3,000)

**Tables:** 2 (5 supplemental tables)

**Figures:** 1 (2 supplemental figure)

**Citations:** 65 (range 50-75)

**Additional Contributions:** The authors gratefully acknowledge the patients, and the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality and HCUP data organization partners that participated in the 2012-2019 National Inpatient Sample (<https://hcup-us.ahrq.gov/partners.jsp>).

**Funding Information:** Data analysis was supported by Boston Globe Media. AL was supported on a NIMH training grant (T32MH122357). LHP is funded by the NIH, the American Society of Hematology, Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, the Mellon Foundation, and Alexion. AG is funded by the NIH, the NSF, and the Society of Family Planning. The funders had no role in the analysis or writing of this paper.

**Author Contributions:** AL: conception and design; analysis; interpretation; drafting and editing. AG: conception and design; interpretation; drafting and editing. JLS: editing. AEB: conception and design; drafting and editing. LHP: conception and design; interpretation; drafting and editing. All authors approved of the final version and have confirmed compliance with the journal's requirements for authorship.

**Conflict of Interest/Declaration of Interest:** AEB received research funding from Merck, Exeltis, Dare', and NICHD, all mediated through Johns Hopkins University, and honorarium for Exeltis Advisory Board. LHP served as a consultant for Global Blood Therapeutics and Novo Nordisk and is the co-founder of the Sickle Cell Reproductive Health Education Directive. AL, AG, & JLS have no disclosures to report.

### **Data Sharing Statement**

Data will not be shared. Data are made available by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality's Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project upon registration and completion of their required training module ([www.hcup-us.ahrq.gov](http://www.hcup-us.ahrq.gov)).

### **Abbreviations List**

95% CI: 95% Confidence Interval

aOR: Adjusted Odds Ratio

CF: Cystic Fibrosis

ICD: *International Classification of Disease*

ICD-10-CM/PCS: *International Classification of Disease, Tenth Revision, Clinical Modification and International Classification of Disease, Tenth Revision, Procedural Coding System*

ICD-9-CM/PCS: *International Classification of Disease, Ninth Revision, Clinical Modification and International Classification of Disease, Ninth Revision, Procedural Coding System*

NIS: National Inpatient Sample

OR: Odds Ratio

RD: Rate Difference

SCD: Sickle Cell Disease

SMM: Severe Maternal Morbidity

TS: Tubal Sterilization during the Immediate Postpartum Period

US: United States

## ABSTRACT

**Importance:** Sickle cell disease (SCD) is associated with high-risk pregnancy and low rates of hormonal contraception use. Intersectional vulnerabilities among individuals with SCD in the United States (US) raise historically and socially contingent questions about tubal sterilization in individuals with SCD. However immediate postpartum tubal sterilization (TS) rates among individuals with SCD in the US are unknown.

**Objective:** To compare rates of TS in deliveries to people with SCD and without SCD, and to determine the modifying effect of severe maternal morbidity (SMM) on the odds of TS.

**Design, Setting, and Participants:** This repeated cross-sectional study used the 2012-2019 National Inpatient Sample to estimate the rate of TS among delivery hospitalizations to people with SCD, without SCD (non-SCD), Black people with and without SCD, and people with cystic fibrosis (CF). Logistic regression models estimated the odds of TS between SCD and non-SCD deliveries, SCD and non-SCD deliveries with Black race, and SCD and CF deliveries. We examined whether SMM modified the association between TS and SCD in interaction analyses.

**Exposure:** SCD, CF

**Results:** Among 29,822,518 deliveries, 6.7% underwent TS. Among 18,860 SCD deliveries, 8.8% underwent TS. Among 2,945 CF deliveries, 6.6% underwent TS. After adjusting for patient and hospital characteristics, SCD had higher odds of TS compared to non-SCD deliveries (aOR= 1.38 [1.06,1.79]) and in a stratified analysis of deliveries coded with Black race (aOR= 1.42 [1.06,1.90]). After adjusting for patient and hospital characteristics, there was no difference in the odds of TS between SCD or CF deliveries (aOR=1.0 [0.51,2.24]). SMM more than doubled the odds of TS in SCD deliveries (interaction: aOR=2.34 [1.57,3.47]; aOR= 2.14 [1.40,3.24] in deliveries coded with Black race).

**Conclusion:** Even after accounting for patient and hospital characteristics, people with SCD have higher odds of immediate postpartum TS compared to control groups. SMM at delivery increased the odds of TS in SCD compared to all non-SCD deliveries and compared to CF deliveries. Possibly SMM severity, patient preference, or clinician recommendations inform this finding. SMM is 3-7 times more common in SCD than non-SCD pregnancies and may be a modifiable risk factor for TS in SCD deliveries.

## KEY POINTS

**Question:** What are the national rates and associations of postpartum tubal sterilization (TS) among deliveries to people with sickle cell disease (SCD) compared to deliveries to people without SCD (non-SCD) and cystic fibrosis (CF)?

**Findings:** From 2012-2019, the TS rate was significantly higher in SCD deliveries (88 per 1,000 deliveries) vs non-SCD (67 per 1,000 deliveries) and CF deliveries (66 per 1,000 deliveries). SCD

was positively associated with TS. SMM modified the association between TS and SCD by two-fold.

**Meaning:** Postpartum TS rate in people with SCD is high; SMM during SCD deliveries significantly increases the odds of postpartum TS.

## INTRODUCTION

Female tubal sterilization (TS) is the most common form of contraception in the United States (US) and is one of the most frequently performed surgical operations nationwide.<sup>1,2</sup> TS is a nonhormonal, highly effective and irreversible form of contraception typically offered to people who have completed childbearing. In the US, women from racial minority groups, those with lower education level, lower income, disability, and those who are incarcerated have reported high rates of TS compared to the general population.<sup>3-5</sup> They are also those targeted by coercive sterilization policies and practices, disproportionately receive misinformation about TS, face barriers in obtaining TS, and experience post-procedure regret.<sup>6-11</sup> Individuals with chronic conditions and genetic conditions face particular historic and contemporary vulnerabilities to TS, limited studies examine TS rates in people with chronic health conditions.<sup>12,13</sup>

