

1 10 14 24

2 Economic Gains from Health Equity: A Model for Pregnancy and
3 Childbirth Policy Decisions

4
5 Mark I. Evans MD,^{1,2,3} Gregory F. Ryan, MBA,² Lawrence D. Devoe MD,⁴ George M.
6 Mussalli MD,¹ David W. Britt Ph.D.², Jaqueline M. Worth MD,¹ Myriam Mondestin-
7 Sorrentino⁵, and Christian R. Macedonia MD⁶

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. 65th 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 **Keywords:** maternal mortality ratio; neonatal mortality rate; disparities of care; prenatal care;

35 maternal health deserts; health care economics; benefit-cost ratio; Value of a Statistical Life;

36 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

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

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

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

105

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:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{(additional hospital stay days due to a CD} \cdot \text{average cost per day)} + \\ & \text{(additional average recovery days} \cdot \text{average lifetime daily GDP contribution)} \end{aligned}$$

119 To quantify the economic benefits of reduced MMR and NMR, we propose a new
120 economic model (**D**evelopment of **V**alue and **E**conomics of **L**ife **O**ptimization and **P**reservation,
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

128 Bureau, World Bank, or UN. To determine the economic costs of maternal mortality in each
129 state, we subtracted the average female life expectancy from the average age at childbirth to
130 estimate years of lost life. This value was then multiplied by the annual GDP per capita. For
131 neonatal mortality, we performed a similar calculation using the overall average life expectancy
132 in each state.

133 We applied a present value discount rate of 10% to the GDP, though this can be adjusted
134 up or down as specific circumstances might warrant. Higher discount rates lead to lower
135 DEVELOP Scores, and vice versa. Purchasing power parity could be substituted for GDP for
136 comparisons among countries.

137 We also added a disability-adjusted weight to the DEVELOP score to account for the
138 economic consequences of different morbidities depending on their severity. For example,
139 severe cerebral palsy (e.g., spastic quadriplegia) is weighted more heavily than moderate
140 cases.^{20,1} CDs have excess costs from additional hospital and recovery days compared to
141 uncomplicated vaginal deliveries.

142 Using this framework, we calculated DEVELOP scores nationwide and for every U.S.
143 state for each year of lost life or year of disabled life averted (Table 2). For example, the 2020
144 World Bank statistics show that Mexico's average per capita GDP was \$10,045.68. The DEVELOP
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
147 corresponding DEVELOP Scores are \$907,912.09 per newborn and \$894,544.63 per mother.
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%.²⁴ 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,
179 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:

- 187 1. **Hospitals** focus on the immediate costs of care. Compensation from insurance
188 companies and governmental agencies affects their bottom line and future viability.
- 189 2. **States** administer Medicaid programs and focus on the costs and revenues of
190 healthcare programs as part of their annual budgets. However, the immediate costs
191 of providing obstetric care should be compared to resultant costs of providing
192 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.

202 Individual projections are always fraught with uncertainties, but cost-benefit estimates
203 generated on a population basis could be more precisely refined. Our data suggest that
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
206 would improve both public and private bottom lines not only by reducing maternal and
207 neonatal costs but also by providing long-term financial and social contributions that are not
208 captured in a hospital's profit and loss statements. Indeed, our estimate of an annual cost
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 fiat; improvements must
211 instead be evaluated as part of a multi-step, contextualized process. By creating sub-goals and
212 evaluating them "tranche by tranche," like responsible businesses do, stakeholders and
213 policymakers could generate greater enthusiasm for better care and improved outcomes.

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 Chicago²² 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.

235 We therefore created DEVELOP, which is a simplified version of the Value of a Statistical
236 Life. We acknowledge that putting dollar values on human life is morally distasteful, especially
237 when done to avoid ethical responsibilities. Our approach and acronym are therefore directed
238 towards “life optimization and preservation,” framing the analysis on integrity and noble
239 principles. Importantly, our valuations yield concrete numbers—dollars of economic benefits
240 associated with every life saved or morbidity prevented and the specific cost benefits for
241 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.
244 The longer someone lives without disability, the more economically productive that individual
245 becomes, and the more tax revenue they generate.³⁵ Later versions of our model will consider
246 secondary economic benefits realized through an individual’s purchases of goods (food,
247 housing, etc.) or services (education, etc.). Furthermore, a reduced MMR means that the state,
248 family, and/or community allocates less time and resources to helping raise a deceased
249 woman’s children, thereby creating more economic opportunities. Reducing the CDR similarly
250 lowers costs and frees hospital beds. Every dollar saved with better labor and delivery
251 management increases the capacity of the health care system to provide improved healthcare.

