1	10 14 24
2	Economic Gains from Health Equity: A Model for Pregnancy and
3	Childbirth Policy Decisions
4	
5	Mark L Evans MD ^{1,2,3} Gregory E Ryan MBA ² Lawrence D. Devoe MD ⁴ George M
5 C	Murchalli MD ¹ David W/ Britt Db D ² Jagualina M. Worth MD ¹ Myriam Mandastin
6	wussalli wid, David w. Britt Ph.D., Jaqueline w. worth wid, "wynam wondestin-
7	Sorrentino ³ , and Christian R. Macedonia MD ^o
8	
9	¹ Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology, and Reproductive Sciences, Icahn School
10	of Medicine at Mount Sinai, NY
11	² Fetal Medicine Foundation of America, NY
12	³ Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Yong Yoo Lin School of Medicine,
13	National University of Singapore
14	⁴ Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Medical College of Georgia at Augusta
15	University
16	⁵ Princeton Perinatal Institute, Lawrenceville, NJ
17	⁶ Lancaster Maternal Fetal Medicine, Lancaster PA.
18	Presentation: Presented in part at the 2024 meeting of the Society for Maternal Fetal Medicine
19	(Washington DC, Feb 12- 14, 2024).
20	
21	Correspondence:
22	Mark I Evans, MD
23	131 E. 65 th St
24	New York, NY 10065, USA
25	evans@compregen.com
26	+1 (212) 288-1422

27	
28	Word Count 3295/3250
29	
30	
31	
32 33	Conflict of interest statement: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.
34 35 36	Keywords: maternal mortality ratio; neonatal mortality rate; disparities of care; prenatal care; maternal health deserts; health care economics; benefit-cost ratio; Value of a Statistical Life; Affordable Care Act; social determinants of health; economic integration; "DEVELOP."
37	

38 ABSTRACT (247)

39	Importance: American maternal and neonatal mortality rates are the worst of the world's high-
40	income countries. These rates are particularly low among patients of color, who have higher
41	Cesarean delivery rates (CDR), higher healthcare costs, and poorer outcomes than White
42	patients. However, common economic analyses do not address interlinked issues and therefore
43	underestimate both the hidden causes of health inequities and the resultant costs to taxpayers.
44	We have therefore designed a more comprehensive health economic model and metric
45	(DEVELOP) that incorporates population health, equity, and economic integration.
46	Design & Measures: The DEVELOP model, a childbirth-specific model of the societal economic
47	gain or loss related to healthcare outcomes, incorporates an individual's long-term economic
48	contributions into its calculations of economic benefits. We first used our model to estimate
49	fiscal outcomes if each state's CDR for Black patients was lowered to that of White patients.
50	Second, we calculated the costs of "excess" CDR and mortalities among Black patients. Third, we
51	incorporated the additional long-term economic contributions of mothers and their children.
52	Results: In the U.S., maternal and neonatal mortality rates and associated costs were higher for
53	Black patients than White patients, and states with the lowest per capita health expenditures
54	showed worse maternal outcomes and higher continuing costs. If the Black patient CDR were
55	reduced to the White patient CDR, taxpayer-funded healthcare programs would save \$263
56	million annually. Reducing the Black patient MMR would improve economic output by \$224
57	million per year, and reducing the Black patient NMR would save \$3.1 billion per year, for a
58	combined economic improvement of \$3.3 billion annually.

- 59 **Conclusions and Relevance:** The costs of improved prenatal care should be reconceptualized as
- 60 investments for future economic growth rather than as short-term burdens. Policies blocking
- 61 reasonable investments in health equity are counterproductive.

62 INTRODUCTION (3063)

63	In the United States, racial disparities in health care outcomes pervade all aspects of
64	medicine. In obstetrics, pregnancy care outcomes are commonly assessed using the maternal
65	mortality ratio (MMR) and neonatal mortality rate (NMR). ¹⁻¹⁵ Here, we focus on integrative
66	economic aspects of healthcare disparities in the United States, emphasizing the cost-
67	effectiveness of hospital payments derived from taxpayer dollars. Over several decades, we
68	have interacted with various federal and state governments concerning their medical/public
69	health programs, and we have observed how legislators, agency directors, and staff typically
70	evaluate funding requests. ¹⁶ Unfortunately, governments often do not distinguish between
71	medicine and other "special interest" groups seeking money from limited government
72	resources. ^{16,17}
73	Taxpayer dollars already account for half of all healthcare spending in the U.S. Proposals
74	for additional healthcare spending accordingly raise two important questions: 1) will the
75	proposed program genuinely improve patient care; and 2) how much will implementation of
76	these programs cost (or save)? ^{16,17} Despite this need for clear cost-benefit analysis, typical
77	econometric indices do not adequately measure the actual economic impacts or return on
78	investment of such proposals. However, we cannot ignore the moral and scientific rationales by
79	which government agencies should prioritize funding decisions. ¹⁸
80	Numerous studies have detailed racial differences in obstetrical and neonatal
81	outcomes. ¹⁻¹⁵ Unlike other medical problems, for which quantifying disparities requires multi-
82	year timescales, most obstetric outcomes are quantifiable within a single year. One commonly
83	used (albeit imperfect) measure of obstetrical care quality is the Cesarean delivery rate

(CDR),^{4,16} which is uniformly higher for Black patients than for White patients. Cesarean
deliveries carry an increased risk of morbidity and mortality during childbirth.¹⁹ Fortunately, the
CDR is routinely calculated by numerous U.S. government agencies.^{7,10-12} We therefore used CDR
benchmarks along with currently accepted U.S. government definitions for race to compare
obstetric care between White and Black patient cohorts. We acknowledge that Hispanic and
Asian patients represent sizable minorities in some states and will consider these groups in
subsequent studies.

Minority women and children consistently have poorer outcomes.¹⁻¹⁶ The higher CDR (and higher cost) among Black patients is partly due to the delayed initiation and reduced utilization and comprehensiveness of prenatal care.^{7,10-12,19,20} Strategies for promoting healthcare equity must confront the harsh economic realities of (i) the increased up-front costs required for enhanced care and (ii) the associated financial stresses on governmental and employer healthcare programs that must pay those costs.^{16,17}

Achieving healthcare equity requires addressing a deeper set of problems at a systems 97 level. To do so, we need better metrics and a common language to evaluate the impacts and 98 costs of disparities in care. Here, we address this need by developing a new approach for 99 100 quantifying the economic costs of healthcare disparities and then use this method to evaluate 101 the economic consequences of higher CDRs, MMRs, and NMRs for Black patients in the United States.^{7,10-12} We additionally model, on a state-by-state basis, the economic consequences of 102 hypothetically lowering the CDR for Black patients (through better care) to contemporaneous 103 104 rates for White patients.