Sickle cell disease (SCD) is a genetic blood disorder that affects approximately 100,000 Americans, most of whom identify as Black. Historically, women with SCD were counseled against pregnancy.<sup>16,17</sup> In a recent study, up to 44% of women with SCD were advised by their clinician they should/could not have children due to their SCD.<sup>18,19</sup> Whether clinicians differentially offer or perform TS for individuals with SCD is unknown, and such recommendations might affect the timing and use of TS among individuals with SCD. Single center studies suggest that 4-30% of women with SCD use irreversible contraception.<sup>19,20</sup> Despite longstanding community concerns about reproductive coercion for individuals who carry sickle cell trait and those living with SCD, little is known about TS in SCD.<sup>14,15</sup>

Indeed, SCD is a plausible risk factor for increased risk of undergoing TS. First, SCD is associated with three to seven times increased risk of severe maternal morbidity (SMM) and 11 to 50 times increased risk for maternal mortality.<sup>21-23</sup> Experiencing or having a risk for SMM is associated with preferentially requesting TS.<sup>24</sup> Second, individuals with SCD primarily identify as Black and the majority rely on public insurance – both characteristics are associated with TS use.<sup>3,25,26</sup> Third, uncertainties regarding the safety of hormonal contraception in SCD may influence recommendations or preference for TS.<sup>27</sup> Finally, SCD is a genetic condition associated with high risk pregnancy. This reality may affect patient and clinician perceptions of whether pregnancy, or avoiding pregnancy altogether, is advisable.<sup>28-30</sup> Whether complex dynamics may lead to differential recommendation for and/or acceptance of TS among individuals with SCD is not established.

The primary objectives of this study were to: (1) estimate national rates of immediate postpartum TS in deliveries to people with and without SCD; and (2) compare the odds of TS in deliveries to people with SCD to those without SCD, to people with Black race with SCD and without, and to people with SCD to people with cystic fibrosis (CF), an autosomal recessive disease that predominately affects people who identify as White and is also associated with high risk pregnancy. Secondary objectives were to examine whether SMM at delivery modifies the odds of TS in the study groups.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Data set

This retrospective study utilized data from the nationally representative 2012-2019 National Inpatient Sample (NIS). Sponsored by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, the NIS is the largest available dataset comprising all-payer, inpatient discharges in the US, covering 97% of the US population.<sup>31</sup>

### Sample Inclusion Criteria

The analytical sample included live birth and stillbirth delivery hospitalizations between 2012 to 2019 to individuals aged 12 to 55 years at the time of delivery (**Figure S1**). Delivery hospitalizations were identified as admissions with at least one diagnosis or procedural code for vaginal or cesarean birth using *International Classification of Disease, Ninth Revision, Clinical Modification and Procedural Coding System* (ICD-9-CM/PCS) codes from January 2012 through September 2015 and ICD-10-CM/PCS codes from October 2015 through December 2019 (**Table S1**).<sup>32,33</sup> Deliveries with codes for abortion, miscarriage, and inconsistent or invalid diagnostic or procedural codes were excluded.

### Delivery Analysis Groups

We defined five analytic groups: 1) SCD deliveries; 2) non-SCD deliveries; 3) SCD deliveries coded with Black race; 4) non-SCD deliveries coded with Black race; and 5) CF deliveries. SCD was identified as deliveries that contained at least one SCD diagnosis code and no sickle cell trait code. This approach has a greater than 90% positive predictive probability for identifying cases of SCD using ICD codes.<sup>34,35</sup> CF was identified as deliveries with one or more CF ICD code.<sup>36,37</sup> This approach is consistent with previous NIS CF studies.<sup>36,38</sup> We excluded deliveries among people with both SCD and CF ( $N < 10$  unweighted deliveries).

### Outcomes

The primary outcome was immediate postpartum TS, defined as deliveries that included at least one ICD code for bilateral tubal ligation, bilateral partial salpingectomy, or bilateral total salpingectomy (**Table S1**). We excluded TS cases that contained codes for both TS and IUD initiation, TS and contraceptive implant insertion, or TS and hysterectomy (comprising <6% of cases). A sensitivity analysis including these cases found no difference in results.

The secondary outcome, intrapartum SMM, was defined as deliveries that included one or more of a set of previously validated ICD search criteria for SMM (**Table S1**).<sup>39-41</sup> We used 18 of the 21 conditions defined by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, excluding blood transfusion, vaso-occlusive crises, and hysterectomy. These were excluded because blood transfusion has poor positive predictivity for SMM and SCD is associated with blood transfusion in pregnancy and vaso-occlusive crises.<sup>40,42,43</sup> Hysterectomy was excluded because it is a

procedure that also results in sterilization. A sensitivity analysis including vaso-occlusive crises in SMM identified no difference in results.

## Statistical Analysis

We compared the distribution of patient and hospital characteristics using chi-square tests, t-tests, or Wilcoxon sign rank tests where appropriate. The rate of TS was estimated as the cumulative incidence of TS per 1,000 deliveries and compared using absolute risk difference (RD).

First, we compared the characteristics and TS rates in SCD deliveries to non-SCD deliveries. Next, we performed a stratified analysis among deliveries coded with Black race and compared the characteristics and TS rates in SCD and non-SCD deliveries. This approach reduces confounding due to effects of structural and interpersonal racism on pregnancy outcomes among people with Black race.<sup>41-43</sup> Last, we compared the characteristics and TS rates among SCD to CF deliveries.

We used logistic regression models to estimate odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs). We estimated sequential multivariate models, incorporating covariates using forward stepwise selection and based on theoretical or subject-matter knowledge. Model fit was assessed using the Archer and Lemeshow F-adjusted mean residual test for survey sample data.<sup>44</sup> To test whether SMM differentially modified the odds of TS by SCD, we assessed the interaction between SCD and SMM. The final multivariate model adjusted for maternal age, SMM, delivery mode, insurance type, median household income by zip code, hospital location and teaching status, hospital census division, year, the interaction between SCD and SMM, and the interaction between SCD and delivery mode.

Separate multivariate models were constructed to compare analytic groups: SCD vs non-SCD deliveries, SCD vs non-SCD deliveries with Black race, and SCD vs CF deliveries. To examine geographic differences in the association between TS and SCD, we repeated multivariate models among deliveries in each hospital census region and division.

We conducted all analyses using design-based analysis (Taylor linearization, and Rao and Scott's second-order corrected Pearson statistics) to account for the NIS sampling design, following NIS-provided guidance and protocols.<sup>45-47</sup> All analyses were conducted in STATA BE version 17 (StataCorp LLC, College Station, TX). Statistical significance was defined at a two-sided  $p$ -value of  $<0.05$ .