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
254 analytic metric. However, we are not suggesting that the current CDR for White patients is a
255 “good” number, especially in comparison to other G7 nations.³⁶ We are instead developing

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

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

282 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

290 Some inertia in the system is always present but difficult to quantify.⁴⁴ Public distrust in
291 a system that, for hundreds of years, created barriers to and lower tiers of care cannot instantly
292 vanish. Trust must be earned through repeated acts of trustworthiness. This lack of trust
293 partially explains why so many patients at the highest end of the need spectrum do not take
294 advantage of supposedly available healthcare services. Inequities in health access and
295 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-
312 term economic consequences of how governments and private insurers allocate resources for
313 obstetrical and resultant neonatal/infant care. Although our conclusions may seem intuitively
314 obvious, a deep search in PubMed suggests that ours is the first research paper to support
315 these intuitive beliefs with factual data and analytics. We hope that our data-driven analysis of
316 the economic consequences of healthcare disparities will engender public policy debates that
317 focus on timelines longer than the next election cycle. We expect future versions of the
318 DEVELOP model to offer even deeper insights.

319 Despite this major step forward, our results do not identify any universal theme
320 underlying the wide variations in (i) health care expenditures among state indemnity and

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
333 or long term: instead, lower “up front” expenditures ultimately cost the U.S. more than \$3
334 billion per year in direct outlays and tens of billions of dollars amortized due to lost years of life
335 and productivity. We believe that the challenge of improving disparities in maternal, fetal, and
336 infant care should be reconceptualized to include a larger, overarching viewpoint that considers
337 both medicine and economics in long-term timescales.⁴⁰ Better economic evaluations will
338 empower concomitant improvements in both data evaluation and machine learning approaches
339 to support more sophisticated analyses and program development.⁵¹⁻⁵⁴ Under the framework
340 we propose here, the justifications for enhancing the provision of prenatal care become
341 economically, ethically, morally, and practically compelling.

342

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

355 **DECLARATIONS**

356 DATA SHARING STATEMENT

357 All data were taken from publicly available databases and then analyzed: we have aggregate, de-

358 identified statistics but no individual patient data. When our current studies based on this data

359 have been completed (no specific date yet established), the aggregate data will be publicly

360 shared in the form of data tables on the lead author’s website.

361

362 FUNDING

363 We received no outside funding for this project or manuscript.

364

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
371 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:

374 No AI or assisted technologies were used in the preparation of this manuscript.

375

376 TABLES

377 TABLE 1.

378
379

Databases Used

380 [https://www.kff.org/medicaid/state-indicator/births-financed-by-](https://www.kff.org/medicaid/state-indicator/births-financed-by-medicaid/?currentTimeframe=0&sortModel=%7B%22colId%22:%22Location%22,%22sort%22:%22asc%22%7D)
381 [medicaid/?currentTimeframe=0&sortModel=%7B%22colId%22:%22Location%22,%22sort%22:%22asc%22%7D](https://www.kff.org/medicaid/state-indicator/births-financed-by-medicaid/?currentTimeframe=0&sortModel=%7B%22colId%22:%22Location%22,%22sort%22:%22asc%22%7D)
382

383 United States Department of Health and Human Services (US DHHS), Centers of Disease Control and Prevention
384 (CDC), National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), Division of Vital Statistics (DVS). Linked Birth / Infant Death
385 Records 2007-2020, as compiled from data provided by the 57 vital statistics jurisdictions through the Vital
386
387 Statistics Cooperative Program, on CDC WONDER On-line Database. Accessed at [http://wonder.cdc.gov/lbd-](http://wonder.cdc.gov/lbd-current.html)
388 [current.html](http://wonder.cdc.gov/lbd-current.html) on April 5, 2023.