106 MATERIALS AND METHODS

107	To quantify the additional costs for CD compared to vaginal delivery, we used data from
108	multiple government-curated and well-vetted public repositories (Table 1). We calculated
109	average additional costs associated with CDs vs. vaginal deliveries. We derived the "excess"
110	number of CDs for Black patients per state by subtracting the total number of CDs performed
111	for Black patients from the total number of CDs that would have been administered if the CDR
112	for Black patients were equivalent to that of White patients.
113	We additionally calculated the financial consequences of different CDRs in each state
114	using a gross domestic product (GDP)-based statistical dollar value of each life analogous to the
115	"Value of a Statistical Life" developed by the National Bureau of Economic Research. ²¹⁻²³ The
116	excess costs associated with a higher CDR were calculated as:
117	(additional hospital stay days due to a CD \cdot average cost per day) +
118	(additional average recovery days \cdot average lifetime daily GDP contribution)
119	To quantify the economic benefits of reduced MMR and NMR, we propose a new
120	economic model (Development of Value and Economics of Life Optimization and Preservation,
121	["DEVELOP"]), from which we calculate a "DEVELOP Score" using generally accepted accounting
122	principles. The DEVELOP Score uses the current GDP per capita in the state (or country) of
123	interest, the associated 10-year average annual GDP growth rate, and the average life
124	expectancy (Figure 1). We chose GDP for our calculations because the UN, U.S., and many other
125	nations and organizations use GDP as a standard measure of wealth and productivity. To
126	calculate DEVELOP Scores in regions with a negative 10-year average annual GDP growth rate,
127	we set the annual growth rate to 0%. Average life expectancy data come from the U.S. Census

Bureau, World Bank, or UN. To determine the economic costs of maternal mortality in each 128 129 state, we subtracted the average female life expectancy from the average age at childbirth to estimate years of lost life. This value was then multiplied by the annual GDP per capita. For 130 neonatal mortality, we performed a similar calculation using the overall average life expectancy 131 132 in each state. We applied a present value discount rate of 10% to the GDP, though this can be adjusted 133 up or down as specific circumstances might warrant. Higher discount rates lead to lower 134 135 DEVELOP Scores, and vice versa. Purchasing power parity could be substituted for GDP for comparisons among countries. 136 We also added a disability-adjusted weight to the DEVELOP score to account for the 137 138 economic consequences of different morbidities depending on their severity. For example, severe cerebral palsy (e.g., spastic quadriplegia) is weighted more heavily than moderate 139 140 cases.^{20,1} CDs have excess costs from additional hospital and recovery days compared to 141 uncomplicated vaginal deliveries. Using this framework, we calculated DEVELOP scores nationwide and for every U.S. 142 state for each year of lost life or year of disabled life averted (Table 2). For example, the 2020 143 World Bank statistics show that Mexico's average per capita GDP was \$10,045.68. The DEVELOP 144 145 Score of newborns and mothers in Mexico correspondingly calculate to \$114,993.69 and 146 \$113,728.88. As a second example, the U.S. per capita GDP is \$70,248.63, and the corresponding DEVELOP Scores are \$907,912.09 per newborn and \$894,544.63 per mother. 147 148 However, DEVELOP Scores vary widely among states: California has newborn and maternal 149 DEVELOP Scores of \$1,466,462.55 and \$1,423,480.82, respectively, whereas neighboring

150	Arizona is 40% lower at \$1,001,930.44 and \$962,099.64, respectively. Mississippi newborn and
151	maternal DEVELOP Scores are even lower: \$546,819.37 and \$539,656.44, respectively.
152	
153	RESULTS
154	In all 50 states and Washington D.C., the CDR was higher for Black patients than for
155	White patients (Figure 2). Nationally, the Black patient CDR was 36.8%, compared to 31.0% for
156	White patients. For comparison, the CDR in sub-Saharan Africa is 7.1%. $\frac{24}{2}$ If the 2021 CDR for
157	Black patients was equivalent to that of White patients, insurance companies and taxpayer-
158	funded health programs would have saved \$263 million. Likewise, reducing the Black patient
159	MMR from 69.9 to the White patient MMR of 26.6 would have increased economic output by
160	\$224 million, and reducing the Black patient NMR from 10.38 to the White patient NMR of 4.40
161	would have added \$3.1 billion back to the economy.
162	By our definitions, racial disparities in these three healthcare outcomes cost the U.S. a
163	total of \$3.3 billion annually (Figure 2). If, by better provision of obstetric and neonatal care, the
164	CDR, MMR, and NMR of Black patients equaled those of White patients, the U.S. economy
165	would improve by \$3.522 billion per cohort-year. This savings would be \$471 per delivery in
166	California and \$1,665 in Georgia (Figure 2).
167	
168	DISCUSSION
169	Of all the world's high-income countries, the U.S. has the worst maternal and neonatal
170	outcome statistics, and healthcare costs and outcomes differ substantially among racial

171 groups.²⁵ This paradox of a high GDP but low-quality obstetric care requires deeper analysis.

172 Indeed, if these racial disparities in care were equalized, the savings could be reallocated to

- 173 other approaches and programs for improving overall healthcare.²⁶ Resolving such discrepancies
- 174 is a continual, complex process addressed extensively elsewhere.²⁷⁻³²
- 175 Restrictions that limit patient access to care can be either physical (e.g., hospital
- 176 closures, staff reductions) or programmatic (e.g., indicated vs. actual access). Explicit bias (e.g.,
- 177 overt racism) and implicit bias (e.g., physician acquiescence to corporate imperatives for
- 178 financial surplus) represent additional 'mental' or 'moral' restrictions which, while important,
- are methodologically more difficult to quantify.
- 180 We have intentionally focused on developing economic measures that encompass a
- 181 longer time frame. The costs of improving care can eventually be recovered; in addition to the
- 182 huge non-financial gain of every human life preserved, patients with improved health outcomes
- 183 will make larger continuing contributions to the GDP.
- 184 One of the most significant barriers to developing a unified strategy for improving 185 obstetric (and other) care is that the various healthcare stakeholders have different economic 186 priorities:
- Hospitals focus on the immediate costs of care. Compensation from insurance
 companies and governmental agencies affects their bottom line and future viability.
 States administer Medicaid programs and focus on the costs and revenues of
 healthcare programs as part of their annual budgets. However, the immediate costs
 of providing obstetric care should be compared to resultant costs of providing
 neonatal and infant care. Because many states require statutory balanced budgets,

193	the financial consequences of disparities in care can vary considerably from year to
194	year.