## Research Ethics and Reporting

This study received approval from the Johns Hopkins Medicine Institutional Review Board. All NIS hospital admission data are fully deidentified, so informed consent was not required. Reporting adhered to the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines.<sup>48</sup> Data analysis was conducted from May to September 2024.

## RESULTS

### Patient and Hospital Characteristics of Deliveries

From 2012 to 2019, there were 29,822,518 (weighted) inpatient deliveries among people aged 12 to 55 years in the US. Among 18,860 (6.3%) SCD deliveries, 15,200 (82.5%) were deliveries with Black race. Among 2,945 CF deliveries, 2,130 (76.1%) were deliveries with White race.

The demographic and hospital characteristics of deliveries are shown (**Table 1**). SCD deliveries had higher rates of SMM and longer average length of stay compared to non-SCD deliveries.<sup>21</sup> Compared to non-SCD deliveries, SCD deliveries were younger, more likely to be publicly insured, and resided in zip codes with median household incomes in lower quartiles. SCD deliveries were more likely to occur at large hospitals, urban teaching hospitals, government-owned hospitals; and most occurred in the South Atlantic, mid-Atlantic and East North Central regions. In a stratified analysis limited to deliveries coded with Black race, similar differences in were observed except that there were no between-group differences in maternal age, household income by zip code, or hospital region.

Compared to CF deliveries, SCD deliveries were younger, resided in zip codes with median household incomes in lower quartiles, more likely to be publicly insured, and more likely to occur at urban teaching hospitals and in the US South. CF deliveries were more likely than SCD deliveries to occur at rural or urban nonteaching hospitals and in the US West. SCD deliveries had a higher rate of SMM than CF deliveries. There was no difference in SCD and CF deliveries by hospital size.

### Tubal Sterilization Rates

The rate of TS in SCD deliveries was higher than non-SCD deliveries (88 per 1,000 SCD deliveries vs 67 per 1,000 non-SCD deliveries, RD 22 per 1,000 deliveries;  $p < 0.001$ ), and higher than CF deliveries (66 per 1,000 CF deliveries, RD 22 per 1,000 deliveries  $p < 0.05$ ) (**Table S3**). Among deliveries with Black race, the TS rate was also higher among SCD than non-SCD deliveries (92 per 1,000 SCD deliveries vs 69 per 1,000 non-SCD deliveries, RD 23 per 1,000 deliveries,  $p < 0.001$ ).

### Characteristics Associated with Tubal Sterilization

In all SCD deliveries and SCD deliveries with Black race, TS was associated with older age at delivery, presence of SMM, cesarean delivery, lower median household income by zip code, government hospital ownership, and delivery in the US South region (**Table S4**). Among all non-SCD deliveries and non-SCD deliveries with Black race, TS was also associated with public insurance, rural hospital location, large hospital volume, and calendar year. Among CF deliveries, TS was only associated with older age at delivery.



Multivariate models comparing SCD to non-SCD deliveries identified higher odds of TS in SCD deliveries (adjusted OR (aOR): 1.38 [1.06,1.79]; **Table 2**). Among deliveries with Black race, SCD was also associated with higher odds of TS (aOR: 1.42 [1.06,1.90]). There was no difference in the odds of TS among SCD deliveries compared to CF deliveries (OR: 1.37 [0.97,1.93]; aOR: 0.82 [0.52,2.25]).

The association between TS and SCD varied by hospital census region (**Figure 1**) and division (**Figure S1**). Increased odds of TS among SCD deliveries were observed in the US South region (aOR= 1.44 [1.04-1.99]), largely driven by the East South Central division (aOR= 3.60 [1.75,7.40]). There were no significant differences in the odds of TS among SCD deliveries in other regions and divisions.

### **Effect Measure Modification by SMM**

SMM modified the association between TS and SCD (**Table 2**). After adjusting for patient and hospital characteristics, SMM in SCD deliveries doubled the odds of TS compared to non-SCD deliveries (aOR: 2.34 [1.57,3.47]) and in deliveries with Black race (aOR: 2.14 [1.40,3.25]). In contrast, a sensitivity analysis of the modification of the association between TS and CF compared to deliveries without CF found no modification (aOR= 2.79 [0.64,12.09]) (**Table S5**).

## **DISCUSSION**

This study uses a nationally representative sample of hospital discharge data to report novel population-based estimates of rates of postpartum TS among people with SCD and CF. Between 2012-2019, the TS rate per 1,000 deliveries was 88 in people with SCD, 67 in people without SCD, and 66 in people with CF. As in the general population, delivering in the US South increased the odds of TS for people with SCD. The odds of TS among SCD deliveries more than doubled among deliveries complicated by SMM, but SMM had no effect on TS for CF deliveries. SMM risk is modifiable in SCD.<sup>49</sup> The urgent need to reduce SMM in people with SCD can be coupled to future studies examining whether reducing SMM also changes postpartum TS rates for people with SCD.<sup>50</sup>

We hypothesized that patient or hospital characteristics contribute to the postpartum TS rates in SCD. However, even after adjusting for age, SMM, delivery mode, insurance type, household income, hospital location and teaching status, hospital census division, and year, the odds of TS remained 1.38 times higher in individuals with SCD. In the race-stratified cohort, the odds of postpartum TS were also higher among those with SCD, suggesting SCD-related factors, not solely race, drive these findings. We then hypothesized that SCD, as a genetic condition, might contribute to the increased odds of postpartum TS. To test this hypothesis, we examined postpartum TS in SCD and CF and found that, although the rate of postpartum TS is higher in SCD, the adjusted odds of postpartum TS were not different between individuals with SCD and CF. The lack of differences in adjusted odds of postpartum TS between individuals with SCD and CF suggests that the higher postpartum TS rates in individuals with SCD compared to those with CF are primarily driven by differences in patient and hospital characteristics between the

groups.