389
390 Maternal Mortality Rate by State 2024 (worldpopulationreview.com)
391

392 Maternal Mortality Rates in the United States, 2021 (cdc.gov)
393

394 [https://www.kff.org/other/state-indicator/infant-mortality-rate-by-race-](https://www.kff.org/other/state-indicator/infant-mortality-rate-by-race-ethnicity/?dataView=1¤tTimeframe=0&sortModel=%7B%22colId%22)
395 [ethnicity/?dataView=1¤tTimeframe=0&sortModel=%7B%22colId%22](https://www.kff.org/other/state-indicator/infant-mortality-rate-by-race-ethnicity/?dataView=1¤tTimeframe=0&sortModel=%7B%22colId%22)
396

397 <https://www.cia.gov/the-world-factbook/field/mothers-mean-age-at-first-birth/>
398

399 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD>
400

401 <https://www.bea.gov/data/gdp/gdp-state>
402
403

404 TABLE 2: DEVELOP SCORE ANALYSIS

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

State Name	10 Year Average Per Capita Healthcare Spend	10 Year Per Capita Healthcare Spend Rank	MMR Rank (lowest MMR = 1)	NMR Rank (lowest NMR = 1)	Statistical Value of a Mother's Life Based on GDP CAGR 2014-2022	Statistical Value of a Neonate's Life Based on GDP CAGR 2014-2022	Healthcare Rank (Lowest = 1)	Economic Rank (Lowest = 1)	Combined Rank (Lowest Score = 1)
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			

406

407 **REFERENCES**

- 408 1. Declercq E, Barnard-Mayers R, Zephyrin LC, Johnson K. The U.S. maternal health divide: the
409 limited maternal health services and worse outcomes of states proposing new abortion
410 restrictions. The Commonwealth Fund. 2024.
411 [https://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/issue-briefs/2022/dec/us-maternal-health-](https://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/issue-briefs/2022/dec/us-maternal-health-divide-limited-services-worse-outcomes)
412 [divide-limited-services-worse-outcomes](https://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/issue-briefs/2022/dec/us-maternal-health-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 3. Gunja MZ, Gumas ED, Williams RDI. The U.S. maternal mortality crisis continues to worsen: an
416 international comparison. The Commonwealth Fund. 2024.
417 [https://www.commonwealthfund.org/blog/2022/us-maternal-mortality-crisis-continues-](https://www.commonwealthfund.org/blog/2022/us-maternal-mortality-crisis-continues-worsen-international-comparison)
418 [worsen-international-comparison](https://www.commonwealthfund.org/blog/2022/us-maternal-mortality-crisis-continues-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
430 equity in preterm birth and low birthweight: the Centering and Racial Disparities randomized
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.0000000000005488

- 439 11. Arechvo A, Nikolaidi DA, Gil MM, et al. Maternal race and stillbirth: cohort study and systematic
440 review with meta-analysis. *J Clin Med.* 2022;11(12). doi:10.3390/jcm11123452
- 441 12. McIlwraith C, Sanusi A, McGwin G, Jr., Battarbee A, Subramaniam A. Recurrent severe maternal
442 morbidity in an obstetric population with a high comorbidity burden. *Obstet Gynecol.*
443 2024;143(2)
- 444 13. Goldfarb S, Deichen Hansen M, Day J, Brown Speights JS, Rust G, Harman J: State variation in
445 progress towards eliminating disparities in Infant Mortality, 2007-19. *Health Affairs* 2024;43
- 446 14. Brown Speights JS, Goldfarb SS, Wells BA, Beitsch L, Levine RS, Rust G. State-level progress in
447 reducing the Black-White infant mortality gap, United States, 1999–2013. *Am J Public*
448 *Health.* 2017;107(5):775–82.
- 449 15. Wallace M, Crear-Perry J, Richardson L, Tarver M, Theall K. Separate and unequal: structural
450 racism 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 17. Cohen A, Hanft R, Encinosa W, Spernak S, Stewart S, White C. *Technology in American health*
453 *care: policy directions for effective evaluation and management* University of Michigan Press;
454 2004.
- 455 18. Buettgens M, Blavin F, Pan C: The affordable care act reduced income inequality in the US.
456 *Health Aff.* 2021 40:121-129
- 457 19. Evans MI, Ryan GF, Mussalli G, Britt DW, Worth J, Devoe LD: Another Reason to
458 Address Social Determinants and Disparities: It Saves Money. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*
459 2024;230:S100
- 460 20. Evans M, Ryan G, Britt D, et al. Reframing the economic arguments for improving obstetrical
461 care: saving money costs too much. presented at: 71st Society for Reproductive Investigation
462 Scientific Meeting; March 12-16 2024; Vancouver, BC, Canada.
- 463
- 464
- 465 21. Artiga S, Hinton E. *Beyond health care: the role of social determinants in promoting health and*
466 *health equity* 2018. <https://files.kff.org/attachment/issue-brief-beyond-health-care>
- 467 22. Kremer M, Gallant S, Rostapshova O, et al. Is development innovation a good investment? Which
468 innovations scale? Evidence on social investing from USAID's development innovation ventures.
469 2019;
- 470 23. Kniesner TJ, Viscusi WK. The value of a statistical life. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Economics*
471 *and Finance.* 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