195	3.	The federal government, through its budget process and the Federal Reserve,
196		supplies money to the economy. This responsibility allows the federal government
197		to consider a longer, multi-year timeframe. Nevertheless, federal programs generally
198		do not emphasize the long-term financial consequences of healthcare disparities and
199		their attendant excess costs. ^{16,17} The federal bureaucracy has traditionally prioritized
200		funding for seniors over women and children, reflecting the historical strength of
201		this voting bloc.

Individual projections are always fraught with uncertainties, but cost-benefit estimates 202 generated on a population basis could be more precisely refined. Our data suggest that 203 204 reframing economic timelines and horizons in healthcare cost-benefit analysis could justify 205 more up-front investments to reduce the costs incurred at birth and beyond. Such investments would improve both public and private bottom lines not only by reducing maternal and 206 neonatal costs but also by providing long-term financial and social contributions that are not 207 captured in a hospital's profit and loss statements. Indeed, our estimate of an annual cost 208 209 savings of \$3.4 billion is likely a significant underestimation of the true return on investment. 210 Healthcare disparities cannot be cured by governmental fiats; improvements must instead be evaluated as part of a multi-step, contextualized process. By creating sub-goals and 211 evaluating them "tranche by tranche," like responsible businesses do, stakeholders and 212 policymakers could generate greater enthusiasm for better care and improved outcomes. 213

214	The challenge in this process of improvement has been finding suitable, quantitative
215	metrics that compare service costs and their resulting economic benefits. We believe the
216	commonly used "benefit cost ratio" and the "social rate of return" developed at the University
217	of Chicago ²² are suboptimal for healthcare economics because they focus primarily on social
218	rather than financial outcomes. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S.
219	Department of Transportation use Vanderbilt University Law School's "Value of a Statistical
220	Life," ²³ which, despite its utility, ignores too many important economic variables to be
221	reasonably precise. Neumann's cost effectiveness thresholds use quality-adjusted life years,
222	which many experts believe have little theoretical or empirical foundation. ³³
223	To determine the cost efficiency of an action, economists typically employ evaluative
224	tools such as cost-effective analysis or the incremental cost effectiveness ratio. The equivalent
225	tools for quantifying treatment outcomes include disability-adjusted life years, quality-adjusted
226	life years, averted years of life lost, and averted years of life lost due to disability. However,
227	these metrics do not adequately address direct economic questions because they mostly
228	compare the costs of the proposed services to the cost of the "next best alternative." We
229	believe that the overall focus of healthcare cost-benefit analysis should be on increasing long-
230	term economic value, exemplified by the question "how much does a healthy individual add to
231	the economic output of a state or nation?" This question is different from the work
232	requirements to ensure a motivated workforce. Research has shown that healthy individuals
233	and communities are more economically productive in multiple ways. ³⁴ We cannot ignore the
234	fact that differing approaches to the costs of care must be justified in a market economy.

We therefore created DEVELOP, which is a simplified version of the Value of a Statistical Life. We acknowledge that putting dollar values on human life is morally distasteful, especially when done to avoid ethical responsibilities. Our approach and acronym are therefore directed towards "life optimization and preservation," framing the analysis on integrity and noble principles. Importantly, our valuations yield concrete numbers—dollars of economic benefits associated with every life saved or morbidity prevented and the specific cost benefits for stakeholders.^{16,17}

242 In the DEVELOP model, the societal economic benefits of preventing morbidities and 243 mortalities include the increased tax revenue generated from an individual's lifetime earnings. The longer someone lives without disability, the more economically productive that individual 244 becomes, and the more tax revenue they generate.³⁵ Later versions of our model will consider 245 secondary economic benefits realized through an individual's purchases of goods (food, 246 247 housing, etc.) or services (education, etc.). Furthermore, a reduced MMR means that the state, family, and/or community allocates less time and resources to helping raise a deceased 248 249 woman's children, thereby creating more economic opportunities. Reducing the CDR similarly lowers costs and frees hospital beds. Every dollar saved with better labor and delivery 250 management increases the capacity of the health care system to provide improved healthcare. 251 252 Modeling the effect of CDR reduction for Black patients, as we did here, is only a starting 253 point for the DEVELOP approach. Indeed, DEVELOP provides a quantitative, contemporaneous analytic metric. However, we are not suggesting that the current CDR for White patients is a 254 "good" number, especially in comparison to other G7 nations.³⁶ We are instead developing 255

256	methods designed to safely guide policy on lowering the CDR, which, by extension, should have
257	disproportionate benefits for patients of color and rural patients of all ethnicities. ^{28,37,38}
258	In the U.S., most childbirth deliveries are financed by either Medicaid or indemnity
259	insurance companies; the latter negotiates fees. Administrators for the Centers for Medicare
260	and Medicaid Services (CMS) are the fiduciaries for physician reimbursement, supposedly
261	tailoring the Medicare/Medicaid fee tables to address historic underpayments for women's
262	medicine relative to more male-oriented specialties like urology, cardiology, and
263	orthopedics. ^{39,40} The CMS payment tables come from an American Medical Association working
264	group called the Relative Value Scale Update Committee (RUC). Although women and children
265	comprise 62% of the U.S. population, Pediatrics and Obstetrics/Gynecology only have two of the
266	32 specialty seats on this committee. It is therefore unsurprising that pediatrics and women's
267	health are perennially underfunded.
268	The emotional benefits of better care are real and important, but they cannot be
269	calculated with current financial metrics. Indeed, typical financial metrics have not moved the
270	needle in any substantial way: U.S. healthcare budgets still skew strongly toward conditions
271	affecting older men. ^{39,40} Our novel approach attempts to correct some of these gaps.
272	Better care means that hospitals can more efficiently use and manage their finite bed
273	capacities, thereby increasing healthcare throughput. Moreover, healthcare agencies can reduce
274	expenditures on the otherwise lifelong costs of care for disabled children. Social Security
275	Disability Insurance monthly payments, over and above the medical costs of care, average
276	\$1,537.00/month from 18 years of age until death (January 2024 data). ⁴¹

Educating a disabled child through out-of-district placement (ages of 4-22 for up to 18)
costs up to \$500,000 per year.⁴² Liability insurance companies have exposures from bad
outcomes including the costs of physical therapy, medications, rehabilitation, doctors' visits,
surgeries, testing, and procedures. From the taxpayer perspective, a more efficient system
could potentially reduce the tax burden of care for disabled children and individuals.
From the public policy and technology assessment perspectives, proposals for increasing

283 up-front healthcare expenditures encounter considerable resistance, especially from states that 284 have traditionally minimized their safety net programs. In these environments, the process of 285 reconceptualizing expenses needs to be evidence-based: for example, the high initial costs 286 involved in starting a business or buying a home are often justified because the value of these 287 entities should be much higher decades into the future. To shift the prevailing narrative of 288 healthcare costs, we must reframe commonly accepted paradigms. Only then can public 289 policies be effectively implemented.⁴³

Some inertia in the system is always present but difficult to quantify.⁴⁴ Public distrust in a system that, for hundreds of years, created barriers to and lower tiers of care cannot instantly vanish. Trust must be earned through repeated acts of trustworthiness. This lack of trust partially explains why so many patients at the highest end of the need spectrum do not take advantage of supposedly available healthcare services. Inequities in health access and availability clearly remain.