Here, delivery geography influenced the odds of postpartum TS for individuals with SCD. Compared to individuals without SCD, those with SCD had higher odds of undergoing TS in the South, particularly in the East South Central division – a pattern not observed elsewhere. The reasons for geographic variation in postpartum TS are not fully elucidated. Possibly, SCD contributes to described differences in postpartum TS rates in the US.<sup>51,52</sup> This is important since the US South has the highest concentrations of individuals living with SCD and inadequate numbers of SCD experts to provide care.<sup>53</sup> Further, individuals with SCD who are at risk for miscarriage and receive fragmented reproductive healthcare may be disproportionately affected by the growing restrictions in access to abortion and limited access to long-acting reversible contraceptive methods in the US South.<sup>19,51,54,55</sup> Overall, the lack of coordinated SCD care and presence of maternity care deserts in regions with higher concentrations of people with SCD may further contribute to higher use of TS.<sup>19,20,53,56</sup>

This is the first study to demonstrate a modifying effect of SMM on postpartum TS for individuals with SCD. In general, deliveries complicated by SMM have higher rates of postpartum TS and pregnant people with SCD are 5-7 times more likely to experience SMM.<sup>21,57,58</sup> In this study, SMM more than doubled the odds of postpartum TS among people with SCD. In contrast, SMM did not modify the odds of postpartum TS among people with CF. The effect modification of SMM on TS for SCD compared to CF requires a qualitative understanding of SMM which is inadequately appraised through the diagnosis codes used in this study. The extent to which SMM modifies TS in SCD may be a consequence of the nature of the SMM and this affects patient preferences and clinical practice.<sup>59</sup> Given the high rates of SMM in this population, limits to existing contraceptive counseling and hormonal contraceptive safety concerns may influence the uptake of or recommendation for postpartum TS.<sup>18,19,60,61</sup> Finally, SMM at delivery may also be a marker for pregnancy complications before delivery in individuals with SCD; a very difficult pregnancy course punctuated by SMM at delivery may shape recommendations for no future pregnancies and increase use of TS at delivery in SCD.<sup>18,19</sup> Future research can help establish the extent to which SMM at delivery constitutes a modifiable risk factor for postpartum TS in SCD.<sup>21,62</sup>

Fifty years ago, Drs. James Bowman and Charles Whitten voiced community concerns that testing for SCD and trait might lead to coercive reproductive care for the SCD community.<sup>14,63</sup> This study cannot determine whether TS rates among individuals with SCD are a manifestation of reproductive coercion, a risk that may increase as growing restrictions to lifesaving reproductive healthcare are implemented, especially in the US South where most individuals with SCD live.<sup>55,64,65</sup> This is the first study to empirically appraise a national dataset on postpartum TS for individuals with SCD or CF; follow-up studies in subsequent NIS will be possible to assess trends. However, this study is not without limitations. First, estimates are limited to postpartum TS and do not capture TS procedures in outpatient settings, outside of the postpartum period, or male partner sterilization. Second, as with administrative data, findings are limited to what is reported for billing purposes during delivery admission. As such, SMM at delivery cannot capture clinical severity across pregnancy. Third, this secondary

analysis cannot identify all factors that shape individual preference or clinician recommendations for postpartum TS. For instance, how sterilization decisions inform cesarean delivery mode or vice versa in people with SCD compared to their counterparts requires further study.

In conclusion, people with SCD undergo postpartum TS at higher rates than the general population, a difference unexplained by differences in patient or hospital characteristics. Experiencing SMM during delivery modified the association between TS and SCD by two-fold, suggesting that the urgently needed interventions to reduce SMM in SCD pregnancy might modify postpartum TS rates. Individuals with SCD and their clinicians balance the risks associated with pregnancy and contraception in the context of a life-limiting illness associated with disturbing and life-altering SMM rates.<sup>19,28,59</sup> Research to understand these findings – including the extent to which pragmatic realities, patient preference, or structural or interpersonal bias inform TS rates – is needed. This is especially critical as states across the country eliminate or severely restrict access to abortion, opening the door to reproductive coercion for an underrepresented patient population with multiple marginalized identities.

## REFERENCES

1. Daniels K, Alma JC. *Current Contraceptive Status Among Women Aged 15–49: United States, 2017–2019*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention National Center for Health Statistics; 2020.
2. Chan LM, Westhoff CL. Tubal sterilization trends in the United States. *Fertil Steril*. 2010;94(1):1-6. doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2010.03.029
3. Borrero S, Schwarz EB, Reeves MF, Bost JE, Creinin MD, Ibrahim SA. Race, Insurance Status, and Tubal Sterilization: *Obstet Gynecol*. 2007;109(1):94-100. doi:10.1097/01.AOG.0000249604.78234.d3
4. Mosher WD, D. JJ (Ph. *Use of Contraception in the United States: 1982-2008*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics; 2010.
5. Mosher W, Hughes RB, Bloom T, Horton L, Mojtabai R, Alhusen JL. Contraceptive use by disability status: new national estimates from the National Survey of Family Growth. *Contraception*. 2018;97(6):552-558. doi:10.1016/j.contraception.2018.03.031
6. Borrero SB, Reeves MF, Schwarz EB, Bost JE, Creinin MD, Ibrahim SA. Race, insurance status, and desire for tubal sterilization reversal. *Fertil Steril*. 2008;90(2):272-277. doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2007.06.041
7. Shreffler KM, McQuillan J, Greil AL, Johnson DR. Surgical sterilization, regret, and race: Contemporary patterns. *Soc Sci Res*. 2015;50:31-45. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2014.10.010
8. Borrero S, Abebe K, Dehlendorf C, et al. Racial variation in tubal sterilization rates: role of patient-level factors. *Fertil Steril*. 2011;95(1):17-22. doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2010.05.031
9. Harris LH, Wolfe T. Stratified reproduction, family planning care and the double edge of history. *Curr Opin Obstet Gynecol*. 2014;26(6):539-544. doi:10.1097/GCO.000000000000121
10. Roth R, Ainsworth SL. If They Hand You a Paper, You Sign It: A Call to End the Sterilization of Women in Prison. *Hastings Womens Law J*. 2015;26(1):7-50.
11. Roberts D. *Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group; 2014.
12. Reilly PR. Eugenics and Involuntary Sterilization: 1907–2015. *Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet*. 2015;16(1):351-368. doi:10.1146/annurev-genom-090314-024930
13. Li H, Mitra M, Wu JP, Parish SL, Valentine A, Dembo RS. Female Sterilization and Cognitive Disability in the United States, 2011–2015. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2018;132(3):559-564. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000002778