Evans 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
480 monitoring: the fetal reserve index. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2023;228:S1129-1143

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.2023.100917

487 31 Mujahid MS, Wall-Wieler E, Hailu EM, Berkowitz RL, Gao X, Morris CM, et al: Neighborhood
488 disinvestment and severe maternal morbidity in the state of California. *Am J Obstet*
489 *Gynecol MFM* 2023; doi: 10.1016/j.ajogmf.2023.100916

490 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

494

495

496

497 33. Neumann PJ, Kim DD. Cost-effectiveness thresholds used by study authors, 1990-2021. *JAMA.*
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 countries. *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 36 Evans MI, Britt DW, Evans SM: Midforceps did not cause “compromised babies” –
506 compromise caused forceps: an approach toward safely lowering the cesarean delivery
507 rate. *J Matern Fetal Neonat Med* 2022; 29:1874-1894
- 508 37. Jiang HJ, Moshe Henke R, Fingar KR, Denis Agniel LL, Roemer MI: Rural hospitals experienced
509 more patient volume variability than urban hospitals during the COVID-19 Pandemic, 2020-21. *Health*
510 *Aff* 2024;43 (5)
- 511 38. Henke RM, Fingar KR, Jiang HJ, Liang L, Gibson TB. Access to obstetric, behavioral health, and
512 surgical inpatient services after hospital mergers in rural areas. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2021;40(10):1627–
513 36.
- 514 39. Polan RM, Barber EL. Reimbursement for female-specific compared with male-specific
515 procedures over time. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2021;138(6):878-883.
516 doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000004599
- 517 40. [https://www.healthsystemtracker.org/chart-collection/health-expenditures-vary-across-](https://www.healthsystemtracker.org/chart-collection/health-expenditures-vary-across-population/#Share%20of%20total%20population%20and%20total%20health%20spending,%20by%20age%20group,%202021)
518 [population/#Share%20of%20total%20population%20and%20total%20health%20spending,](https://www.healthsystemtracker.org/chart-collection/health-expenditures-vary-across-population/#Share%20of%20total%20population%20and%20total%20health%20spending,%20by%20age%20group,%202021)
519 [g,%20by%20age%20group,%202021\)](https://www.healthsystemtracker.org/chart-collection/health-expenditures-vary-across-population/#Share%20of%20total%20population%20and%20total%20health%20spending,%20by%20age%20group,%202021)
520
- 521 41. U.S. Social Security Administration. Monthly Statistical Snapshot: January 2024.
522 https://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/quickfacts/stat_snapshot/index.html
- 523 42. Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Special Education Tuition Pricing Details. 26.
524 <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 45. Batman S, Rivlin K, Robinson W, Brown O, Carter EB, Lindo E: A rubric to center equity in
528 obstetrics and gynecology research. *Obstet Gynecol* 2023;142:772-778
- 529 46. Doll KM: The future of research on racism in reproductive health. *Obstet Gynecol* 2023;142:987-
530 988.
- 531 47. Henke RM, Fingar KR, Jiang HJ, Liang L, Gibson TB. Access to obstetric, behavioral health, and
532 surgical inpatient services after hospital mergers in rural areas. *Health Affairs*. 2021;40(10):1627-
533 1636. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2021.00160
- 534

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

552

553