296 Our data, along with other studies, show that methods for implementing and diffusing 297 healthcare services must be improved to address disparities of care and make sure healthcare 298 services are equitably available.^{345,46} Compartmentalizing medical expenditures would permit a

299	continuing analysis of the overall economic value of healthcare, which accounts for 17% of the
300	U.S. GDP. Indeed, the federal government pays more than 50% of U.S. healthcare costs and has
301	a predominant role in setting healthcare prices. However, in our opinion, CMS has not provided
302	sufficient incentives for health insurers, hospitals, and independent medical practices to
303	improve maternal outcomes.
304	Policy and budget initiatives have improved some components of healthcare but have
305	not yet meaningfully overcome the large, systemic biases that contribute to current inequities
306	in adverse healthcare outcomes. Only when these issues receive specific attention from diverse
307	stakeholders will we see real progress for the large patient groups that have historically been
308	adversely affected.
309	
310	Strengths and limitations
311	We believe our work is the first study to comprehensively model both short- and long-
311 312	We believe our work is the first study to comprehensively model both short- and long- term economic consequences of how governments and private insurers allocate resources for
311 312 313	We believe our work is the first study to comprehensively model both short- and long- term economic consequences of how governments and private insurers allocate resources for obstetrical and resultant neonatal/infant care. Although our conclusions may seem intuitively
311312313314	We believe our work is the first study to comprehensively model both short- and long- term economic consequences of how governments and private insurers allocate resources for obstetrical and resultant neonatal/infant care. Although our conclusions may seem intuitively obvious, a deep search in PubMed suggests that ours is the first research paper to support
 311 312 313 314 315 	We believe our work is the first study to comprehensively model both short- and long- term economic consequences of how governments and private insurers allocate resources for obstetrical and resultant neonatal/infant care. Although our conclusions may seem intuitively obvious, a deep search in PubMed suggests that ours is the first research paper to support these intuitive beliefs with factual data and analytics. We hope that our data-driven analysis of
 311 312 313 314 315 316 	We believe our work is the first study to comprehensively model both short- and long- term economic consequences of how governments and private insurers allocate resources for obstetrical and resultant neonatal/infant care. Although our conclusions may seem intuitively obvious, a deep search in PubMed suggests that ours is the first research paper to support these intuitive beliefs with factual data and analytics. We hope that our data-driven analysis of the economic consequences of healthcare disparities will engender public policy debates that
 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 	We believe our work is the first study to comprehensively model both short- and long- term economic consequences of how governments and private insurers allocate resources for obstetrical and resultant neonatal/infant care. Although our conclusions may seem intuitively obvious, a deep search in PubMed suggests that ours is the first research paper to support these intuitive beliefs with factual data and analytics. We hope that our data-driven analysis of the economic consequences of healthcare disparities will engender public policy debates that focus on timelines longer than the next election cycle. We expect future versions of the
 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 	We believe our work is the first study to comprehensively model both short- and long- term economic consequences of how governments and private insurers allocate resources for obstetrical and resultant neonatal/infant care. Although our conclusions may seem intuitively obvious, a deep search in PubMed suggests that ours is the first research paper to support these intuitive beliefs with factual data and analytics. We hope that our data-driven analysis of the economic consequences of healthcare disparities will engender public policy debates that focus on timelines longer than the next election cycle. We expect future versions of the DEVELOP model to offer even deeper insights.
 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 	We believe our work is the first study to comprehensively model both short- and long- term economic consequences of how governments and private insurers allocate resources for obstetrical and resultant neonatal/infant care. Although our conclusions may seem intuitively obvious, a deep search in PubMed suggests that ours is the first research paper to support these intuitive beliefs with factual data and analytics. We hope that our data-driven analysis of the economic consequences of healthcare disparities will engender public policy debates that focus on timelines longer than the next election cycle. We expect future versions of the DEVELOP model to offer even deeper insights. Despite this major step forward, our results do not identify any universal theme