14. Whitten CF. Sick cell programming--an imperiled promise. *N Engl J Med*. 1973;288(6):318-319. doi:10.1056/NEJM197302082880612
15. Bowman JE. Prenatal screening for hemoglobinopathies. *Am J Hum Genet*. 1991;48(3):433-438.
16. Fort AT, Morrison JC. Motherhood with sickle cell and sickle-C disease is not worth the risk. *South Med J*. 1972;65(5):531-533. doi:10.1097/00007611-197205000-00005
17. Fort AT, Morrison JC, Diggs LW, Fish SA, Berreras L. Counseling the patient with sickle cell disease about reproduction: pregnancy outcome does not justify the maternal risk. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 1971;111(3):324-327. doi:10.1016/0002-9378(71)90772-1
18. Carrithers B, Klein R, Kanter J. Addressing Reproductive Education Among Young Adults with Sickle Cell Disease (SCD): Sickle Cell Reproductive Outreach and Education (ROE) Project. In: ; 2023. <https://ash.confex.com/ash/2023/webprogram/Paper190927.html>
19. Pecker LH, Hussain S, Lanzkron S, et al. Women with sickle cell disease report low knowledge and use of long acting reversible contraception. *J Natl Med Assoc*. 2021;113(5):552-559. doi:10.1016/j.jnma.2021.05.005
20. Roe AH, Lang B, McAllister A, et al. Contraceptive use and preferences among females with sickle cell disease. *Contraception*. 2022;105:42-45. doi:10.1016/j.contraception.2021.08.009
21. Early ML, Eke AC, Gemmill A, Lanzkron S, Pecker LH. Severe Maternal Morbidity and Mortality in Sickle Cell Disease in the National Inpatient Sample, 2012-2018. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2023;6(2):e2254552. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.54552
22. Boghossian NS, Greenberg LT, Saade GR, et al. Association of Sickle Cell Disease With Racial Disparities and Severe Maternal Morbidities in Black Individuals. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2023;177(8):808-817. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2023.1580
23. Lesage N, Deneux Tharaux C, Saucedo M, et al. Maternal mortality among women with sickle-cell disease in France, 1996-2009. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol*. 2015;194:183-188. doi:10.1016/j.ejogrb.2015.09.016
24. Albanese A, French M, Gossett DR. Request and fulfillment of postpartum tubal ligation in patients after high-risk pregnancy. *Contraception*. 2017;95(3):234-238. doi:10.1016/j.contraception.2016.08.009
25. Wilson-Frederick S, Hulihan M, Mangum A, et al. *Medicaid and CHIP Sickle Cell Disease Report, T-MSIS Analytic Files (TAF) 2017*. Center for Medicaid and CHIP Services, Division of Quality and Health Outcomes, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services; 2021. <https://www.medicare.gov/sites/default/files/2021-01/scd-rpt-jan-2021.pdf>

26. Brousseau DC, A Panepinto J, Nimmer M, Hoffmann RG. The number of people with sickle-cell disease in the United States: national and state estimates. *Am J Hematol*. 2010;85(1):77-78. doi:10.1002/ajh.21570
27. Smith-Whitley K. Complications in pregnant women with sickle cell disease. *Hematology*. 2019;2019(1):359-366. doi:10.1182/hematology.2019000039
28. Rance JC, Skirton H. An integrative review of factors that influence reproductive decisions in women with sickle cell disease. *J Community Genet*. 2019;10(2):161-169. doi:10.1007/s12687-018-0386-0
29. Dehlendorf C, Akers AY, Borrero S, et al. Evolving the Preconception Health Framework: A Call for Reproductive and Sexual Health Equity. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2021;137(2):234-239. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000004255
30. Smith C, Fatima H, McClain E, Bryant K, Verbiest S, Hassmiller Lich K. Supporting reproductive health among birthing persons with chronic conditions in the United States: A qualitative multilevel study using systems thinking to inform action. *Health Serv Res*. 2023;58(2):521-533. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.14131
31. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ). National Inpatient Sample (NIS). <https://hcup-us.ahrq.gov/nisoverview.jsp>
32. Kuklina EV, Whiteman MK, Hillis SD, et al. An Enhanced Method for Identifying Obstetric Deliveries: Implications for Estimating Maternal Morbidity. *Matern Child Health J*. 2008;12(4):469-477. doi:10.1007/s10995-007-0256-6
33. Clapp MA, James KE, Friedman AM. Identification of Delivery Encounters Using International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision, Diagnosis and Procedure Codes. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2020;136(4):765-767. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000004099
34. Grosse SD, Green NS, Reeves SL. Administrative data identify sickle cell disease: A critical review of approaches in U.S. health services research. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2020;67(12):e28703. doi:10.1002/psc.28703
35. Olaniran KO, Seethapathy H, Zhao SH, Allegretti AS, Kalim S, Nigwekar SU. Validity of International Classification of Diseases Codes for Sickle Cell Trait and Sickle Cell Disease. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2020;35(4):1323-1324. doi:10.1007/s11606-019-05555-w
36. Schmidt CN, Friedman AM, DiMango EA, et al. Trends in and Outcomes of Deliveries Complicated by Cystic Fibrosis. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2022;140(5):861-868. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000004959
37. Patel EM, Swamy GK, Heine RP, Kuller JA, James AH, Grotegut CA. Medical and obstetric complications among pregnant women with cystic fibrosis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2015;212(1):98.e1-98.e9. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2014.07.018

38. Farooq F, Mogayzel PJ, Lanzkron S, Haywood C, Strouse JJ. Comparison of US Federal and Foundation Funding of Research for Sickle Cell Disease and Cystic Fibrosis and Factors Associated With Research Productivity. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(3):e201737. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.1737
39. Division of Reproductive Health; National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. How Does CDC Identify Severe Maternal Morbidity? July 3, 2023. Accessed April 12, 2024. <https://www.cdc.gov/reproductivehealth/maternalinfanthealth/smm/severe-morbidity-ICD.htm>
40. Main EK, Abreo A, McNulty J, et al. Measuring severe maternal morbidity: validation of potential measures. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2016;214(5):643.e1-643.e10. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2015.11.004
41. Himes KP, Bodnar LM. Validation of criteria to identify severe maternal morbidity. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol*. 2020;34(4):408-415. doi:10.1111/ppe.12610
42. Kilpatrick SK, Ecker JL. Severe maternal morbidity: screening and review. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2016;215(3):B17-B22. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2016.07.050
43. Fabricant SP, Opara KN, Paul JV, et al. The Positive Predictive Value of Hospital Discharge Data for Identifying Severe Maternal Morbidity With and Without Blood Transfusion. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf*. 2023;49(9):467-473. doi:10.1016/j.jcjq.2023.05.004
44. Archer KJ, Lemeshow S. Goodness-of-fit Test for a Logistic Regression Model Fitted using Survey Sample Data. *Stata J*. 2006;6(1):97-105. doi:10.1177/1536867X0600600106
45. Rao JNK, Scott AJ. On Chi-Squared Tests for Multiway Contingency Tables with Cell Proportions Estimated from Survey Data. *Ann Stat*. 1984;12(1):46-60. doi:10.1214/aos/1176346391
46. Houchens R, Ross D, Elixhauser A. *Final Report on Calculating National Inpatient Sample (NIS) Variances for Data Years 2012 and Later*. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ); 2015. <https://hcup-us.ahrq.gov/reports/methods/methods.jsp>
47. Binder DA. On the Variances of Asymptotically Normal Estimators from Complex Surveys. *Int Stat Rev Rev Int Stat*. 1983;51(3):279-292. doi:10.2307/1402588
48. Vandembroucke JP, von Elm E, Altman DG, et al. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE): explanation and elaboration. *PLoS Med*. 2007;4(10):e297. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0040297
49. Alan S, Sharma D, Pecker LH. Prophylactic red cell transfusions for sickle cell disease pregnancy: increased use of therapy could transform outcomes. *Curr Opin Hematol*. Published online August 15, 2024. doi:10.1097/MOH.0000000000000837

50. Pecker LH, Boghossian NS, Saade G. US Trends in Maternal Mortality by Racial and Ethnic Group. *JAMA*. 2023;330(18):1799. doi:10.1001/jama.2023.17544
51. White K, Potter JE, Zite N. Geographic variation in characteristics of postpartum women using female sterilization. *Womens Health Issues Off Publ Jacobs Inst Womens Health*. 2015;25(6):628-633. doi:10.1016/j.whi.2015.06.011
52. White K, Potter JE. Reconsidering racial/ethnic differences in sterilization in the United States. *Contraception*. 2014;89(6):550-556. doi:10.1016/j.contraception.2013.11.019
53. Lee L, Smith-Whitley K, Banks S, Puckrein G. Reducing Health Care Disparities in Sickle Cell Disease: A Review. *Public Health Rep*. 2019;134(6):599-607. doi:10.1177/0033354919881438
54. Pecker LH, Sharma D, Nero A, et al. Knowledge gaps in reproductive and sexual health in girls and women with sickle cell disease. *Br J Haematol*. 2021;194(6):970-979. doi:10.1111/bjh.17658
55. Pecker LH, Oteng-Ntim E, Nero A, et al. Expecting more: the case for incorporating fertility services into comprehensive sickle cell disease care. *Lancet Haematol*. 2023;10(3):e225-e234. doi:10.1016/S2352-3026(22)00353-2
56. Brigance C, Lucas R, Jones E, et al. *Nowhere to Go: Maternity Care Deserts Across the U.S.* March of Dimes; 2022. [https://www.marchofdimes.org/sites/default/files/2022-10/2022\\_Maternity\\_Care\\_Report.pdf](https://www.marchofdimes.org/sites/default/files/2022-10/2022_Maternity_Care_Report.pdf)
57. Ha TK, Boulet SL, Cotsonis G, Geary F, Jamieson DJ, Lindsay M. Association of Sickle Cell Disease With Severe Maternal Morbidity. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2023;141(1):163-169. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000004986
58. Rodriguez MI, Acevedo AM, Renfro S, Tasset J, Sosanya O, Caughey AB. Association of intrapartum severe maternal morbidity with receipt of postpartum contraception among Medicaid recipients. *Contraception*. 2023;127:110110. doi:10.1016/j.contraception.2023.110110
59. Roe AH, Wu J, McAllister A, et al. Contraceptive Attitudes and Beliefs of Women With Sickle Cell Disease: A Qualitative Study. *Womens Health Issues*. Published online May 3, 2024. doi:10.1016/j.whi.2024.03.007
60. Stanek CJ, Reich J, Theroux CI, Creary SE, Quinn GP, Nahata L. Reproductive Health Counseling among Youth with Sickle Cell Disease. *J Pediatr Adolesc Gynecol*. 2023;36(4):393-398. doi:10.1016/j.jpag.2023.03.002
61. Gros M, Jung C, Fourmaux C, et al. Sexual health of French adolescents with sickle cell disease. *Eur J Contracept Reprod Health Care Off J Eur Soc Contracept*. 2020;25(4):293-298. doi:10.1080/13625187.2020.1774868



62. Malinowski AK, Shehata N, D'Souza R, et al. Prophylactic transfusion for pregnant women with sickle cell disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Blood*. 2015;126(21):2424-2435; quiz 2437. doi:10.1182/blood-2015-06-649319
63. Scott RB, Castro O. Screening for sickle cell hemoglobinopathies. *JAMA*. 1979;241(11):1145-1147.
64. Mishkin AD, Mapara MY, Reshef R. Iatrogenic Infertility After Curative Stem Cell Transplantation in Patients With Sickle Cell Disease. *Ann Intern Med*. 2018;168(12):881-882. doi:10.7326/M18-0185
65. Boodman E. Coercive Care: Investigating sickle cell, pregnancy, and sterilization. *STAT*. <https://www.statnews.com/coercive-care-sickle-cell-disease/>. Accessed September 12, 2024.

## **TABLES & FIGURES**

**Table 1.** Patient and hospital characteristics of delivery admissions by comparison group

**Table 2.** Adjusted odds of postpartum tubal sterilization

**Figure 1.** Adjusted odds of postpartum tubal sterilization among sickle cell disease deliveries compared with non-sickle cell disease deliveries, stratified by hospital census region