321	Medicaid programs, (ii) approvals for services by managed care gatekeepers, and (iii) what
322	different companies and governments consider adequate treatments. Indeed, new approaches
323	to care continually transition from "experimental" to routine, eventually (and often too slowly)
324	making them eligible for future insurance coverage.44,47
325	Deeper analyses will also be required to determine how governments create "winners,"
326	whereby large health systems have large profit margins for services such as neonatal intensive
327	care even as the overall health universe loses. ^{48,50} Even so, resistance to changing approaches to
328	care only hinders the health care landscape from taking advantage of new methods to amplify
329	the voices of historically underserved demographic groups.
330	
331	Conclusions
332	Miserliness in the provision of obstetrical care does not save money in either the short
332 333	Miserliness in the provision of obstetrical care does not save money in either the short or long term: instead, lower "up front" expenditures ultimately cost the U.S. more than \$3
332 333 334	Miserliness in the provision of obstetrical care does not save money in either the short or long term: instead, lower "up front" expenditures ultimately cost the U.S. more than \$3 billion per year in direct outlays and tens of billions of dollars amortized due to lost years of life
332 333 334 335	Miserliness in the provision of obstetrical care does not save money in either the short or long term: instead, lower "up front" expenditures ultimately cost the U.S. more than \$3 billion per year in direct outlays and tens of billions of dollars amortized due to lost years of life and productivity. We believe that the challenge of improving disparities in maternal, fetal, and
332 333 334 335 336	Miserliness in the provision of obstetrical care does not save money in either the short or long term: instead, lower "up front" expenditures ultimately cost the U.S. more than \$3 billion per year in direct outlays and tens of billions of dollars amortized due to lost years of life and productivity. We believe that the challenge of improving disparities in maternal, fetal, and infant care should be reconceptualized to include a larger, overarching viewpoint that considers
332 333 334 335 336 337	Miserliness in the provision of obstetrical care does not save money in either the short or long term: instead, lower "up front" expenditures ultimately cost the U.S. more than \$3 billion per year in direct outlays and tens of billions of dollars amortized due to lost years of life and productivity. We believe that the challenge of improving disparities in maternal, fetal, and infant care should be reconceptualized to include a larger, overarching viewpoint that considers both medicine and economics in long-term timescales. ⁴⁰ Better economic evaluations will
 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 	Miserliness in the provision of obstetrical care does not save money in either the short or long term: instead, lower "up front" expenditures ultimately cost the U.S. more than \$3 billion per year in direct outlays and tens of billions of dollars amortized due to lost years of life and productivity. We believe that the challenge of improving disparities in maternal, fetal, and infant care should be reconceptualized to include a larger, overarching viewpoint that considers both medicine and economics in long-term timescales. ⁴⁰ Better economic evaluations will empower concomitant improvements in both data evaluation and machine learning approaches
332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339	Miserliness in the provision of obstetrical care does not save money in either the short or long term: instead, lower "up front" expenditures ultimately cost the U.S. more than \$3 billion per year in direct outlays and tens of billions of dollars amortized due to lost years of life and productivity. We believe that the challenge of improving disparities in maternal, fetal, and infant care should be reconceptualized to include a larger, overarching viewpoint that considers both medicine and economics in long-term timescales. ⁴⁰ Better economic evaluations will empower concomitant improvements in both data evaluation and machine learning approaches to support more sophisticated analyses and program development. ⁵¹⁻⁵⁴ Under the framework
 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 	Miserliness in the provision of obstetrical care does not save money in either the short or long term: instead, lower "up front" expenditures ultimately cost the U.S. more than \$3 billion per year in direct outlays and tens of billions of dollars amortized due to lost years of life and productivity. We believe that the challenge of improving disparities in maternal, fetal, and infant care should be reconceptualized to include a larger, overarching viewpoint that considers both medicine and economics in long-term timescales. ⁴⁰ Better economic evaluations will empower concomitant improvements in both data evaluation and machine learning approaches to support more sophisticated analyses and program development. ⁵¹⁻⁵⁴ Under the framework we propose here, the justifications for enhancing the provision of prenatal care become
 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 	Miserliness in the provision of obstetrical care does not save money in either the short or long term: instead, lower "up front" expenditures ultimately cost the U.S. more than \$3 billion per year in direct outlays and tens of billions of dollars amortized due to lost years of life and productivity. We believe that the challenge of improving disparities in maternal, fetal, and infant care should be reconceptualized to include a larger, overarching viewpoint that considers both medicine and economics in long-term timescales. ⁴⁰ Better economic evaluations will empower concomitant improvements in both data evaluation and machine learning approaches to support more sophisticated analyses and program development. ⁵¹⁻⁵⁴ Under the framework we propose here, the justifications for enhancing the provision of prenatal care become economically, ethically, morally, and practically compelling.

343	Figure 1: Mathematical calculations used to determine the "DEVELOP" Score.
344	Legend: Steps in the calculation of the DEVELOP Score using California data as an example.
345	
346	Figure 2. Racial variation in CDR, MMR, and NMR, and their financial implications.
347	Legend: Black patients have increased rates of Cesarean deliveries, maternal mortality, and
348	neonatal mortality relative to White patients in all U.S. states. Our model suggests that lowering
349	the Black patient CDR and MMR/NMR to that of White patients through the provision of better
350	care would save \$213 million and \$3 billion per cohort-year, respectively, for a total of
351	approximately \$3.5 billion in economic improvement.
352	
353	
354	
354 355	DECLARATIONS
354 355 356	DECLARATIONS DATA SHARING STATEMENT
354 355 356 357	DECLARATIONS DATA SHARING STATEMENT All data were taken from publicly available databases and then analyzed: we have aggregate, de-
354 355 356 357 358	DECLARATIONS DATA SHARING STATEMENT All data were taken from publicly available databases and then analyzed: we have aggregate, de- identified statistics but no individual patient data. When our current studies based on this data
354 355 356 357 358 359	DECLARATIONS DATA SHARING STATEMENT All data were taken from publicly available databases and then analyzed: we have aggregate, de- identified statistics but no individual patient data. When our current studies based on this data have been completed (no specific date yet established), the aggregate data will be publicly
354 355 356 357 358 359 360	DECLARATIONS DATA SHARING STATEMENT All data were taken from publicly available databases and then analyzed: we have aggregate, de- identified statistics but no individual patient data. When our current studies based on this data have been completed (no specific date yet established), the aggregate data will be publicly shared in the form of data tables on the lead author's website.
354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361	DECLARATIONS DATA SHARING STATEMENT All data were taken from publicly available databases and then analyzed: we have aggregate, de- identified statistics but no individual patient data. When our current studies based on this data have been completed (no specific date yet established), the aggregate data will be publicly shared in the form of data tables on the lead author's website.
354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362	DECLARATIONS DATA SHARING STATEMENT All data were taken from publicly available databases and then analyzed: we have aggregate, de- identified statistics but no individual patient data. When our current studies based on this data have been completed (no specific date yet established), the aggregate data will be publicly shared in the form of data tables on the lead author's website. FUNDING
354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363	DECLARATIONS DATA SHARING STATEMENT All data were taken from publicly available databases and then analyzed: we have aggregate, de- identified statistics but no individual patient data. When our current studies based on this data have been completed (no specific date yet established), the aggregate data will be publicly shared in the form of data tables on the lead author's website. FUNDING We received no outside funding for this project or manuscript.

- 365 IRB APPROVAL
- 366 Because this project has no individual patient data and is only a secondary analysis of previously
- 367 published, de-identified data, no IRB approval is necessary.
- 368
- 369 RACE and ETHNICITY
- 370 Data on racial differences are taken directly from contemporaneous U.S. government databases
- using their definitions. We have not attempted to dissect or alter these definitions.
- 372
- 373 DECLARATION of AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process:
- No Al or assisted technologies were used in the preparation of this manuscript.