**Table 1.** Patient and hospital characteristics of delivery admissions by comparison group

	SCD N (%)	Non-SCD N (%)	Black, SCD N (%)	Black, non-SCD N (%)	CF N (%)
<b>Total admissions</b>					
Unweighted	3,772	5,960,734	3,040	831,540	589
Weighted	18,860	29,803,658	15,200	4,157,700	2,945
<b>Characteristics</b>					
Age, mean (SD), years	27.4 (5.85)	28.6 (5.89)	27.1 (5.74)	27.2 (6.05)	28.3 (5.64)
<b>Race</b>					
Black	15,200 (82.5)	4,157,870 (21.0)	15,200 (100)	4,157,700 (100)	190 (76.1)
Hispanic	1,285 (7.0)	5,865,503 (29.6)	–	–	345 (6.8)
White	880 (4.8)	14,958,803 (75.5)	–	–	2130 (12.3)
Asian or Pacific Islander	325 (1.8)	1,680,749 (8.5)	–	–	DS
Native American	45 (0.2)	212,510 (1.1)	–	–	0 (0)
Other	680 (3.7)	1,326,025 (6.7)	–	–	90 (3.2)
<b>SMM</b>					
Yes	1,015 (5.4)	183,925 (0.6)	865 (5.7)	37,295 (0.9)	70 (2.4)
<b>Delivery Mode</b>					
Vaginal	10,300 (54.6)	20,124,602 (67.5)	8,070 (53.1)	2,670,385 (64.2)	1,995 (67.7)
Cesarean	8,560 (45.4)	9,679,056 (32.5)	7,130 (46.9)	1,487,315 (35.8)	950 (32.3)
<b>Household income by zip code</b>					
1 <sup>st</sup> quartile	8,365 (45.1)	8,296,652 (28.2)	7,120 (46.8)	2,028,440 (48.8)	640 (22.1)
2 <sup>nd</sup> quartile	4,495 (24.2)	7,396,431 (25.1)	3,690 (24.3)	944,935 (22.7)	785 (27.1)
3 <sup>rd</sup> quartile	3,470 (18.7)	7,283,302 (24.7)	2,670 (17.6)	709,005 (17.1)	725 (25)
4 <sup>th</sup> quartile	2,220 (12.0)	6,456,283 (21.9)	1,485 (9.8)	423,795 (10.2)	750 (25.9)
<b>Insurance Type</b>					
Public <sup>a</sup>	12,435 (66.0)	13,001,226 (43.7)	10,460 (68.8)	2,702,775 (65.0)	1215 (41.3)
Private	5,530 (29.4)	15,136,808 (50.9)	4,030 (26.5)	1,266,320 (30.5)	1600 (54.4)
Self-pay	390 (2.1)	759,555 (2.6)	300 (2.0)	85,915 (2.1)	30 (1.0)
No charge, Other <sup>b</sup>	475 (2.5)	864,375 (2.9)	380 (2.5)	96,020 (2.3)	95 (3.2)
<b>Hospital Teaching Status</b>					
Rural	555 (2.9)	2,904,294 (9.7)	470 (3.1)	246,370 (5.9)	130 (4.4)
Urban					

Teaching	15,195 (80.6)	7,954,727 (63.6)	2,470 (16.3)	845,510 (20.3)	2230 (75.7)
Nonteaching	3,110 (16.5)	18,944,637 (26.7)	12,260 (80.7)	3,065,820 (73.7)	585 (19.9)
<b>Hospital Volume</b>					
Small	2,380 (12.6)	5,002,124 (16.8)	1,920 (12.6)	595,550 (14.3)	340 (11.5)
Medium	5,265 (27.9)	9,017,209 (30.3)	4,310 (28.4)	1,323,195 (31.8)	800 (27.2)
Large	11,215 (59.5)	15,784,325 (53.0)	8,970 (59.0)	2,239,125 (53.9)	1805 (61.3)
<b>Hospital Ownership</b>					
Government, nonfederal	3,205 (17.0)	3,546,635 (11.9)	2,630 (17.3)	578,155 (13.9)	410 (13.9)
Private, no-profit	13,480 (71.5)	21,956,163 (73.7)	10,805 (71.1)	2,967,281 (71.4)	2200 (74.7)
Private, invest-own	2,175 (11.5)	4,300,861 (14.4)	1,765 (11.6)	612,265 (14.7)	335 (11.4)
<b>Hospital Region</b>					
Northeast	3,410 (18.1)	4,777,009 (16.0)	2,370 (15.6)	628,030 (15.1)	475 (16.1)
Midwest	3,585 (19.0)	6,306,635 (21.2)	3,015 (19.8)	807,450 (19.4)	650 (22.1)
South	10,260 (54.4)	11,569,382 (38.8)	8,720 (57.4)	2,366,715 (56.9)	1105 (37.5)
West	1,605 (8.5)	7,150,632 (24.0)	1,095 (7.2)	355,505 (8.6)	715 (24.3)
<b>Hospital Census Division</b>					
New England	560 (3.0)	1,162,955 (3.9)	410 (2.7)	102,555 (2.5)	130 (4.4)
Mid-Atlantic	2,850 (15.1)	3,614,054 (12.1)	1,960 (12.9)	525,480 (12.6)	345 (11.7)
East North Central	2,875 (15.2)	4,227,774 (14.2)	2,485 (16.3)	650,070 (15.6)	425 (14.4)
West North Central	710 (3.8)	2,078,862 (7.0)	530 (3.5)	157,380 (3.8)	225 (7.6)
South Atlantic	6,720 (35.6)	5,628,926(18.9)	5,750 (37.8)	1,439,455 (34.6)	585 (19.9)
East South Central	1,165 (6.2)	1,819,945 (6.1)	1,045 (6.9)	348,410 (8.4)	205 (7)
West South Central	2,375 (12.6)	4,120,511(13.8)	1,925 (12.7)	578,849 (13.9)	315 (10.7)
Mountain	330 (1.7)	2,263,563 (7.6)	255 (1.7)	106,755 (2.6)	170 (5.8)
Pacific	1,275 (6.8)	4,887,069 (16.4)	840 (5.5)	248,750 (6.0)	545 (18.5)
<b>Year</b>					
2012	1,945 (10.3)	3,761,961(12.6)	1,545 (10.2)	508,891 (12.2)	315 (10.7)
2013	1,910 (10.1)	3,737,643 (12.5)	1,515 (10.0)	507,780 (12.2)	300 (10.2)
2014	2,120 (11.2)	3,797,240 (12.7)	1,680 (11.1)	508,075 (12.2)	320 (10.9)
2015	2,175 (11.5)	3,809,910 (12.8)	1,780 (11.7)	529,075 (12.7)	390 (13.2)
2016	2,565 (13.6)	3,782,316 (12.7)	2,105 (13.8)	524,145 (12.6)	410 (13.9)
2017	2,560 (13.6)	3,700,681 (12.4)	2,035 (13.4)	534,485 (12.9)	460 (15.6)
2018	2,930 (15.5)	3,630,719 (12.2)	2,350 (15.5)	519,140 (12.5)	390 (13.2)

2019	2,655 (14.1)	3,584,189 (12.0)	2,190 (14.4)	526,110 (12.7)	360 (12.2)
<b>Length of Stay, medium (IQR), days</b>	4.35 (5.02)	2.65 (2.28)	4.49 (5.12)	2.93 (2.74)	3.44 (4.1)

All statistics are survey weighted. Reported percentages calculated without taking missingness into account for race, household income by zip code, and insurance type. (see **Table S2** for proportion of missingness by group).