376	TABLES
377	TABLE 1.
378	Databases Used
379	
380 381 382	https://www.kff.org/medicaid/state-indicator/births-financed-by- medicaid/?currentTimeframe=0&sortModel=%7B%22colId%22:%22Location%22,%22sort%22:%22asc%22%7D
383 384	United States Department of Health and Human Services (US DHHS), Centers of Disease Control and Prevention
385 386	Records 2007-2020, as compiled from data provided by the 57 vital statistics jurisdictions through the Vital
387 388 389	Statistics Cooperative Program, on CDC WONDER On-line Database. Accessed at http://wonder.cdc.gov/lbd- current.html on April 5, 2023.
390 391	Maternal Mortality Rate by State 2024 (worldpopulationreview.com)
392 393	Maternal Mortality Rates in the United States, 2021 (cdc.gov)
394	https://www.kff.org/other/state-indicator/infant-mortality-rate-by-race-
395 396	ethnicity/?dataView=1¤tTimeframe=0&sortModel=%7B%22colld%22
397 398	https://www.cia.gov/the-world-factbook/field/mothers-mean-age-at-first-birth/
399 400	https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD
401 402 403	https://www.bea.gov/data/gdp/gdp-state

404 TABLE 2: DEVELOP SCORE ANALYSIS

405 Legend: States ranked from best to worst based on their MMR, NMR, and combined score.

	10 Year					Statistical Value	Statistical Value			
State Name	Average Per Capita Healthcare		10 Year Per Capita Healthcare	MMR Rank (lowest MMR = 1)	NMR Rank (lowest NMR = 1)	of a Mother's Life Based on GDP CAGR 2014-	of a Neonate's Life Based on GDP CAGR 2014	Healthcare Rank (Lowest = 1)	Economic Rank (Lowest = 1)	Combined Rank (Lowest Score = 1)
		Spend	Spend Kank			2022	2022			
Alabama	\$	7,769.90	41	48	46	\$ 689,549.67	\$ 703,584.18	48	51	51
Alaska	\$	11,498.00	2	34	19	\$ 856,269.57	\$ 859,859.50	16	18	16
Arizona	\$	7,146.20	47	43	23	\$ 962,099.64	\$1,001,930.44	29	30	31
Arkansas	\$	7,826.10	40	50	49	\$ 693,395.36	\$ 705,813.03	49	45	48
California	\$	8,240.50	32	6	5	\$1,423,480.82	\$1,466,462.55	6	6	2
Colorado	\$	7,220.60	46	8	17	\$1,295,198.07	\$1,343,188.91	5	17	7
Connecticut	\$	10,509.60	7	12	12	\$1,050,239.15	\$1,067,239.22	25	14	19
Delaware	\$	10,865.30	6	18	13	\$ 950,648.78	\$ 959,721.25	18	15	15
District of Colu	\$	12,680.50	1	1	2	\$3,099,718.65	\$3,127,780.30	3	7	1
Florida	\$	8,471.80	28	36	30	\$ 998,340.83	\$1,038,533.53	42	16	29
Georgia	\$	7,138.60	48	49	38	\$1,030,527.20	\$1,068,057.68	47	24	40
Hawaii	\$	8,036.40	35	19	21	\$ 769,658.49	\$ 774,611.70	13	46	32
Idaho	\$	6,971.60	50	16	20	\$ 937,344.22	\$ 988,259.39	7	27	17
Illinois	\$	8,510.00	25	17	27	\$ 979,688.59	\$ 994,461.27	24	32	27
Indiana	\$	8,626.70	22	41	45	\$ 829,514.84	\$ 847,542.55	40	28	38
Iowa	\$	8,360.30	31	21	15	\$ 841,931.40	\$ 859,236.74	15	44	33
Kansas	\$	7,913.70	38	27	41	\$ 914,318.15	\$ 936,637.96	32	38	39
Kentucky	\$	8,501.90	26	45	39	\$ 714,911.16	\$ 728,646.26	46	40	45
Louisiana	\$	8,482.80	27	46	50	\$ 609,150.49	\$ 612,797.47	50	48	49
Maine	\$	9,978.80	10	3	36	\$ 841,553.90	\$ 867,347.52	20	10	12
Maryland	\$	9,176.40	17	23	34	\$ 919,758.58	\$ 934,313.47	36	31	37
Massachusetts	\$	11,266.00	3	9	4	\$1,376,581.06	\$1,413,648.63	10	2	3
Michigan	\$	8,517.40	24	20	44	\$ 781,338.10	\$ 801,458.94	37	42	43
Minnesota	\$	9,372.20	16	5	11	\$ 972,615.17	\$ 994,432.19	4	12	6
Mississippi	\$	7,954.30	36	51	51	\$ 539,656.44	\$ 546,819.37	51	47	50
Missouri	\$	8,430.00	29	32	33	\$ 763,128.49	\$ 776,435.81	31	43	41
Montana	\$	8,568.40	23	38	16	\$ 739,865.20	\$ 756,421.46	22	33	23
Nebraska	\$	8,814.10	20	33	29	\$1,057,313.59	\$1,087,031.21	26	5	13
Nevada	\$	7,137.10	49	26	18	\$1,024,280.51	\$1,056,867.29	30	25	24
New Hampshir	\$	10,080.00	9	7	3	\$1,016,798.18	\$1,051,117.95	11	3	5
New Jersey	\$	9,744.80	14	30	6	\$1,004,362.80	\$1,022,950.46	23	9	14
New Mexico	\$	7,552.30	44	42	24	\$ 679,609.81	\$ 688,150.84	27	50	42
New York	\$	10,907.90	5	25	10	\$1,375,330.36	\$1,399,409.19	28	1	11
North Carolina	\$	7,718.60	42	24	43	\$ 957,599.03	\$ 985,636.94	33	22	25
North Dakota	\$	9,572.10	15	29	22	\$ 927,360.27	\$ 936,010.64	17	26	20
Ohio	\$	8,926.70	19	28	42	\$ 868,808.55	\$ 887,554.70	35	29	36
Oklahoma	\$	8,053.10	33	40	35	\$ 659,769.86	\$ 666,520.24	41	49	47
Oregon	\$	8,426.10	30	13	9	\$1,106,935.23	\$1,149,145.91	8	4	4
Pennsylvania	\$	9,846.40	13	15	25	\$ 855,378.75	\$ 870,131.80	21	34	26
Rhode Island	\$	9,953.30	12	14	8	\$ 763,108.89	\$ 773,673.09	19	37	28
South Carolina	\$	7,560.70	43	44	40	\$ 792,797.70	\$ 816,523.26	45	41	46
South Dakota	\$	9,970.40	11	37	47	\$ 917,945.05	\$ 939,701.86	34	11	21
Tennessee	\$	7,937.90	37	47	37	\$ 994,681.51	\$1,028,857.27	43	20	35
Texas	\$	7,239.60	45	35	26	\$1,128,559.30	\$1,159,073.98	39	19	30
Utah	\$	6,299.40	51	11	28	\$1,288,664.82	\$1,398,271.25	9	13	8
Vermont	\$	11,021.30	4	2	1	\$ 754,792.99	\$ 769,363.79	1	21	9
Virginia	\$	7,883.50	39	39	32	\$ 969,834.98	\$ 990,950.21	38	23	34
Washington	\$	8,040.90	34	22	14	\$1,616,822.41	\$1,696,692.74	14	8	10
West Virginia	\$	10,270.70	8	31	48	\$ 596,718.93	\$ 603,629.62	44	39	44
Wisconsin	\$	8,744.60	21	4	31	\$ 828,139.55	\$ 848,393.47	12	36	22
Wyoming	\$	8,935.60	18	10	7	\$ 806,332.13	\$ 811,695.11	2	35	18
United States						\$ 957,648.34	\$ 976,725.33			

Declercq E, Barnard-Mayers R, Zephyrin LC, Johnson K. The U.S. maternal health divide: the

407 **REFERENCES**

1.

408

409 limited maternal health services and worse outcomes of states proposing new abortion 410 restrictions. The Commonwealth Fund. 2024. https://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/issue-briefs/2022/dec/us-maternal-health-411 412 divide-limited-services-worse-outcomes 413 2. Declercq E, Thoma M. Measuring US maternal mortality. JAMA. 2023;330(18):1731-1732. 414 doi:10.1001/jama.2023.19945 415 Gunja MZ, Gumas ED, Williams RDI. The U.S. maternal mortality crisis continues to worsen: an 3. 416 international comparison. The Commonwealth Fund. 2024. 417 https://www.commonwealthfund.org/blog/2022/us-maternal-mortality-crisis-continues-418 worsen-international-comparison 419 4. Leonard SA, Berrahou I, Zhang A, Monseur B, Main EK, Obedin-Maliver J. Sexual and/or gender 420 minority disparities in obstetrical and birth outcomes. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2022;226(6):846.e1-421 846.e14. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2022.02.041 422 5. Osterman MJK, Hamilton BE, Martin JA, Driscoll AK, Valenzuela CP. Births: Final Data for 2021. 423 Natl Vital Stat Rep. Jan 2023;72(1):1-53. 424 6. Corbisiero MF, Tolbert B, Sanches M, et al. Medicaid coverage and access to obstetrics and 425 gynecology subspecialists: findings from a national mystery caller study in the United States. Am 426 J Obstet Gynecol. 2023;228(6):722.e1-722.e9. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2023.03.004 427 7. Ely DM, Driscoll AK. Infant Mortality in the United States, 2020: Data From the Period Linked 428 Birth/Infant Death File. Natl Vital Stat Rep. Sep 2022;71(5):1-18. 429 8. Crockett AH, Chen L, Heberlein EC, et al. Group vs traditional prenatal care for improving racial equity in preterm birth and low birthweight: the Centering and Racial Disparities randomized 430 431 clinical trial study. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2022;227(6):893.e1-893.e15. 432 doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2022.06.066 433 9. Kern-Goldberger AR, Malhotra T, Zera CA. Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine Special 434 Statement: Utilizing telemedicine to address disparities in maternal-fetal medicine: a call to 435 policy action. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2024;230(5):B6-B11. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2023.11.001 436 10. Davidson KW, Terry MB, Braveman P, Reis PJ, Timmermans S, Epling JW, Jr. Maternal mortality: A 437 National Institutes of Health Pathways to Prevention panel report. Obstet Gynecol. 438 2024;143(3):e78-e85. doi:10.1097/AOG.000000000005488

439 440	11.	Arechvo A, Nikolaidi DA, Gil MM, et al. Maternal race and stillbirth: cohort study and systemati review with meta-analysis. <i>J Clin Med</i> . 2022;11(12). doi:10.3390/jcm11123452				
441 442 443	12.	McIlwraith C, Sanusi A, McGwin G, Jr., Battarbee A, Subramaniam A. Recurrent severe mate morbidity in an obstetric population with a high comorbidity burden. <i>Obstet Gynecol</i> . 2024;143(2)				
444 445	13.	Goldfarb S, Deichen Hansen M, Day J, Brown Speights JS, Rust G, Harman J: State variation in progress towards eliminating disparities in Infant Mortality, 2007-19. Health Affairs 2024;43				
446 447 448	14. reduci Health	Brown Speights JS, Goldfarb SS, Wells BA, Beitsch L, Levine RS, Rust G. State-level progress in Icing the Black-White infant mortality gap, United States, 1999–2013. Am J Public Ith. 2017;107(5):775–82.				
449 450	15. racism	Wallace M, Crear-Perry J, Richardson L, Tarver M, Theall K. Separate and unequal: structural m and infant mortality in the US. Health Place. 2017;45:140–4.				
451	16.	Evans MI, Hanft R. The introduction of new technologies. ACOG; 1997:3.				
452 453 454	17.	Cohen A, Hanft R, Encinosa W, Spernak S, Stewart S, White C. <i>Technology in American health care: policy directions for effective evaluation and management</i> University of Michigan Press; 2004.				
455 456	18.	Buettgens M, Blavin F, Pan C: The affordable care act reduced income inequality in the US. Health Aff. 2021 40:121-129				
457 458 459	19. Addro 2024;2	Evans MI, Ryan GF, Mussalli G, Britt DW, Worth J, Devoe LD: Another Reason to ess Social Determinants and Disparities: It Saves Money. Am J Obstet Gynecol 230:S100				
460 461 462	20.	Evans M, Ryan G, Britt D, et al. Reframing the economic arguments for improving obstetric care: saving money costs too much. presented at: 71st Society for Reproductive Investigati Scientific Meeting; March 12-16 2024; Vancouver, BC, Canada.				
463						
464 465 466	21.	Artiga S, Hinton E. <i>Beyond health care: the role of social determinants in promoting health and health equity</i> 2018. <u>https://files.kff.org/attachment/issue-brief-beyond-health-care</u>				
467 468 469	22.	Kremer M, Gallant S, Rostapshova O, et al. Is development innovation a good investment? Which innovations scale? Evidence on social investing from USAID's development innovation ventures. 2019;				
470 471	23.	Kniesner TJ, Viscusi WK. The value of a statistical life. <i>Oxford Research Enyclopedia of Economics and Finance</i> . Vanderbilt Law Research Paper No. 19-15; 2019.				