N (%): Count (Percentage)

SD: Standard deviation

IQR: Interquartile range

SCD: Sickle Cell Disease

CF: Cystic Fibrosis

SMM: Severe Maternal Morbidity

DS: Data are suppressed as the number of deliveries with SCD and CF are excluded (N= unweighted cell size is 10 or fewer)

<sup>a</sup> “Public” includes Medicaid and Medicare

<sup>b</sup> “No charge, Other” includes Worker’s Compensation, CHAMPUS, CHAMPVA, Title V, and other government programs

**Table 2.** Adjusted odds of postpartum tubal sterilization

	All deliveries		Deliveries coded with Black race		SCD or CF deliveries	
	aOR	95% CI	aOR	95% CI	aOR	95% CI
<b>Main Effects</b>						
Comparison Group						
Comparison [Reference Group]	1.00 [non-SCD]	–	1.00 [Black, non-SCD]	–	1.00 [CF]	–
SCD	1.38**	1.06 - 1.79	1.42**	1.06 - 1.90	0.82	0.52 - 2.25
SMM						
No	Ref	–	Ref	–	Ref	–
Yes	0.75**	0.72 - 0.78	0.91**	0.84 - 0.99	2.25	0.60 - 8.46
Delivery Mode						
Vaginal	Ref	–	Ref	–	Ref	–
Cesarean	8.31***	8.13 - 8.49	6.82***	6.60 - 7.06	6.93***	3.13 - 15.33
Characteristics						
Age, years	1.12***	1.12 - 1.13	1.13***	1.12 - 1.13	1.12***	1.10 - 1.15
Insurance Type						
Public	Ref	–	Ref	–	Ref	–
Private	0.50***	0.49 - 0.50	0.67***	0.66 - 0.69	0.67***	0.51 - 0.88
Self-pay	0.44***	0.42 - 0.46	0.33***	0.30 - 0.36	0.33**	0.12 - 1.04
No charge, Other	0.61***	0.59 - 0.63	0.78***	0.73 - 0.84	0.89	0.43 - 1.62
Median Household Income by Zip Code						
0-25 <sup>th</sup> percentile	Ref	–	Ref	–	Ref	–
26th-50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.93***	0.92 - 0.95	0.89***	0.85 - 0.90	0.76*	0.56 - 1.03
51st-75 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.78***	0.77 - 0.79	0.77***	0.72 - 0.77	0.75*	0.55 - 1.04
76 <sup>th</sup> -100 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.57***	0.55 - 0.58	0.58***	0.53 - 0.60	0.40***	0.25 - 0.62
Hospital Location and Teaching Status						
Rural	Ref	–	Ref	–	Ref	–
Urban, nonteaching	0.68***	0.66 - 0.70	0.62***	0.57 - 0.64	0.83	0.43 - 1.60
Urban, teaching	0.59***	0.58 - 0.61	0.58***	0.54 - 0.60	0.81	0.44 - 1.49
Hospital Census Division						
New England	Ref	–	Ref	–	Ref	–

Middle Atlantic	0.96	0.90 - 1.03	1.22***	1.06 - 1.34	0.93	0.44 - 1.94
East North Central	1.21***	1.14 - 1.29	1.68***	1.58 - 1.98	1.21	0.57 - 2.55
West North Central	1.30***	1.21 - 1.39	1.46***	1.32 - 1.84	0.74	0.28 - 2.99
South Atlantic	1.41***	1.34 - 1.49	2.02***	1.77 - 2.21	1.50	0.76 - 2.99
East South Central	1.52***	1.41 - 1.62	2.36***	2.00 - 2.53	2.04	0.94 - 4.44
West South Central	1.70***	1.60 - 1.80	2.52***	2.12 - 2.64	1.94	0.94 - 4.03
Mountain	1.24***	1.17 - 1.32	1.49***	1.33 - 1.72	0.72	0.21 - 2.41
Pacific	1.08***	1.02 - 1.15	1.24***	1.07 - 1.36	1.22	0.56 - 2.65
<b>Year</b>						
2012	Ref	–	Ref	–	Ref	–
2013	1.00	0.95 - 1.05	0.97	0.90 - 1.05	1.03	0.65 - 1.65
2014	0.98	0.94 - 1.03	0.94	0.87 - 1.02	0.77	0.47 - 1.26
2015	0.94**	0.90 - 0.99	0.87***	0.82 - 0.95	0.59**	0.35 - 0.99
2016	0.91***	0.87 - 0.96	0.82***	0.76 - 0.89	0.77	0.48 - 1.21
2017	0.89***	0.85 - 0.93	0.75***	0.71 - 0.82	0.72	0.46 - 1.15
2018	0.87***	0.83 - 0.91	0.74***	0.69 - 0.80	0.51***	0.32 - 0.81
2019	0.85***	0.81 - 0.89	0.71***	0.67 - 0.77	0.60**	0.37 - 0.96
<b>Interaction</b>						
SMM by SCD	2.34***	1.57 - 3.47	2.14***	1.40 - 3.25	0.82	0.21 - 3.27
Cesarean delivery by SCD	0.66**	0.49 - 0.89	0.75*	0.54 - 1.05	0.79	0.34 - 1.85

Multivariate models adjusted for SCD, age, SMM, delivery mode, insurance type median household income by zip code, hospital location and teaching status, hospital census division, year, and the interaction of SCD and SMM, and SCD and delivery mode.

\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

aOR: Adjusted Odds Ratio

Ref: Reference group (aOR=1.0)

95% CI: 95% Confidence Interval


SCD: Sickle Cell Disease

CF: Cystic Fibrosis

SMM: Severe Maternal Morbidity

Amy Luo  
Spring 2, 2024

**Figure 1.** Adjusted odds of postpartum tubal sterilization among sickle cell disease deliveries compared with non-sickle cell disease deliveries, stratified by hospital census division



Multivariate models adjusted for SCD, age, SMM, delivery mode, insurance type median household income by zip code, hospital location and teaching status, hospital census division, year, and the interaction of SCD and SMM, and SCD and delivery mode.

aOR: Adjusted Odds Ratio

95% CI: 95% Confidence Interval