472 24. Zaigham M, Varallo J, Thangaratinam S, Nicholson W, H. A. Visser G (2024) Global disparities in caesarean 473 section rates: Why indication-based metrics are needed. PLOS Glob Public Health 4(2): e0002877

Brans MI, Ryan GF, Britt DW, Macedonia CR: The Mortality of Politics: An American paradox.

- 475 Fetal Diagn Therapy 2024 doi.org/10.1159/000541912
- 476 26. Evans MI, Britt DW, Devoe LD. Etiology and ontogeny of cerebral palsy: implications for practice 477 and research. Reprod Sci. 2024;31(5):1179-1189. doi:10.1007/s43032-023-01422-6 20a.

478 27. Evans MI: Overcoming Militant Mediocrity Am J Obstet Gynecol 2008; 198:656-661

479 28. Evans MI, Britt DW, Evans SM, Devoe LD: Improving the interpretation of electronic fetal monitoring: the fetal reserve index. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2023;228:S1129-1143 480

- 481 29. Levitt L, Altman D. Complexity in the US health care system is the enemy of access and 482 affordability. JAMA Health Forum. 2023;4(10):e234430-e234430.
- 483 doi:10.1001/jamahealthforum.2023.4430
- 484 30 Philbbs CM, Kristensen-Cabrera A, Kozhimannil KB, Leonard SA, Lorch SA, Main EK, et al: 485 Racial/ethnic disparities in costs, length of stay, and severity of severe maternal morbidity. Am J 486 Obstet Gynecol MFM 2023;5:100971 doi: 10.1016/j.ajogmf.2023.1009170
- 487 31 Mujahid MS,Wall-Wieler E, Hailu EM, Berkowitz RL, Gao X, Morris CM, et al: Neighborhood disinvestment and severe maternal maternal morbidity in thestate of California. Am J Obstet 488 489 Gynecol MFM 2023; doi: 10.1016/j.ajogmf.2023.100916

24-9.0 32. Cole MB, Kim J, Gordon SH, Lasser KE, Ncube C, Patton E, et al: Massachusetts Medicaid ACO 491 Program May Have Improved Care Use And Quality For Pregnant And Postpartum Enrollees, Health 492 Aff 2024;43.00230

493

294

- 496
- Neumann PJ, Kim DD. Cost-effectiveness thresholds used by study authors, 1990-2021. JAMA. 497 33. 498 2023;329(15):1312-1314. doi:10.1001/jama.2023.1792
- 499 34 Cerf ME: The social-education-economy-health nexus, development and sustainability: 500 perspectives from low and middle-income and African countires. Discov Sustain 2023; 501 doi.org/10.1007/s43621-023-00153-7
- 502 35. Caraballo C, Massey DS, Ndumele CD, et al. Excess mortality and years of potential life lost 503 among the black population in the US, 1999-2020. JAMA. 2023;329(19):1662-1670. 504 doi:10.1001/jama.2023.7022

505 506 507	36	Evans MI, Britt DW, Evans SM: Midforceps did not cause "compromised babies" – compromise caused forceps: an approach toward safely lowering the cesarean delivery rate. J Matern Fetal Neonat Med 2022; 29:1874-1894
508 509 510	37. more pa Aff 2024	Jiang HJ, Moshe Henke R, Fingar KR, Denis Agniel LL, Roemer MI: Rural hospitals experienced atient volume variability than urban hospitals during the COVID-19 Pandemic, 2020-21. Health 4;43 (5)
511 512 513	38. surgical 36.	Henke RM, Fingar KR, Jiang HJ, Liang L, Gibson TB. Access to obstetric, behavioral health, and inpatient services after hospital mergers in rural areas. Health Aff (Millwood). 2021;40(10):1627–
514 515 516	39.	Polan RM, Barber EL. Reimbursement for female-specific compared with male-specific procedures over time. <i>Obstet Gynecol</i> . 2021;138(6):878-883. doi:10.1097/AOG.000000000004599
517 518 519 520	40.	https://www.healthsystemtracker.org/chart-collection/health-expenditures-vary-across population/#Share%20of%20total%20population%20and%20total%20health%20spendin g,%20by%20age%20group,%202021)
521 522	41.	U.S. Social Security Administration. Monthly Statistical Snapshot: January 2024. https://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/quickfacts/stat_snapshot/index.html
523 524	42.	Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Special Education Tuition Pricing Details. 26. https://www.mass.gov/info-details/special-education-tuition-pricing-details
525	43.	Peters T: Re-Imagine! Business Excellence in a Disruptive Age. DK Publishing, NY 2003.
526	44.	Evans MI, Britt DW: Resistance to Change Reprod Sci: 2023;30:835-853
527 528	45.	Batman S, Rivlin K, Robinson W, Brown O, Carter EB, Lindo E: A rubric to center equity in obstetrics and gynecology research. Obstet Gynecol 2023;142:772-778
529 530	46.	Doll KM: The future of research on racism in reproductive health. Obstet Gynecol 2023;142:987-988.
531 532 533	47.	Henke RM, Fingar KR, Jiang HJ, Liang L, Gibson TB. Access to obstetric, behavioral health, and surgical inpatient services after hospital mergers in rural areas. <i>Health Affairs</i> . 2021;40(10):1627-1636. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2021.00160

535 536 537	48.	Pineda R, Kati K, Breault CC, Rogers EE, Mack WJ, Fernandez-Fernandez A. NICUs in the US: levels of acuity, number of beds, and relationships to population factors. <i>J Perinatol</i> . 2023/06/01 2023;43(6):796-805. doi:10.1038/s41372-023-01693-6
538 539	49.	https://www.bcbs.com/the-health-of-america/articles/healthy-communities-mean- better-economy
540 541	50.	Policy Framework March 2023. US Agency for international development. https://www.usaid.gov/policy/documents/mar 23-2023.
542 543 544	51.	Chappel, A., DeLew, N., Grigorescu, V., & Smith, S. R. (2021). Addressing the maternal health crisis through improved data infrastructure: guiding principles for progress. Health Affairs Forefront.
545 546	52.	Peahl, A. F., & Shah, N. (2023). The Maternal Health Crisis Is A Consequence Of Design. Health Affairs Forefront.
547 548	53.	Attanasio, L. B., & Geissler, K. H. (2024). The Role Of Medicaid Accountable Care Organizations In Maternal Health. Health Affairs Forefront.
549 550 551	54.	Bowser DM, Maurico K, Ruscitti BA, Crown WH: American clusters: using machine learning to understand health and healthcare disparities in the United States. Health Aff Scholar 2024;2 qxae017.
552		
553		